

Approved January 26, 1989  
Date

MINUTES OF THE Senate COMMITTEE ON Agriculture

The meeting was called to order by Senator Allen at  
Chairperson

10:07 a.m. ~~XX~~ on January 25, 19 89 in room 423-S of the Capitol.

All members were present ~~except~~

Committee staff present: Raney Gilliland, Legislative Research Department  
Jill Wolters, Revisor of Statutes Department

Conferees appearing before the committee: Sam Brownback, Secretary, State Board of Agriculture  
Lois Schlickau, President, State Board of  
Agriculture

Senator Allen called the committee to order and called attention to information provided to the committee for their information concerning animal rights (attachment 1). The Chairman then called on Sam Brownback to present a review of the State Board of Agriculture.

Mr. Brownback introduced the President of the State Board of Agriculture, Lois Schlickau, to report the condition of Kansas Agriculture before he made his presentation. Copies of their presentation were given to the committee (attachment 2).

Mrs. Schlickau expressed pleasure in being able to present information to the committee about the activities of the seven divisions of the State Board of Agriculture. Mr. Brownback, with his presentation showed two products, a plastic jug and a disposable diaper, which are now being manufactured using corn as part of the manufacturing ingredients and both products are biodegradable. Mr. Brownback also showed the committee colored newsprint which was made from soybeans; also samples of kenaf billets which are used to make paper. Kenaf billet might be a future product to grow in southeast Kansas; the product requires either irrigation or an area with plenty of rainfall.

During committee questions and discussion it was explained that privatization means that the State Board of Agriculture certifies a private business to do what has been done by the Board of Agriculture such as the testing of scales. Appreciation was expressed that extra efforts are being taken to rid the state of musk thistle and to enforce the Noxious Weed laws. Mr. Brownback explained that the Board of Agriculture has no stand on the issue of the state controlling, on a volunteer basis by landowners, areas of private land for recreational access for a fee. Mr. Brownback replied that more mediation had taken place in the private sector than through the FACTS Program.

The Chairman thanked Mrs. Schlickau and Mr. Brownback and then called for action on committee minutes.

Senator Sallee moved the committee minutes for January 24 be approved. Senator Daniels seconded the motion. Motion carried.

The Chairman adjourned the committee at 10:55 a.m.

GUEST LIST

COMMITTEE: Senate Agriculture

DATE: January 25, 1989

NAME	ADDRESS	ORGANIZATION
Warren Parker	Manhattan	Kansas Farm Bureau
MIKE BEAM	TOPEKA	Ks. LIVSTK. ASSN.
Kathy Taylor	Topeka	Ks Bankers Assn.
Chuck Stones	"	"
T.D. Wilson	"	Kans. Grain Insp. Dept.
Hazel Gibbs	Wichita	Sevek John
GARY HARE	CHAMPAIGN	Ks State Bd. of Ag.
DON JACKA	TOPEKA	Ks STATE BOARD OF Agric.
Maureen Hall	Topeka	KS Co-op Council
G. D. Lums	LYNDON	KVMA
Joe Rickabaugh	Topeka	Ks Livestock Assn.
Wilbur Leonard	Topeka	Comm. Ks Farm Org.
Juan Wyatt	McPherson	Ko Farmers Union
Emile P. Mushrush	McPherson	Kansas Farmers Union
Lois Schlichau	Haven	Ks. State Bd. of Ag.
Victoria Duber	Kansas City	Ks citizen
Mechelle Lutz	Wichita	Haysville Pioneer Reporter
<del>William</del>	Topeka	SPAA

# On To The Next Battle

*Agriculture won one in Massachusetts, but the next battle is forming.*

By Joe Roybal  
Managing Editor

**F**ailure of the farm animal initiative in Massachusetts in November wasn't a total loss for proponents of the measure. The debate reaped plenty of national exposure and helped to further elevate animal rights in the national consciousness, says an advocate for U.S. agriculture.

The result is that major media organizations in the country have seized the emotional issue. And by the time you read this article, you may already have seen one or both of the two works in progress that Steve Kopperud, director of the Animal Industry Foundation, referred to in his address before the Minnesota State Cattlemen's Association in early December.

Kopperud said CBS television and the weekly magazine *Newsweek* plan to air or publish major works on the animal welfare issue in late December or January. CBS News will devote an hour via its weekly program "48 Hours," while *Newsweek* plans to give animal welfare major treatment in an upcoming issue and has instructed all its U.S. bureaus to provide material, Kopperud said.

Kopperud expects the CBS program to deal with the areas of biomedical research, consumer product safety testing, puppy mills and farm animals.

"They (CBS) plan to portray all of animal agriculture by interviewing one veal producer in California. They'll contrast him with one animal advocate in the Humane Farming Association (a San Francisco-based animal rights group with Buddhist roots) and we'll all take the flak from it. From what we've determined, this is not going to be a positive piece. We're going to be painted as mechanized, factory-like operations that don't care about animals," Kopperud said.

The *Newsweek* project, Kopperud continued, will deal with the same

four areas, pets, farms, product safety testing and biomedical research. But, he said, his organization anticipates a more balanced report from the magazine.

"We hold some greater hope for this one (*Newsweek* piece), but if these things come off as badly as they might, and Lord knows we have not been treated well by the media up to this point, we'll call on every state group in the country to mount a massive letter-writing campaign to the president of CBS and the chairman of the board of *Newsweek* Magazine. We can't afford to tolerate that kind of media abuse because what the public reads is what they believe," Kopperud said.

Regardless of the challenges, Kopperud emphasized that this "battle for consumers" is not a hopeless cause. Referring to the Massachusetts referendum on farm animals defeated in November, he said: "If we can beat them in Boston, we can beat them anywhere. The lady that heads up the state agriculture department's division of animal health (Mabel Owen) said it right. When asked by the *New York Times* how the battle was won, she replied: 'It's quite simple. We won because we were right.'"

In Massachusetts, Kopperud said farmers, of which there are only 4,500, pulled together and spent \$500,000 in local and national money to campaign against the referendum. On November 8, it died — 71 percent to 29 percent.

"Three weeks before that we were told we could not win in Boston. Boston is urban. Boston is Democrat. Boston is yuppie. So to win by a 2 to 1 margin was incredible to political analysts in Massachusetts," he said.

If it had passed, the referendum, which asked, "Do you favor the continued humane treatment of farm animals in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts?", would have set up a scientific advisory committee to advise the Massachusetts ag commissioner. Consisting of the director of the



Kopperud

department of animal health and representatives of four animal rights groups, there would have been no farm representation on the committee, Kopperud said.

Four weeks before the election, polls indicated 55 percent of the population would have voted for the measure. "Ten days later, that percentage had completely reversed, based on the message that the farmers put out, which was very simple: 'Vote No on Question 3, help us save our farms,'" Kopperud said.

Kopperud, who also serves as coordinator of the Farm Animal Welfare Coalition, a unified organization on animal rights for 35 agricultural organizations, among which the National Cattlemen's Association is one, said the challenge against American agriculture from animal welfarist organizations is formidable. By their own estimate, there are some 400 animal rights groups in the U.S. today with a combined budget of \$200 million. These groups, he said, are trying to position themselves to be more mainstream. They're also becoming more sophisticated in their methods, and more violent.

"We have to put aside our commodity rivalries, our group rivalries, come up with a single strategic plan and move forward on it," Kopperud said.

A major step in this effort occurred

*Senate agriculture  
1-25-89  
attachment 1*

December 8-9 in St. Louis, when representatives of the various cattle industry segments (beef, dairy, feed and veal) met to put together a framework for a cattle industry strategic plan. The meeting was funded by

\$30,000 which was provided from beef checkoff funds.

"We can't afford to say it's someone else's problem or to say that we have our own approach to this issue. This must be a universally coordi-

nated effort among all aspects of animal agriculture. Because if one group gets regulated, it will be that much tougher to stop it for the next commodity and the next and the next," Kopperud said. ♦

# Welfarists Suffer Setbacks

By Joe Vansickle  
Senior Associate Editor

The animal welfare movement, dealt some recent harsh setbacks, may be ready to turn tail and run.

First there was the humiliating defeat last fall of a referendum in Massachusetts. A group known as the Coalition to End Animal Suffering and Exploitation (CEASE) wanted to set standards for livestock production and marketing practices. Activists wanted to outlaw raising of milk-fed veal, require the use of anesthetics for routine animal care and form a scientific advisory board on agriculture dominated by their own kind.

Massachusetts was no accident for this issue. CEASE thought it would be easy prey because of its liberal populace and small agricultural base.

Playing on people's emotions, they flashed posters and ran ads depicting a veal calf in a cramped crate or other "abused" animals, with the campaign theme, "There Ought To Be A Law."

And they came out of the closet. They suggested farm animals should be treated as well as pets — or animal agriculture should be phased out of existence.

Officials of the Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation found some T-shirts from CEASE emblazoned with the message, "Meat Is Murder," spattered with red to mean blood.

CEASE smelled a victory. Polls showed the majority favored their cause. The group talked about victory plans. They admitted plans to milk the Massachusetts case, to export their ideas to other states.

Instead, Massachusetts voters killed the animal welfare referendum almost three to one at the polls. The overwhelming defeat of the group CEASE (they can't propose a similar measure for at least six years) sym-

bolizes a rejection of the entire animal welfare movement, as this was the first statewide attempt to legislate broad limits on farming.

What happened? CEASE underestimated the resourcefulness of the Farm Bureau with limited funds and the grit of those outnumbered farmers. Though polls taken shortly before the election still showed voters favoring the referendum, Farm Bureau mounted a last-ditch education campaign and truck farmers (fruits and vegetables) to livestockmen "beat the pavement" getting the true word out.

CEASE members stressed they weren't out to eliminate animal agriculture. But farmers knew better and they told voters that if the referendum passed, it *would* endanger the livelihood of the state's agricultural industry, affecting the state's dwindling amount of open space and pasture land. Farms that were forced out of business would quickly be bulldozed and turned into yuppie condos.

That's not idle talk. During the heat of the campaign, one of the state's two veal operations pulled up stakes and the land was sold to a home developer.

But that was a shallow victory for CEASE. They not only lost the battle, but they paid for it afterwards, too. Often on the positive end of publicity, this time the tables were turned on them. Farm Bureau officials said their phone lines were jammed for days on end with journalists calling from across the U.S. and across the seas, wanting to know what determined the outcome.

Recent publicity may also have hurt the tax-exempt status of the Humane Society of the United States.

Two officers of the society have been accused of alleged misuse of funds, according to recent columns in the *Washington Post*. Syndicated col-

umnist Jack Anderson reveals HSUS Internal Revenue Service forms for 1987 show that President John Hoyt received \$95,000 and Vice President-Treasurer Paul Irwin \$80,000 in salary.

However, unknown to the full board of HSUS, the two failed to file other benefits they received. The past four years, both Hoyt and Irwin received money from two affiliates of the Humane Society — the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education and the National Humane Education Center.

To top it off, the Humane Society bought its president a \$310,000 home in Maryland last year. And the society's treasurer wrote himself \$85,000 in checks last year as reimbursements for lease payments and improvements on oceanside real estate in Maine.

According to columnist Anderson, the Humane Society's board of directors never authorized these financial deals arranged by its officers — deals that could threaten the tax-exempt status of the society.

Two other syndicated columnists have also done agriculture some favors. Ann Landers, in her October 17 column, said, "Dr. Benjamin Trump, from the University of Maryland Medical School, said in a recent interview, 'We in the medical profession find it painful to accept a dead child over a dead mouse.' Dr. Trump's same sentiments are shared by millions, and you can put me at the top of the list."

In a recent column Abigail Van Buren (Dear Abby) set the record straight for a reader when she said she had been misquoted as saying she totally opposed use of animals in laboratory research. She said she is totally in favor of humane use of animals in medical research. ♦

Kansas Livestock Association, 2044 Fillmore, Topeka, Kansas 66604 • Phone 913/232-9358

### **ANIMAL RIGHTS MOVE IS LARGE, WELL FUNDED**

There are over 400 recognized animal rights groups in the U.S. today with a combined budget of \$200 million, according to the executive director of the Animal Industry Foundation, a group founded and subscribed to by those involved in animal agriculture and interested in defending against animal rights activists. Steve Kopperud delivered those and other startling comments concerning the animal rights movement at last week's Kansas State Board of Agriculture annual meeting in Topeka.

Kopperud, also chairman of the Farm Animal Welfare Coalition of which NCA is a member, said groups such as the Farm Animal Reform Movement (FARM) and People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) are offspring of a sociopolitical movement imported from Europe. Actions of these activist groups include defacing packages of meat in supermarkets with stickers stating "This package contains meat from dead animals" or "Farm animals never have a nice day" and carrying out acts of a violent nature on research facilities using animals to find cures for animal and human diseases. Kopperud admitted that talking reason with animal rights proponents on any subject is impossible.

Dr. Cliff Templeton, who is involved with biomedical research at the University of Kansas, followed Kopperud on the program and testified to the fact that the animal rights movement could have a seriously negative impact on public health if the situation worsens due to a lack of cures for serious medical problems such as AIDS, heart disease and diabetes.

PRESENTATION BY  
LOIS SCHLICKAU, PRESIDENT, KANSAS STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE

AND

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE SAM BROWNBACK

TO THE KANSAS HOUSE AND SENATE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEES

January 25, 1989

*Senate Agriculture  
1-25-89  
attachment 2*

Thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee for allowing us the opportunity to present to you a statement on the present condition of Kansas agriculture, issues facing the industry in general and the Kansas State Board of Agriculture in particular.

During the past year the State Board of Agriculture has had a very active calendar. Our main work is being done in the trenches day in and day out by our seven divisions, each of which have significant successes to report. Within the Plant Health section, we have reinitiated a bio-control program of musk thistle which we are excited about and have worked with other entities on encouraging biological control of other pests such as the Russian Wheat Aphid. Furthermore, we are seeing more enforcement of the Noxious Weed laws.

In the division of Inspections, which includes dairy, meat and poultry, weights and measures, and agricultural products, we are evaluating additional opportunities to extend privatization into other areas similar to what was accomplished in the large and small scale program. We are also striving to maximize inspection efficiency through firm and uniform enforcement of the laws.

The FACTS program continues to receive a number of calls from financially distressed farmers. Calls have increased since the recent FmHA foreclosure mailings. Your amendments to the FACTS legislation last year enabled us to receive more than \$400,000 in mediation funds from the federal government to contract with a group in this state to provide mediation on Farmers Home Administration delinquent loans and others as requested.

The Statistics division was kept very busy monitoring the drought and providing dependable crop estimates given the weather conditions. We further resumed several key agricultural surveys such as the Custom Rates Survey, Wheat Variety Survey, Grain Marketing and Transportation and Pasture Rental Survey. They have further initiated some new surveys pertaining to agriculture and the rural economy. Information on the production of sunflowers and catfish in the state will soon be available. We also anticipate publishing improved measures of farm income assets and debts, tabulation of farm bankruptcies and surveys pertaining to rural business trends.

The division of Water Resources continued its heavy workload. It's staff was also extra busy due to the drought, responding to water shortages, water rights and minimum desirable streamflow administration and trying to expedite the processing of various types of applications, etc., during emergency conditions. The division is trying to beef up enforcement of our water laws and to implement the new provisions related to water use reporting to improve the water data base which is important for planning, management and enforcement purposes. The division has implemented new water conservation requirements for new applications to appropriate water, established an intensive groundwater use control area in the Upper Smoky Hill River Basin, continued to work with the groundwater management districts and played a significant role in interstate water matters, particularly in the Kansas v. Colorado law suit, other interstate river compacts, and in the Missouri River Basin. The Division has been able to make progress in reducing the backlog of field inspection work and the issuance of certificates of appropriation but is still understaffed to handle all of the additional responsibilities added to the division by recent legislation and to otherwise administer the programs assigned to the division in light of the current needs related to water in Kansas.

Our Laboratory division has added analysis of chemical residues in water. We have been periodically surveying chemigation wells to determine if there are any chemical pesticide residues. We were able to do this by a shift of resources within the lab. The lab has continued to be inundated with a heavy load on seed analysis, particularly in the native grass area. This is a result of the high quality work that we do at reasonable prices at the Seed Lab and also the government Conservation Reserve Program and its increase in demand for quality grass seed.

Our most visible division within the Board of Agriculture during the past year has been our Marketing division, with the highly successful Bloomingdale's promotion, the FROM THE LAND OF KANSAS program and the "Celebrate Kansas Food" promotions we have really hit our stride on promoting Kansas food thus increasing the market for the production and processing of these products within the state. We now have 212 companies associated with the FROM THE LAND OF KANSAS program, two years ago there were 60. Within this marketing area the state is receiving an 8 to 1 return on its investment in market promotion and development. Funds for loans for agricultural diversification have been located and used. The Blueprint Study was completed this last year and is being implemented. During the upcoming year you will see a number of conferences take place in the area of adding value to agricultural production. The Wheat Commission along with the Board of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce and KSU is sponsoring a conference today on adding value to Kansas wheat. In the High Plains area around Dodge City there will be a conference on business opportunities associated with agriculture in the month of February. In March we, along with three other state departments of agriculture and several other entities, will be sponsoring a commercializing non-food uses of agricultural commodities conference in Kansas City. The targeted audience for that conference will be agriculture and industry to explore places that we can commercialize presently developed non-food uses of agricultural commodities. This is an area which we have had a task force meeting on and I believe holds tremendous potential for the agricultural production in the state. Mr. Chairman, I would certainly like to encourage the Committee to hear from the Chairman of that task force, Ladd Seaberg, President of Midwest Grain Products, Inc. in Atchison, Kansas about their report and findings. It is most interesting and encouraging.

As you can see, 1988 was a busy year and a very good year for the Kansas State Board of Agriculture and we believe for Kansas agriculture in general.

However, the biggest story in Kansas agriculture during the past year was the drought that gripped much of the nation's mid-section throughout the summer of 1988 and continues even today for many parts of the midwest and Kansas. The dry weather had a major impact on fall harvested crops, hay and pasture throughout the state, the resulting reductions in crop yields were more than offset though, by increased prices so that the value of crop production in Kansas during 1988 actually exceeded the previous year. Most Kansas farmers came into 1988 in an improved financial condition with Kansas net farm income at a record level in 1987. Kansas net farm income was at \$1.7 billion in 1987, an all time record high. The year brought higher cattle prices, but lower hog prices. Producers of both cattle and hogs gave overwhelming support to check-off referendums which provided optimism for improving demand for beef and pork through aggressive promotion programs.



At the beginning of 1988, Kansas agriculture appeared to be on the road to recovery. Farmland values in February 1988 averaged \$368 an acre, up 8% from the previous year. Kansas farmers came into 1988 with total assets 26% higher than the previous year and net worth, 36% higher. Debt-to-asset ratios continue to show considerable improvement declining to .23 as compared to .28 at the beginning of 1987 and .32 a year earlier. This means that for every dollar of assets farmers across Kansas had, they had 23 cents in debt. Survey's showed a declining portion of Kansas farmers in financial trouble.

However, the drought year of 1988 did not treat all farmers equally. Some who were already in financial trouble had to bear an even greater burden while those who were blessed with rain and produced a reasonable crop were able to take advantage of improved prices and had opportunity to further enhance their financial condition. Total net farm income in Kansas in 1988 should, very nearly, equal the record set in 1987.

In wheat, production was down 12% below 1987 and the lowest since 1981, but the price was much higher. The total market value of the 1988 wheat crop approaching 1.2 Billion dollars compared with about 879 million dollars for the previous year, and the quality of the crop was excellent with tremendous test weights and protein averaging the highest of recent years.

Corn production was up slightly from the previous year with close to 2/3 of the Kansas corn crop irrigated. The value of the crop seems likely to reach 350 million dollars, some 34% more than the 1987 crop.

Grain sorghum production was down 29% from a year earlier with the estimated average yield of 62 bushels per acre. Again prices were much higher with the total market value of the crop close to 450 million dollars. Kansas continues to be the nation's leading grain sorghum producer.

Soybean production was significantly hurt by the drought with production down 32% from a year ago. The estimated value of the soybean production at slightly less than 350 million dollars was about 2% less than last year.

Hay prices were extremely volatile during the hot, dry, uncertain summer. The Kansas hay crop was estimated to be down 14% but average prices received for all hay reached as high as \$93 a ton in August 1988 compared with \$51 per ton in August 1987. There were many reported sales at even a much higher price.

Kansas continued its strong position in cattle, with all cattle and calves on Kansas farms as of January 1, 1988 at 5.86 million head, down 1% from the previous year. The cattle feeding industry in Kansas continues to show expansion with Kansas gaining ground from its third ranking position on the state's of Nebraska and Texas. We still hope, and if present trends continue, Kansas will become the beef state within the next ten years. Kansas, of course, is the industry leader in processing of cattle.

Kansas hog inventories increased in numbers and were up in concert with the national trends, however, total cash receipts from hogs are likely to be down about 10% from one year ago level due to lower prices paid for pigs.

Dairies in Kansas continue to contribute a steady amount to the state's economy.

In the sheep area, Kansas lambs on feed are up 17% from the previous year and the highest in 14 years.

To summarize, although 1988 was a year marred by drought; all in all, one would have to take the production and prices of 1988 put it in a bottle and label it, a good year.

Regarding the upcoming Legislative Session, topics which the Legislature may wish to investigate include:

1. A review and, where deemed appropriate, implementation of the recommendations of the non-food use task force.
2. Increased privatization of enforcement functions at the State Board of Agriculture.
3. A request for civil penalties in certain enforcement areas.
4. Consideration of the Interim Committee report on changes needed in the Pesticide and Chemigation laws.
5. Funding of the Value-Added Processing Center.
6. A proposal for Recreational Fee Access on private land.

I will discuss each of these briefly.

As I mentioned previously, we believe the non-food use area holds tremendous potential for expansion of demand of Kansas agricultural production. I would be happy to provide each of you a copy of the task force report however, as I stated at the outset, I would again encourage you to hear instead from the Chairman of that group. The findings of this group generally mesh three areas of concern: The number one concern is increasing demand and hopefully price for agricultural production in the state; number two, increasing the value of crops which we produce and ship out of state by value-adding; and number three, environmental concerns that are coming forward, many of which can be addressed by non-food uses of agricultural commodities. I know you will want to take a good hard look at the possibilities in this area.

For sometime the State Board of Agriculture has pursued as much privatization of our enforcement functions as possible. During previous Legislative Sessions you have authorized the privatization of scale inspection in both large and small scales. I am pleased to report that those efforts are paying dividends. Not only is our investment in those areas decreasing but our efficacy is improving. When we were doing all of the inspection of the scales, the efficacy rate we were finding was 66%. Now the efficacy rate of scales is around 90%. We would like to see more of our programs examined for possible privatization, particularly in the area of Chemigation where a requirement of annual inspection of a Chemigation unit by a private certified company might help alleviate concerns and make a more productive inspection system.

We are asking that certain areas regulated by the State Board of Agriculture be allowed to give civil penalties for violation of law. Specifically, in the area of the Chemigation law, we believe that civil penalties should be assessed against those violating that law. Also, in the

area of dairy plant inspection, we are requesting the ability to levy civil penalties. In the area of dairy plant inspection, we presently have only two options, one is to continually remind the operators to do certain items as required by law, the other is to shut the entire plant down. Neither of these options is wholly acceptable. A half step would allow a civil penalty of an appropriate amount would help us in enforcing the law without being so draconian as shutting the entire plant down and thus injuring, perhaps to death, the plant and the dairy producers that supply the plant.

The State Board of Agriculture presented to the Interim Committee proposed changes in the Chemigation and Pesticide laws. We continue to support some changes and modifications in those areas. Of specific interest to us is to allow the use of chemicals at less than label rate, the creation of special chemical use districts where the groundwater may be particularly susceptible to chemical contamination and in the Chemigation area the private inspection. I believe that you will hear more information from the Interim Committee regarding this particular area. I certainly believe that this is going to be one of the most if not the single most difficult issue facing the entire agricultural industry throughout the upcoming decade.

I serve on Value-Added Processing Center Leadership Council. We are just getting that entity underway. It is something that stands to benefit Kansas agriculture tremendously by encouraging the processing industry thus increasing local markets for our agricultural supplies and, in many cases, rural jobs. I mention this here in that this Committee was the one that approved the creation of this Value-Added Processing Center. Now vigilance is needed to make sure that it is appropriately funded and operated in such a manner to be of greatest benefit to the state.

Finally, the State Board of Agriculture cooperated with the Department of Wildlife and Parks after the Commission Report on the Future of Kansas Agriculture, the Governor and several legislators asked us to work on a recreational fee access proposal. Agriculture, for many years, has had a problem with the deer population. There was a feeling during the last legislative session that the landowner should reap some benefit out of feeding the state's deer herd. An additional impetus for us to work in this area was the Commission Report on the Future of Kansas Agriculture which encouraged looking at charging for access to landowners' property as a way and means of receiving additional income from the fixed resources that the farmers have. For the past several months we have worked with the Department of Wildlife and Parks to come forward with a proposal. The proposal does have flaws but we do believe has a number of positive characteristics as well. In general, the Recreational Fee Access Proposal would allow landowners to voluntarily lease land to the state for a fee in exchange for the landowner allowing those people who purchase an access permit to come upon the land. The second portion of the proposal would allow landowners and others to create special wildlife districts and then sell access to the districts. The final portion of the plan would have deer permits run with the land, the landowner could charge access to his land to harvest the deer. This proposal is based completely upon voluntary participation by the landowner and the recreational enthusiast, it transfers all liability to the state, it provides a mechanism for farmers to realize some income from feeding the state's deer herd and puts forward some mechanisms for rural economic development. The proposal is certainly not flawless, much concern has been raised about adjacent landowners, to those who lease their land or absentee landowners who lease their land leaving others to contend with the

problems. Likewise notification of the landowner by those who come onto the land is an issue that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Chairman, it's my delight to come in front of your group and to serve this state as the Secretary of Agriculture. I have certainly enjoyed myself over the past year and look forward to working with you and your Committee throughout the upcoming session in any way that we can. If further information needs to be provided on certain topics or if you have specific requests please let us know. We will be happy to assist.

We would be happy to respond to any questions.