

SESSION OF 2003

**CONFERENCE COMMITTEE REPORT BRIEF
HOUSE BILL NO. 2078**

As Agreed to April 2, 2003

Brief *

HB 2078 would make several modifications and additions to the laws dealing with the Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks (KDWP).

Big Game Permits. The bill would, for the years 2003 and thereafter, increase the number of nonresident firearm and deer archery permits issued by KDWP by 2 percent each year.

The bill would require that a nonresident deer permit obtained by a landowner or tenant would only be valid within a designated county and one additional county where the qualifying landowner's or tenant's lands are located. This provision would expire on June 30, 2007.

The bill also would establish different maximum fees for big game tags for residents and nonresidents. For residents the maximum fee would be \$20 and for nonresidents the fee would be \$30. The maximum fee for nonresident applicants would also increase from \$5 to \$25.

Commercialization of Wildlife Provisions. The bill would raise the minimum value of wildlife species as follows:

- ! Deer or antelope, from \$200 to \$400;
- ! Elk or buffalo, from \$500 to \$600;
- ! Owls, hawks, falcons, kite, harriers, or ospreys, from \$125 to \$200;

*Conference committee report briefs are prepared by the Legislative Research Department and do not express legislative intent. No summary is prepared when the report is an agreement to disagree. The conference committee summary report may be accessed on the Internet at <http://www.kslegislature.org/kldr>

- ! Game birds, migrating game birds, resident and migratory nongame birds, game and nongame animals from \$10 to \$20 unless otherwise specified by law;
- ! Processed turtles, from \$8 per pound to \$10 per pound;
- ! Unprocessed turtles \$8 per pound to \$10 per pound; and
- ! Other unlisted wildlife, from \$5 to \$10.

Deer Management and Property Damage Control. The bill would authorize and direct the KDWP to develop a report containing recommendations for the establishment of a landowner deer management program. The report is to include recommended procedures, requirements, and guidelines to provide qualified landowners an allotment of antlered and antlerless deer permits that may be transferred by the landowner to resident or nonresident deer hunters for use on the landowner's land. The report would be presented to the Senate Natural Resources Committee and the House Tourism and Parks Committee on or before January 15, 2004.

The bill also would require the Secretary of KDWP to identify local geographical areas in which deer populations are causing significant property damage. The Secretary would be authorized and directed to take actions necessary to reduce deer populations in these areas.

Sale of Seized Items, Including Wildlife Parts and Certain Firearms. The bill would direct the KDWP to sell seized items, including wildlife parts with a dollar value, and certain firearms as described by the bill. The money would be credited to the Wildlife Fee Fund.

The bill would become effective January 1, 2004.

Background

Conferees who presented testimony before the House Tourism and Parks Committee included the Commissioner of the Department of Wildlife and Parks; the Secretary of Wildlife and Parks; a spokesperson of Kansas Farm Bureau, the Senior Vice President of

Kansas Livestock Association; and two citizens. This testimony was of a background nature and generally supportive of the changes proposed by the Kansas Deer Management Work Group. Two private citizens and the representative of Kansas Wildlife Federation appeared as opponents to the bill.

The House Tourism and Parks Committee amendment would sunset the big game permit provisions on June 30, 2005.

The House Committee of the Whole amendment pertains to rules and regulations regarding special landowner or tenant hunt-on-your-own-land deer archery permits.

The Senate Committee on Natural Resources amended the bill to:

- ! Eliminate a provision which would have required the issuance of special landowner or tenant hunt-on-your-own-land deer archery permits;
- ! Eliminate language that would have limited the validity of nonresident deer permits obtained by landowners or tenants to the landowner's or tenant's lands or lands controlled by the landowner or tenant;
- ! Provide that nonresident deer permits obtained by landowners or tenants be valid within a designated county or counties where the qualifying landowner or tenant's lands are located;
- ! Make the sunset date for the issuance of nonresident deer permits to landowners and tenants expire on June 30, 2008;
- ! Provide for the establishment of a landowner deer management program;
- ! Provide that the proceeds from sales of seized items, including wildlife parts with a dollar value, and certain firearms be deposited in the Wildlife Fee Fund;
- ! Require the Secretary of KDWP to identify local geographical areas in which deer populations are causing significant property damage and to take appropriate actions to reduce damage; and
- ! Make the bill effective January 1, 2004.

The Senate Committee of the Whole amendment pertains to the use of a nonresident deer permit on one adjacent county where the qualifying landowner's or tenant's lands are located.

The Conference Committee amendment pertains to the use of a nonresident deer permit on one additional county where the qualifying landowner's or tenant's lands are located. Conferees also changed the expiration date on the provisions pertaining to nonresident deer permits from June 30, 2008 to June 30, 2007. Finally, conferees made a technical change.

The fiscal note prepared by the Division of the Budget estimates that the bill would increase revenues by \$296,102 in FY 2004. All additional revenues would be deposited in the Wildlife Fee Fund. These estimates are based on information provided by the Department of Wildlife and Parks. The Department used calendar year 2001 permit sales data to formulate estimates for calendar years 2001, 2002, and 2003. The Division of the Budget converted those estimates to a fiscal year basis. Any fiscal effect resulting from passage of the bill is not reflected in *The FY 2004 Governor's Budget Report*.