

PERIODIC RULE REVIEW
Missouri Department of Conservation

Rule Number	Rule Title	Date of Adoption or Last Amendment	Is rule necessary?	Is rule obsolete?	Does rule overlap, duplicate, or conflict with other rules? (state, federal, local)	Can a less restrictive or alternative rule accomplish same purpose?	Can rule be modified to reduce regulatory burden or eliminate unnecessary paperwork?	Does the rule properly incorporate material by reference?	For rules affecting small business: does the public purpose or interest for adopting justify continued existence of rule?	Appendix A-Comments Received 7/1/20-8/31/20	Notes
Chapter 1											
Wildlife Code: Organization											
3 CSR 10-1.010	Organization and Methods of Operation	3/1/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	3	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
Chapter 2											
Wildlife Code: Forest Crop Lands											
3 CSR 10-2.020	Forest Cropland	6/30/2016	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
Chapter 3											
Wildlife Code: Monetary Values for Fish and Wildlife											
3 CSR 10-3.010	Monetary Values Established for Fish and Wildlife	3/1/2018	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
Chapter 4											
Wildlife Code: General Provisions											
3 CSR 10-4.105	Title; Authority	1/1/1988	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-4.110	General Prohibition; Applications	5/30/2016	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-4.111	Endangered Species	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-4.113	Ginseng	3/1/2009	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-4.117	Prohibited Species	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-4.118	Public Use of Certain Department Buildings	3/1/1999	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-4.120	Boundary Waters	12/31/1957	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-4.125	Inspection	3/1/2000	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-4.130	Owner May Protect Property; Public Safety	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	2	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.

Rule Number	Rule Title	Date of Adoption or Last Amendment	Is rule necessary?	Is rule obsolete?	Does rule overlap, duplicate, or conflict with other rules? (state, federal, local)	Can a less restrictive or alternative rule accomplish same purpose?	Can rule be modified to reduce regulatory burden or eliminate unnecessary paperwork?	Does the rule properly incorporate material by reference?	For rules affecting small business: does the public purpose or interest for adopting justify continued existence of rule?	Appendix A-Comments Received 7/1/20-8/31/20	Notes
3 CSR 10-4.135	Transportation	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time. A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-4.136	Giving Away Wildlife	12/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-4.137	Wildlife Identification	12/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-4.138	Possession and Daily Limit	1/1/1996	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-4.140	Possession, Storage and Processing	12/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-4.141	Right to Possess Wildlife	3/1/2003	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-4.145	Preparing and Serving Wildlife	12/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-4.150	Legality of Wildlife Taken Outside of Missouri	1/15/1993	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10- 4.200	Chronic Wasting Disease; Management Zone	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	N/A	0	
Chapter 5											
Wildlife Code: Permits											
3 CSR 10-5.205	Permits Required: Exceptions	12/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	5	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-5.210	Permits to be Signed and Carried	3/30/2017	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.215	Permits and Privileges: How Obtained; Not Transferable	12/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-5.216	Permits and Privileges: Revocation	3/1/2001	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.220	Resident and Nonresident Permits	8/30/2017	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	7	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-5.222	Youth Pricing: Deer and Turkey Permits	3/1/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.225	Permits: Permit Issuing Agents; Service Fees; Other Provisions	12/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.250	Daily Hunting or Fishing Tags	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.300	Apprentice Hunter Authorization	12/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	

Rule Number	Rule Title	Date of Adoption or Last Amendment	Is rule necessary?	Is rule obsolete?	Does rule overlap, duplicate, or conflict with other rules? (state, federal, local)	Can a less restrictive or alternative rule accomplish same purpose?	Can rule be modified to reduce regulatory burden or eliminate unnecessary paperwork?	Does the rule properly incorporate material by reference?	For rules affecting small business: does the public purpose or interest for adopting justify continued existence of rule?	Appendix A-Comments Received 7/1/20-9/31/20	Notes
3 CSR 10-5.310	Resident Lifetime Conservation Partner Permit	12/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-5.315	Resident Lifetime Fishing Permit	2/29/2008	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-5.320	Resident Lifetime Small Game Hunting Permit	12/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-5.330	Resident Small Game Hunting and Fishing Permit	12/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.331	Resident National Guard and Reserve Service Small Game Hunting and Fishing Permit	12/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.340	Resident Fishing Permit	3/30/2004	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.345	Resident Small Game Hunting Permit	12/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.351	Resident Firearms Any-Deer Hunting Permit	2/28/2007	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.352	Resident Firearms Antlerless Deer Hunting Permit	2/28/2007	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.359	Resident Managed Deer Hunting Permit	3/1/2003	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-5.360	Resident Archer's Hunting Permit	3/1/2003	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	2	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-5.365	Resident Turkey Hunting Permits	3/30/2004	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.370	Resident Trapping Permit	1/1/1996	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.425	Resident Archery Antlerless Deer Hunting Permit	3/1/2018	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.430	Trout Permit	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.435	Migratory Bird Hunting Permit	1/30/2010	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.436	Resident Conservation Order Permit	3/1/2011	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.440	Daily Fishing Permit	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.445	Daily Small Game Hunting Permit	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.460	Licensed Hunting Preserve Hunting Permit	4/1/2007	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.465	Three-Day Licensed Hunting Preserve Hunting Permit	4/1/2007	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.535	White River Border Lakes Permit	3/1/2001	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.540	Nonresident Fishing Permit	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.545	Nonresident Small Game Hunting Permit	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.551	Nonresident Firearms Any-Deer Hunting Permit	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.

Rule Number	Rule Title	Date of Adoption or Last Amendment	is rule necessary?	is rule obsolete?	Does rule overlap, duplicate, or conflict with other rules? (state, federal, local)	Can a less restrictive or alternative rule accomplish same purpose?	Can rule be modified to reduce regulatory burden or eliminate unnecessary paperwork?	Does the rule properly incorporate material by reference?	For rules affecting small business: does the public purpose or interest for adopting justify continued existence of rule?	Appendix A-Comments Received 7/1/20-8/31/20	Notes
3 CSR 10-5.552	Nonresident Firearms Antlerless Deer Hunting Permit	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-5.554	Nonresident Archery Antlerless Deer Hunting Permit	6/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	2	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-5.559	Nonresident Managed Deer Hunting Permit	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.560	Nonresident Archer's Hunting Permit	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.565	Nonresident Turkey Hunting Permits	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.567	Nonresident Conservation Order Permit	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.570	Nonresident Furbearer Hunting and Trapping Permit	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.576	Nonresident Landowner Firearms Any-Deer Hunting Permit	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.579	Nonresident Landowner Firearms Turkey Hunting Permits	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.580	Nonresident Landowner Archer's Hunting Permit	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.600	Resident Firearms Deer Management Assistance Program Permit	3/1/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.605	Nonresident Firearms Deer Management Assistance Program Permit	3/1/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.700	Resident Antlered Elk Hunting Permit	12/20/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-5.705	Resident Landowner Antlered Elk Hunting Permit	12/20/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
Chapter 6	Wildlife Code: Sport Fishing: Seasons, Methods, Limits										
3 CSR 10-6.405	General Provisions	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-6.410	Fishing Methods	3/1/2011	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	2	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-6.415	Restricted Zones	8/30/2020	YES	no	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.

Rule Number	Rule Title	Date of Adoption or Last Amendment	is rule necessary?	is rule obsolete?	Does rule overlap, duplicate, or conflict with other rules? (state, federal, local)	Can a less restrictive or alternative rule accomplish same purpose?	Can rule be modified to reduce regulatory burden or eliminate unnecessary paperwork?	Does the rule properly incorporate material by reference?	For rules affecting small business: does the public purpose or interest for adopting justify continued existence of rule?	Appendix A-Comments Received 7/1/20-9/3/20	Notes
3 CSR 10-6.505	Black Bass	3/1/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-6.510	Channel Catfish, Blue Catfish, Flathead Catfish	3/1/2014	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	2	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-6.515	Crappie	3/1/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-6.520	Muskellunge, Northern Pike, Grass Pickerel, Chain Pickerel	2/28/2007	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-6.525	Paddlefish	3/1/2011	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-6.530	Goggle-eye (Ozark Bass, Rock Bass, and Shadow Bass) and Warmouth	3/1/2018	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-6.533	Shovelnose Sturgeon	4/30/2009	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-6.535	Trout	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	5	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-6.540	Walleye and Sauger	4/30/2009	YES	NO	no	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-6.545	White Bass, Yellow Bass, Striped Bass	3/1/2014	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-6.550	Other Fish	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time. A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.

Rule Number	Rule Title	Date of Adoption or Last Amendment	Is rule necessary?	Is rule obsolete?	Does rule overlap, duplicate, or conflict with other rules? (state, federal, local)	Can a less restrictive or alternative rule accomplish same purpose?	Can rule be modified to reduce regulatory burden or eliminate unnecessary paperwork?	Does the rule properly incorporate material by reference?	For rules affecting small business: does the public purpose or interest for adopting justify continued existence of rule?	Appendix A-Comments Received 7/1/20-9/31/20	Notes
3 CSR 10-6.605	Live Bait	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	2	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time. A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-6.610	Mussels and Clams	3/1/2015	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-6.615	Bullfrogs and Green Frogs	4/30/2009	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-6.620	Turtles	3/1/2018	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
Chapter 7	Wildlife Code: Hunting: Seasons, Methods, Limits										
3 CSR 10-7.405	General Provisions	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-7.410	Hunting Methods	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-7.415	Quail: Seasons, Limits	2/28/2007	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	3	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-7.420	Rabbits: Seasons, Limits	3/1/2001	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	5	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-7.425	Squirrels: Seasons, Limits	3/1/2010	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-7.427	Groundhogs: Seasons, Limits	2/28/05	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-7.430	Pheasants: Seasons, Limits	3/1/2015	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.

Rule Number	Rule Title	Date of Adoption or Last Amendment	is rule necessary?	is rule obsolete?	Does rule overlap, duplicate, or conflict with other rules? (state, federal, local)	Can a less restrictive or alternative rule accomplish same purpose?	Can rule be modified to reduce regulatory burden or eliminate unnecessary paperwork?	Does the rule properly incorporate material by reference?	For rules affecting small business: does the public purpose or interest for adopting justify continued existence of rule?	Appendix A-Comments Received 7/1/20-9/31/20	Notes
3 CSR 10-7.431	Deer Hunting Seasons: General Provisions	3/1/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	N/A	6	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-7.432	Deer: Archery Hunting Season	11/30/2017	YES	NO	No	No	NO	N/A	N/A	2	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-7.433	Deer: Firearms Hunting Season	7/1/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	9	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-7.434	Deer: Landowner Privileges	7/1/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	4	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-7.435	Deer: Special Harvest Provisions	7/1/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-7.436	Deer: Managed Hunts	5/15/2004	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-7.437	Deer: Antlerless Deer Hunting Permit Availability	7/1/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-7.438	Deer: Regulations for Department Areas	3/1/2011	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.

Rule Number	Rule Title	Date of Adoption or Last Amendment	is rule necessary?	is rule obsolete?	Does rule overlap, duplicate, or conflict with other rules? (state, federal, local)	Can a less restrictive or alternative rule accomplish same purpose?	Can rule be modified to reduce regulatory burden or eliminate unnecessary paperwork?	Does the rule properly incorporate material by reference?	For rules affecting small business: does the public purpose or interest for adopting justify continued existence of rule?	Appendix A-Comments Received 7/1/20-8/31/20	Notes
3/CSR 10-7.439	Deer: Chronic Wasting Disease Management Program; Permit Availability, Methods, Limits	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time. A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-7.440	Migratory Game Birds and Waterfowl: Seasons, Limits	5/15/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	2	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-7.441	Crows: Seasons, Methods, Limits	3/1/2001	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-7.445	Bullfrogs and Green Frogs: Seasons, Methods, Limits	3/1/2011	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-7.450	Furbearers: Hunting Seasons, Methods	12/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	9	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-7.455	Turkeys: Seasons, Methods, Limits	1/15/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	15	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-7.600	Deer Management Assistance Program	7/1/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-7.700	Elk Hunting Seasons: General Provisions	4/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-7.705	Elk: Hunting Season	12/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-7.710	Elk: Landowner Privileges	12/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-7.715	Elk: Regulations for Department Areas	12/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	N/A	0	
Chapter 8	Wildlife Code: Trapping: Seasons, Methods										
3 CSR 10-8.505	Trapping	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	

Rule Number	Rule Title	Date of Adoption or Last Amendment	Is rule necessary?	Is rule obsolete?	Does rule overlap, duplicate, or conflict with other rules? (state, federal, local)	Can a less restrictive or alternative rule accomplish same purpose?	Can rule be modified to reduce regulatory burden or eliminate unnecessary paperwork?	Does the rule properly incorporate material by reference?	For rules affecting small business: does the public purpose or interest for adopting justify continued existence of rule?	Appendix A-Comments Received 7/1/20-9/31/20	Notes
3 CSR 10-8.510	Use of Traps	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-8.515	Furbearers: Trapping Seasons	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	8	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
Chapter 9	Wildlife Code: Confined Wildlife: Privileges, Permits, Standards										
3 CSR 10-9.105	General Provisions	7/30/2018	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-9.106	Confined Wildlife Permits: How Obtained, Replacements	3/1/2003	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-9.110	General Prohibition; Applications	7/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-9.220	Wildlife Confinement Standards	6/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-9.230	Class I Wildlife	5/30/2003	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review.

Rule Number	Rule Title	Date of Adoption or Last Amendment	is rule necessary?	is rule obsolete?	Does rule overlap, duplicate, or conflict with other rules? (state, federal, local)	Can a less restrictive or alternative rule accomplish same purpose?	Can rule be modified to reduce regulatory burden or eliminate unnecessary paperwork?	Does the rule properly incorporate material by reference?	For rules affecting small business: does the public purpose or interest for adopting justify continued existence of rule?	Appendix A-Comments Received 7/1/20-8/31/20	Notes
3 CSR 10-9.240	Class II Wildlife	2/28/2005	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-9.350	Class I Wildlife Breeder Permit	1/1/1994	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-9.351	Class II Wildlife Breeder Permit	2/28/2007	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-9.353	Privileges of Class I and Class II Wildlife Breeders	9/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review.
3 CSR 10-9.359	Class I and Class II Wildlife Breeder: Records Required	7/30/2015	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review.
3 CSR 10-9.415	Wildlife Rehabilitation Permit	4/30/2009	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-9.420	Wildlife Hobby Permit	3/1/2001	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-9.425	Wildlife Collector's Permit	3/1/2015	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-9.430	Bird Banding	3/1/2011	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-9.440	Resident Falconry Permit	3/1/2017	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	

Rule Number	Rule Title	Date of Adoption or Last Amendment	Is rule necessary?	Is rule obsolete?	Does rule overlap, duplicate, or conflict with other rules? (state, federal, local)	Can a less restrictive or alternative rule accomplish same purpose?	Can rule be modified to reduce regulatory burden or eliminate unnecessary paperwork?	Does the rule properly incorporate material by reference?	For rules affecting small business: does the public purpose or interest for adopting justify continued existence of rule?	Appendix A-Comments Received 7/1/20-8/31/20	Notes
3 CSR 10-9.442	Falconry	7/30/2018	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-9.560	Licensed Hunting Preserve Permit	7/30/2015	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	1	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time. A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-9.565	Licensed Hunting Preserve: Privileges	9/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-9.566	Licensed Hunting Preserve: Records Required	7/30/2015	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-9.570	Hound Running Area Operator and Dealer Permit	2/28/2005	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-9.575	Hound Running Area: Privileges, Requirements	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-9.625	Field Trial Permit	12/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-9.627	Dog Training Area Permit	4/1/2007	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	2	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-9.628	Dog Training Area: Privileges	4/30/2009	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-9.640	Licensed Trout Fishing Area Permit	7/1/2001	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	

Rule Number	Rule Title	Date of Adoption or Last Amendment	Is rule necessary?	Is rule obsolete?	Does rule overlap, duplicate, or conflict with other rules? (state, federal, local)	Can a less restrictive or alternative rule accomplish same purpose?	Can rule be modified to reduce regulatory burden or eliminate unnecessary paperwork?	Does the rule properly incorporate material by reference?	For rules affecting small business: does the public purpose or interest for adopting justify continued existence of rule?	Appendix A-Comments Received 7/1/20-8/31/20	Notes
3 CSR 10-9.645	Licensed Trout Fishing Area Permit: Privileges, Requirements	3/1/2010	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
Chapter 10	Wildlife Code: Commercial Permits: Seasons, Methods, Limits										
3 CSR 10-10.705	Commercialization	7/30/2018	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-10.707	Resident Fur Dealer's Permit	8/30/2006	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-10.708	Nonresident Fur Dealer's Permit	8/30/2006	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-10.715	Resident and Nonresident Fur Dealers: Reports, Requirements	3/1/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-10.720	Commercial Fishing Permit	2/29/2008	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-10.722	Resident Roe Fish Commercial Harvest Permit	3/1/2016	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-10.724	Nonresident Mississippi River Roe Fish Commercial Harvest Permit	8/30/2010	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-10.725	Commercial Fishing: Seasons, Methods	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-10.726	Reciprocal Privileges: Commercial Fishing; Commercial Waters	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-10.727	Record Keeping and Reporting Required: Commercial Fishermen	3/1/2018	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-10.728	Roe Fish Dealer Permit	7/1/2009	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-10.732	Tag and Release Fishing Promotion Permit	2/28/2005	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-10.735	Sale of Live Bait	4/30/2009	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-10.739	Fish Utilization Permit	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-10.743	Commercial Establishments	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	

Rule Number	Rule Title	Date of Adoption or Last Amendment	is rule necessary?	is rule obsolete?	Does rule overlap, duplicate, or conflict with other rules? (state, federal, local)	Can a less restrictive or alternative rule accomplish same purpose?	Can rule be modified to reduce regulatory burden or eliminate unnecessary paperwork?	Does the rule properly incorporate material by reference?	For rules affecting small business: does the public purpose or interest for adopting justify continued existence of rule?	Appendix A-Comments Received 7/1/20-8/31/20	Notes
3 CSR 10-10.744	Commercial Deer Processing: Permit, Privileges, Requirements	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-10.767	Taxidermy; Tanning: Permit, Privileges, Requirements	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-10.768	Sales and Possession of Wildlife Parts and Mounted Specimens	12/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-10.771	Commercial Permits: How Obtained, Replacements	7/1/1994	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-10.788	Resident Commercial Live Coyote and Fox Trapping Permit	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
3 CSR 10-10.789	Resident Commercial Live Coyote and Fox Trapping: Privileges, Seasons, Methods, Requirements	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	YES	0	
Chapter 11	Wildlife Code: Special Regulations for Department Areas										
3 CSR 10-11.105	Title; Authority	9/30/2001	Y	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-11.110	General Provisions	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	5	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-11.115	Closings	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-11.120	Pets and Hunting Dogs	3/1/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-11.125	Field Trials	3/1/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	

Rule Number	Rule Title	Date of Adoption or Last Amendment	Is rule necessary?	Is rule obsolete?	Does rule overlap, duplicate, or conflict with other rules? (state, federal, local)	Can a less restrictive or alternative rule accomplish same purpose?	Can rule be modified to reduce regulatory burden or eliminate unnecessary paperwork?	Does the rule properly incorporate material by reference?	For rules affecting small business: does the public purpose or interest for adopting justify continued existence of rule?	Appendix A-Comments Received 7/1/20-9/3/20	Notes
3 CSR 10-11.130	Vehicles, Bicycles, Horses, and Horseback Riding	3/1/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-11.135	Wild Plants, Plant Products, and Mushrooms	3/1/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-11.140	Camping	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-11.145	Tree Stands	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	2	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-11.150	Target Shooting and Shooting Ranges	4/30/2009	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-11.155	Decoys and Blinds	3/1/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-11.160	Use of Boats and Motors	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-11.165	Bullfrogs and Green Frogs	3/1/2012	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-11.180	Hunting, General Provisions and Seasons	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	2	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-11.181	Turkey Hunting	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-11.182	Deer Hunting	3/1/2011	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-11.184	Quail Hunting	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-11.185	Dove Hunting	3/1/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	2	A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-11.186	Waterfowl Hunting	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	2	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time. A response to the comments received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-11.187	Trapping	2/28/2005	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR010-11.190	Elk Hunting	12/30/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-11.200	Fishing, General Provisions and Seasons	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	

Rule Number	Rule Title	Date of Adoption or Last Amendment	is rule necessary?	is rule obsolete?	Does rule overlap, duplicate, or conflict with other rules? (state, federal, local)	Can a less restrictive or alternative rule accomplish same purpose?	Can rule be modified to reduce regulatory burden or eliminate unnecessary paperwork?	Does the rule properly incorporate material by reference?	For rules affecting small business: does the public purpose or interest for adopting justify continued existence of rule?	Appendix A-Comments Received 7/1/20-8/31/20	Notes
3 CSR 10-11.205	Fishing, Methods and Hours	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-11.210	Fishing, Daily and Possession Limits	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-11.215	Fishing, Length Limits	3/1/2019	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-11.220	Taking Feral Swine	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
Chapter 12	Wildlife Code: Special Regulations for Areas Owned by Other Entities										
3 CSR 10-12.101	Title; Authority	9/30/2016	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-12.105	Wildlife Refuges	9/30/2001	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-12.109	Closed Hours	7/30/2018	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-12.110	Use of Boats and Motors	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-12.115	Bullfrogs and Green Frogs	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	

Rule Number	Rule Title	Date of Adoption or Last Amendment	is rule necessary?	is rule obsolete?	Does rule overlap, duplicate, or conflict with other rules? (state, federal, local)	Can a less restrictive or alternative rule accomplish same purpose?	Can rule be modified to reduce regulatory burden or eliminate unnecessary paperwork?	Does the rule properly incorporate material by reference?	For rules affecting small business: does the public purpose or interest for adopting justify continued existence of rule?	Appendix A-Comments Received 7/1/20-8/31/20	Notes
3 CSR 10-12.125	Hunting and Trapping	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-12.130	Fishing, General Provisions and Seasons	8/30/2017	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-12.135	Fishing, Methods	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-12.140	Fishing, Daily and Possession Limits	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-12.145	Fishing, Length Limits	2/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-12.150	Fishing, Trout Parks	12/29/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-12.155	Fishing, Stone Mill Spring Branch	1/30/2011	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
3 CSR 10-12.160	Outdoor Recreational Access Program	7/30/2016	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	
Chapter 20	Wildlife Code: Definitions										
184 3 CSR 10-20.805	Definitions	8/30/2020	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	0	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review and are pending at this time.

APPENDIX A
Periodic Review Comments
July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/01/20	Stephen McIntosh	New Madrid	3 CSR 10- 1.010: Organization and Methods of Operation	Leave this rule intact	It looks good to me.	Thank you for your comment.
07/01/20	John Dougan	unknown (zipcode = Ashland)	3 CSR 10- 1.010: Organization and Methods of Operation	Amend this rule	Several general administrative divisions should be consolidated to streamline operations. These are marked as paragraphs (F), (G), (J), (K). Private land services roles should be placed into the forest, fish, wildlife and administrative divisions to maximize expertise and streamline operations.	Since this comment was submitted, the Department has updated this rule to reflect a recent reorganization which, in part, is designed to consolidate and streamline operations, as the commenter suggests. The rule was amended on September 4, 2020, with an effective date of February 28, 2021.
07/27/20	John Bales	Farmington	3 CSR 10- 1.010: Organization and Methods of Operation	Amend this rule	I would like to promote volunteers by giving volunteers a reduced price rate for MDC sales of trees, wildflower seed, books, permits, etc, based on there time volunteering.	This comment is not applicable to this rule or any other rules in the <i>Wildlife Code of Missouri</i> , however, we appreciate the comment and will take the suggestion under advisement. The Department appreciates the hard work of all our volunteers.
07/01/20	John Dougan	unknown (zipcode = Ashland)	3 CSR 10- 2.020: Classification and Requirements of Forest Crop Lands After December 1974	Repeal this rule	Purpose, usefulness and function are not clearly delineated in the rule so appears to be unnecessary.	The classification and requirements for Forest Croplands were evaluated and updated in 2016 to reduce administrative burden and to reflect current conditions. The rule is not obsolete or duplicative of any other regulation. The program still serves a useful function in encouraging long term, active care and management of Missouri forests.
07/02/20	John Dougan	unknown (zipcode = Ashland)	3 CSR 10- 3.010: Monetary Values Established for Fish and Wildlife	Repeal this rule	Incorporated by reference information not publicly available so it is impossible to determine details of the regulation.	The cited publication in this rule is available for public viewing at the Department of Conservation Headquarters. Requests should be sent to the Records Custodian at Records@mdc.mo.gov .
07/02/20	John Dougan	unknown (zipcode = Ashland)	3 CSR 10- 4.130: Owner May Protect Property; Public Safety	Amend this rule	3 CSR 10-4.130 (2) should have exceptions for reporting for small fur bearers. Agents and the public should not have the deal with daily reports of incidents with squirrels, rabbits, possums, raccoons, skunks, ground hogs, muskrats, or even depredations by foxes, coyotes, beaver, bobcat and otter.	Given that these species all have regulated seasons, it is important to ensure that any take that occurs outside the season is warranted. Additionally, agents provide guidance related to the proper disposition of carcasses. For example, a bobcat that is taken due to damage outside of the season is not eligible to enter the fur market. Ensuring that species are reported provides accountability and would not provide someone with an opportunity to take wildlife outside of the regulated season.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
08/06/20	Unknown Name	unknown	3 CSR 10- 4.130: Owner May Protect Property; Public Safety	Amend this rule	<p>3 CSR 10-4.130(5) states that Black bears that are causing damage may be killed only with the permission of an agent of the department and by methods authorized by him/her, except that they may be killed without prior permission if they are attacking or killing livestock or domestic animals, or "attacking humans". 3 CSR 10-4.130(5) states that Mountain lions may be killed without prior permission if they are attacking or killing live-stock or domestic animals, or if they are "threatening human safety". In my opinion, the rule should be the same for a black bear as a mountain lion. People should be allowed to kill them if they are threatening humans, the same as mountain lions. They are both large predators that are fully capable of killing a human in short order. And while it is true that bears are somewhat less likely to attack, they sometimes do, with tragic results. It is not prudent to wait for a threatening bear to actually attack to end that threat, by shooting if necessary. We can't read the bear's mind. We don't know if the bear's charge is a bluff or not. The rule should also include a section explicitly allowing the use of non-lethal ammunition, such as rubber buckshot, etc., without prior permission, to deter bears which are deemed to be a nuisance by the homeowner. People have a God-given right to protect themselves and their families.</p>	<p>It is likely that these rules were written at different times, thus resulting in the slightly different language. That being said, "threatening human safety" and "attacking humans" are functionally the same. The mere presence of a mountain lion or a black bear is not a threat to human safety and thus does not warrant removal.</p>
07/01/20	Bradley A Beffa	Saint Louis	3 CSR 10- 4.135: Transportation	Amend this rule	<p>I understand the need for some form of control of deer taken in CWD areas. I would like to amend the rule to allow the disposal of the carcass in the landfill. Which is better than leaving the carcass in a field in the area where CWD was found anyway. That is what I do with the bones/ carcass anyway for years. Because I hunt just outside St. Louis County in Franklin county. But this year in 2020, if I harvest a deer during archery season, and usually I take multiple antlerless deer, they will have to be tracked, cut up and boned out or at the very least quartered, before I can go home. That means not getting home til about 3 or 4 in the morning. Normally I would put the deer on ice and process it in the morning myself. But even the processor is not open at 8, 9 or 10 pm. So now do I sleep in my truck till morning to take it to the processor the next day? A ridiculous expectation. That means less deer will be taken if I have to pay to process the deer. This needs to be thought through a little better.</p>	<p>Development of the carcass transportation regulations that went into effect last year was a lengthy process that involved communication with meat processors, taxidermists, and hunters. We understand that the new regulations will affect how some hunters process their deer and will involve additional work for some to comply with the regulations. However, chronic wasting disease (CWD) represents a serious threat to our state's deer herd and to our deer hunting culture, and we feel that the new regulations are needed to protect one of our state's most cherished natural resources. As you may be aware, there are many states that have similar carcass transportation regulations to minimize the spread of CWD. When developing the regulations, the decision was made to allow hunters to transport their deer carcasses out of counties in the CWD Management Zone if being delivered to a processor or taxidermist. This is a rather unique exception that will help our hunters and also helps to minimize adverse effects to these businesses. For those hunters that are taking their deer to a processor, they can take the entire carcass to the processor of their choice in any county as long as the carcass is delivered within 48 hours of leaving the county of harvest. We did consider allowing hunters to transport deer out of the CWD Management Zone if they disposed of unused parts in a landfill, but realized it would have been difficult, if not impossible, to enforce the regulation given there would be no reasonable way to track waste disposal by individual hunters. For hunters that process their own deer, deer can be quartered or deboned prior to being transported outside of the county of harvest. Although this is not as convenient as transporting the entire carcass home, we believe the sacrifices that we are asking hunters to make are a necessary step to protect Missouri's deer herd and the tradition of deer hunting. CWD is one of the most significant wildlife challenges of our time. We are fortunate in Missouri that the disease is relatively rare at this time and we still have a chance to alter the impacts of the disease. There is no doubt that CWD is changing hunting as we know it and we are working hard to find solutions that prevent CWD from becoming widespread in Missouri.</p>

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/01/20	Raymon Bogart	Licking	3 CSR 10- 5.205: Permits Required; Exceptions	Repeal this rule	Forcing landowners to "register" their land to get a landowner permit is not acceptable. I have talked to several landowners in Texas County and they do not intend to do it. This rule needs to be repealed. It shows how out of touch MDC is with the rural landowners.	The requirement to submit an application to obtain landowner deer and turkey hunting permits in Missouri is not new; however, it was eliminated in the early 2000s. At that time, landowners could obtain landowner permits from any permit vendor by simply stating they were a landowner, and providing the county/acreage of their property. The relative ease in which a landowner permit could be obtained, created an opportunity for both intentional and unintentional permit fraud. In 2018, there were over 180,000 unique landowners that were issued no-cost landowner deer and/or turkey permits. The Department performs an annual qualification check of a random subset of individuals receiving no-cost landowner permits each year. During the 2018 check, 34% of individuals directly contacted were found to not qualify for no-cost landowner deer permits. The most frequent reasons individuals did not qualify included claiming to possess 5 acres or more when in fact they did not (i.e., fraud) or individuals who obtained the no-cost landowner permits when they were no longer a household member of a landowner (i.e., not eligible). As a result, the department changed the regulations to again require the submission of an application to obtain landowner deer and turkey hunting permits. This application system is available online and is intuitive for assisting the applicant with determining if they qualify for landowner deer and turkey hunting privileges. Additionally, landowners are only required to verify the information every 3 years, or when there is a change to the information on the current application. The purpose of these landowner permit application and verification requirements is to ensure that individuals who are eligible for landowner permits receive them, while those who are ineligible, do not.
07/02/20	John Dougan	unknown (zipcode = Ashland)	3 CSR 10- 5.205: Permits Required; Exceptions	Amend this rule	The a la carte approach to permitting discourages participation in conservation activities on a broad scale. There should be an annual "Buffet" permit that includes fishing, small game, trapping, (one or two) any method any sex deer, one (or two) any method turkey and all the other associated smaller special permits. Every time another permit is added the public views it as revenue seeking verses independent conservation reporting streams. Fees for duck stamps, managed hunts (including elk and bear) and harvest of enclosure raised trout, quail, pheasant, etc, could retain their separate fees. The same could also be done for the lifetime and out of state permits. The amounts could be set so that more people will buy them thus there would be little or no lost revenue.	The Department has tried a similar approach in the past by offering the "Resident Annual All Hunting Permit". However, the permit was rescinded in 1998. The department strives to implement a permitting structure that provides mechanisms for the regulation of the take of wildlife, provides funding for wildlife management and regulation, and minimizes complexities that could discourage participation or cause unintentional violations. While new permits have recently been added to address new hunting opportunities (deer and elk), many permits have been eliminated or consolidated over the past thirty years. For example, there is no longer a pheasant hunting permit, a muzzleloading firearms deer hunting permit, or a cable restraint device permit. The privileges of those permits have been consolidated into other existing permits.
07/09/20	Terry Henke	Auxvasse	3 CSR 10- 5.205: Permits Required; Exceptions	Repeal this rule	don't know if this the right place but the new rule whereby you have to register the 80 acres legal boundaries is 'part of a big brother beautcratic BS, seem to me anyways.. what is the purpose of this new rule, did without it for all these years?	The requirement to submit an application to obtain landowner deer and turkey hunting permits in Missouri is not new; however, it was eliminated in the early 2000s. At that time, landowners could obtain landowner permits from any permit vendor by stating they were a landowner, and providing the county/acreage of their property. The relative ease in which a landowner permit could be obtained, created an opportunity for both intentional and unintentional permit fraud. In 2018, there were over 180,000 unique landowners that were issued no-cost landowner deer and/or turkey permits. The Department performs an annual qualification check of a random subset of individuals receiving no-cost landowner permits each year. During the 2018 check, 34% of individuals directly contacted were found to not qualify for no-cost landowner deer permits. The most frequent reasons individuals did not qualify included claiming to possess 5 acres or more when in fact they did not (i.e., fraud) or individuals who obtained the no-cost landowner permits when they were no longer a household member of a landowner (i.e., not eligible). As a result, the department changed the regulations to again require the submission of an application to obtain landowner deer and turkey hunting permits. This application system is available online and is intuitive for assisting the applicant with determining if they qualify for landowner deer and turkey hunting privileges. Additionally, landowners are only required to verify the information every 3 years, or when there is a change to the information on the current application. The purpose of these landowner permit application and verification requirements is to ensure that individuals who are eligible for landowner permits receive them, while those who are ineligible, do not.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/27/20	Gary M Johnson	Odessa	3 CSR 10- 5.205: Permits Required; Exceptions	Amend this rule	Still don't understand why you took my privilege away for being a land owner of 6 acres when for years you only have to own 5 . I buy tags to hunt other counties and have always done that. There has been a group of us that always put in for managed hunts and we never get drawn but we know people that put in and they get drawn every year. So I feel that as a landowner I should get my tags for the land that I own.	The Department has offered no-cost hunting privileges to resident landowners since the inception of the "modern" firearms deer hunting season in 1944. The primary rationale for offering these privileges has been that private landowners, as defined by <i>Wildlife Code</i> , provide space and resources for wildlife. In the early years, it was also hoped that these privileges would serve as an incentive to landowners; if they could hunt on their land for free, perhaps they would also invest in creating wildlife habitat. Over the years, free privileges have been promoted by the Department as a type of landowner recognition for contributions of habitat and/or a tool for wildlife damage that may have been incurred. The Department has consistently adhered to this rationale over time, although the definition of "landowner" and privileges offered have changed periodically in response to changing wildlife populations, land ownership patterns, and social considerations. The Department completed a permit evaluation in 2018. In this review, and during a previous 2008 review, it was noted that land ownership patterns have changed; smaller holdings have become the norm as farms and larger holdings are subdivided and resold, often as recreational lands and residential sites. Additionally, when it comes to deer and turkey, a 5-acre threshold is not a meaningful acreage requirement and does not reflect their habitat needs, and a healthy deer density in Missouri equates to about 1 deer for every 20-25 acres. An increase of the acreage threshold to a more meaningful size provides a more realistic impact on small-game populations as well as on the habitat needs of deer and turkey, and gives emphasis and special privileges to production farmers who are most likely to experience crop loss due to wildlife. In addition, most fraudulent and use of no-cost landowner permits occurs at the lower-end of the qualifying acreage.
08/09/20	Jeff Churan	Chillicothe	3 CSR 10- 5.205: Permits Required; Exceptions	Amend this rule	1 (D) Expand this rule so that youth 15 and under may take fish by any legal method without a license. This rule currently excludes the permit exemption for youth while using trotlines, bank poles, etc. The rule is widely misunderstood and makes no sense. Adults 65 and over do not need a license while using these methods, so why should youth? If nothing else, let them assist adults without a license, while not allowing them 33 hooks.	This regulation has been in place for decades as an enforcement tool to prevent adults from labeling fishing equipment with a child's name to avoid fishing permit requirements for fishing methods that are not personally attended (trotlines, throw lines, limb lines, bank lines, etc.). However, with the general decline in the number of hunters and anglers across the country, it is a regulation that should be evaluated to determine if the need for the restriction outweighs the benefits of providing additional opportunities to introduce youth to the entire suite of legal fishing methods.
07/13/20	adam brandes	prairie home	3 CSR 10- 5.215: Permits and Privileges: How Obtained; Not Transferable	Amend this rule	Resident purchased deer and turkey permits should be transferable. As long as the permit has been purchased by an individual it should be up to them if they choose to fill the permit or to give it to a family member/friend, as long as that person is also a missouri resident.	The Department's requirement that deer and turkey hunting permits are nontransferable is similar to the approach taken by most state fish and wildlife agencies. Having deer and turkey hunting permits that are not transferable between hunters has several benefits to the Department. First, it ensures that only those hunters who are qualified to possess deer and turkey permits can obtain them. Another benefit of nontransferable permits is that it allows the Department to track the number of deer and turkey hunters. In addition to being able to determine trends in hunter numbers, having nontransferable permits also allows the Department to send post-season surveys to a random sample of hunters. Responses from these surveys are critically-important to assessing deer and turkey population trends, evaluating the Department's deer and turkey management programs, and establishing hunting regulations. As such, obtaining input from a representative sample of hunters is needed, and this is only possible if the Department is able to select survey recipients at random from all hunters. This would not be possible if deer and turkey permits were transferable between hunters.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/01/20	Richard Butler	Camdenton	3 CSR 10- 5.220: Resident and Nonresident Permits	Repeal this rule	I think it is very sad that you took away the free deer hunting permits on the land owners of 5 ac. and gave the non resident of 80 ac a free ride. If you don't live in the state you should have to pay the non res. fee to hunt. They only have this land to hunt on, or to make money off of it. They don't live here, they want to live some were else. Get rid of the free ride.	The Department has offered no-cost hunting privileges to resident landowners since the inception of the modern firearms deer hunting season in 1944. The primary rationale for offering these privileges has been that private landowners, as defined in the Wildlife Code, provide space and resources for wildlife. In the early years, it was also hoped that these privileges would serve as an incentive to landowners; if they could hunt on their land for free, perhaps they would also invest in creating wildlife habitat. Over the years, free privileges have been promoted by the Department as a type of landowner recognition for contributions of habitat. The Department has consistently adhered to this rationale over time, although the definition of landowner and privileges offered have changed periodically in response to changing wildlife populations, land ownership patterns, and social considerations. Land use patterns and wildlife populations have changed significantly from those existing when free landowner privileges were established with the intent to impact wildlife like small-game, deer, and turkey, and to recognize the landowners with acreages large enough to impact the habitat needs of deer and turkey. As an example, with respect to deer, a 5-acre threshold is typically not a meaningful acreage requirement for this species and does not reflect their broad habitat needs. A healthy deer density in Missouri equates to about 1 deer for every 20-25 acres. To arrive at the 20-acre requirement, we reached out to the public and received responses from about 14,600 individuals. The average response when asked what size acreage should be required to qualify for landowner permits was 21 acres. As such, we choose 20 acres as the cut-off. Although qualifying resident landowners can obtain no-cost landowner permits, such a permit does not exist for nonresidents. Rather, a qualifying nonresident landowner that has at least 75 acres in Missouri can receive nonresident deer and turkey permits at a reduced cost. Like resident landowner permits, the lower cost of the nonresident landowner permits is a recognition for contributions of wildlife habitat.
07/01/20	Richard cook	Crystal city	3 CSR 10- 5.220: Resident and Nonresident Permits	Amend this rule	I believe the non-resident permit dollar amount should reciprocate with the state they come from. Trout tags for non-residents should be a dollar or two more there's no reason they should enjoy our Trout and streams for the same price the taxpayers do. I find absolutely no reason why this cannot be achieved.	The Department recently increased non-resident permit fees after receiving input from Missouri residents on the issue. Nonresident permit fees have not been raised in over a decade and adjustments were needed to offset the increasing costs of providing conservation programs and services around the state. Information from the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Price Index related to cost-of-living increases from 2008 to 2018 were used to determine the appropriate increases to non-resident permit fees. While a non-resident does not pay a higher fee for a daily trout tag, they do pay a higher fee for a fishing permit (whether annual or daily) to fish in Missouri.
07/01/20	Bradley mashek	UNKNOWN (ZIPCODE = Farmington)	3 CSR 10- 5.220: Resident and Nonresident Permits	Amend this rule	I believe non residents should have to pay more to hunt our state it costs us a lot to go hunt in other states and possibly have to be on a waiting list charge them more take the money improve our state	The Department recently increased non-resident permit fees after receiving input from Missouri residents on the issue. Nonresident permit fees have not been raised in over a decade and adjustments were needed to offset the increasing costs of providing conservation programs and services around the state. Information from the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Price Index related to cost-of-living increases from 2008 to 2018 were used to determine the appropriate increases to non-resident permit fees.
07/01/20	Unknown Name	unknown	3 CSR 10- 5.220: Resident and Nonresident Permits	Amend this rule	Raise non resident tags. Only give them 1 doe and 1 buck can use tag for any season	The Conservation Commission recently increased non-resident permit fees after receiving input from Missouri residents on the issue. Nonresident permit fees have not been raised in over a decade and adjustments were needed to offset the increasing costs of providing conservation programs and services around the state. Information from the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Price Index related to cost-of-living increases from 2008 to 2018 were used to determine the appropriate increases to non-resident permit fees. The department evaluates the deer population and citizen desires for hunting opportunities on an ongoing basis. The current limits on the take of deer are designed to accomplish population management objectives and provide equal harvest opportunities for all hunters.
07/02/20	John Dougan	unknown (zipcode = Ashland)	3 CSR 10- 5.220: Resident and Nonresident Permits	Amend this rule	Add set ratio of out of state permitting fees across all licenses. Currently antlered deer permits cost almost 14 more for out of state hunters while antler-less deer permits cost a little over 3 times as much. Setting all at the same rate will help with this disparity and make future revisions easier.	The Department recently increased non-resident permit fees after receiving input from Missouri residents on the issue. Nonresident permit fees have not been raised in over a decade and adjustments were needed to offset the increasing costs of providing conservation programs and services around the state. Information from the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Price Index related to cost-of-living increases from 2008 to 2018 were used to determine the appropriate increases to non-resident permit fees.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
08/07/20	Lee LeGrande	St Robert	3 CSR 10- 5.220: Resident and Nonresident Permits	Amend this rule	The price for non-resident licenses and permits are far too low. I recently retired from the United States Marine Corps and decided to make Missouri my home, however, I still travel back to past duty stations to hunt and fish. In those states I pay a premium to hunt and fish. In Missouri non-residents are paying a fraction of the cost other states are charging Missouri residents to hunt in their states. Increase the non-resident fees and put the money to good use. Yes, we will have less non-resident hunters, but the increased fees will even out. This also provides Missouri residents with better opportunities to harvest game. Thank you MDC for all you do.	The Department recently increased non-resident permit fees after receiving input from Missouri residents on the issue. Nonresident permit fees have not been raised in over a decade and adjustments were needed to offset the increasing costs of providing conservation programs and services around the state. Information from the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Price Index related to cost-of-living increases from 2008 to 2018 were used to determine the appropriate increases to non-resident permit fees. The Department evaluates wildlife populations and citizen desires for hunting opportunities on an ongoing basis. The current regulations are designed to accomplish population management objectives and provide equal harvest opportunities for all hunters.
08/09/20	Phil Johnston	Hillsboro	3 CSR 10- 5.220: Resident and Nonresident Permits	Amend this rule	Need to raise the price of non-resident deer hunting permits and limit the number available. The antler restriction needs to be permanent state wide.	Last year, the Department raised the price of nonresident deer and turkey permits. The price increase affected both archery and firearms deer hunting permit prices, as well as spring and fall turkey hunting permit prices. Given the abundance of deer and turkeys throughout the state, we do not feel there is a need to restrict the hunting opportunity of nonresident hunters by using a draw system. Additionally, nonresident hunters provide a benefit to our state due to their support of local economies when they travel and stay in Missouri to hunt. Despite the popularity and quality of deer and turkey hunting in Missouri, the vast majority of permits are acquired by residents each year. During most years, about 95% of the deer and turkey permits are acquired by Missouri residents. As such, we feel we can provide over-the-counter permits for nonresidents without jeopardizing the quality of hunting for resident hunters. Regarding the antler-point restriction (APR) – it is certainly a popular regulation in the counties where it is in place because it does allow many young bucks to be recruited into older age-classes. To determine which counties to implement the APR, we send surveys to deer hunters to gauge their level of support. In counties where most hunters support the APR, we put the regulation in place; in counties where most hunters are opposed to the APR, it is not implemented. Therefore, the distribution of the APR across Missouri is driven by hunter support or opposition for the regulation at the county-level. In addition to hunter support, another factor that determines whether counties have the APR is proximity to detection of chronic wasting disease (CWD). Counties where we have detected the disease, and those counties within 10 miles of positive detections, do not have the APR. These counties form our CWD Management Zone. The APR does not exist within the CWD Management Zone because yearling bucks typically disperse from the area in which they were born. As such, the APR does not make sense in these areas from a disease management standpoint. In other words, within the CWD Management Zone, we do not want to protect yearling bucks from harvest because these deer are the most likely to spread the disease to other areas of the state. Taken collectively, we use the APR to satisfy the desires of our hunters where there is majority support for the regulation, while also making sure to implement the regulation only in areas where it will not compromise our disease management goals.
07/01/20	Mark Leonard	Bates City	3 CSR 10- 5.310: Resident Lifetime Conservation Partner Permit	Amend this rule	Amend the following sections to read: (D) For persons age forty (40) through fifty-five (55): six hundred dollars (\$600) (E) For persons age fifty-six (56) and older: seventy dollars (\$100)	The current permit fee structure provides incentives that maximize savings for youth and resident adults over the age of sixty (60) that are designed to encourage participation in hunting and fishing by these groups. In addition to the privileges of the resident hunting and fishing permit, the lifetime conservation partner permit also includes the privileges of the migratory bird hunting permit, trout permit, and conservation order permit that provide savings for all age brackets. While the selected age and fee structure may seem arbitrary, considering that Missouri residents age 65 and older are exempt from small game hunting and fishing permit requirements, the current age and fee structure is appropriate. Additionally, regardless of the age bracket a person is in when they obtain a lifetime permit, they will realize savings in permit fees because they will not be affected by future increases to permit fees for the privileges associated with the permit.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/01/20	Mark Leonard	Bates City	3 CSR 10- 5.315: Resident Lifetime Fishing Permit	Amend this rule	Amend the following sections to read: (D) For persons age forty (40) through fifty-five (55): six hundred dollars (\$600) (E) For persons age fifty-six (56) and older: seventy dollars (\$100)	The current permit fee structure provides incentives that maximize savings for youth and resident adults over the age of sixty (60) that are designed to encourage participation fishing by these groups. In addition to the privileges of the resident fishing permit, the lifetime fishing permit also includes the privileges of the trout permit and provides savings at all age brackets. While the selected age and fee structure may seem arbitrary, considering that Missouri residents age 65 and older are exempt from fishing permit requirements, the current age and fee structure is appropriate. Additionally, regardless of the age bracket a person is in when they obtain a lifetime permit, they will realize savings in permit fees because they will not be affected by future increases to permit fees for the privileges associated with the permit.
07/01/20	Mark Leonard	Bates City	3 CSR 10- 5.320: Resident Lifetime Small Game Hunting Permit	Amend this rule	Amend the following sections to read: (D) For persons age forty (40) through fifty-five (55): six hundred dollars (\$600) (E) For persons age fifty-six (56) and older: seventy dollars (\$100)	The current permit fee structure provides incentives that maximize savings for youth and resident adults over the age of sixty (60) that are designed to encourage participation in hunting and fishing by these groups. In addition to the privileges of the resident permit, the lifetime conservation partner permit also includes the privileges of the migratory bird hunting permit and the conservation order permit that provide savings for all age brackets. While the selected age and fee structure may seem arbitrary, considering that Missouri residents age 65 and older are exempt from small game hunting permit requirements, the current age and fee structure is appropriate. Additionally, regardless of the age bracket a person is in when they obtain a lifetime permit, they will realize savings in permit fees because they will not be affected by future increases to permit fees for the privileges associated with the permit.
07/01/20	Terry Henke	auxvasse	3 CSR 10- 5.359: Resident Managed Deer Hunting Permit	Amend this rule	The new rule where you have to register your land seems to be excessive, more on the big brother mode, I would like to know what you expect to accomplish with this new rule. Thanks	The requirement to submit an application to obtain landowner deer and turkey hunting permits in Missouri is not new; however, it was eliminated in the early 2000s. At that time, landowners could obtain landowner permits from any permit vendor by simply stating they were a landowner, and providing the county/acreage of their property. The relative ease in which a landowner permit could be obtained, created an opportunity for both intentional and unintentional permit fraud. In 2018, there were over 180,000 unique landowners that were issued no-cost landowner deer and/or turkey permits. The Department performs an annual qualification check of a random subset of individuals receiving no-cost landowner permits each year. During the 2018 check, 34% of individuals directly contacted were found to not qualify for no-cost landowner deer permits. The most frequent reasons individuals did not qualify included claiming to possess 5 acres or more when in fact they did not (i.e., fraud) or individuals who obtained the no-cost landowner permits when they were no longer a household member of a landowner (i.e., not eligible). As a result, the department changed the regulations to again require the submission of an application to obtain landowner deer and turkey hunting permits. This application system is available online and is intuitive for assisting the applicant with determining if they qualify for landowner deer and turkey hunting privileges. Additionally, landowners are only required to verify the information every 3 years, or when there is a change to the information on the current application. The purpose of these landowner permit application and verification requirements is to ensure that individuals who are eligible for landowner permits receive them, while those who are ineligible, do not.
07/04/20	Fred Meyer	St. Peters	3 CSR 10- 5.360: Resident Archer's Hunting Permit	Amend this rule	Create a separate season for using a cross-bow rather than allowing this during the entire bow season. Crossbows are extremely accurate and powerful in excess of 100 yards with a scope and thus very similar to a firearm. One of the things I love about bow hunting is the challenge with a recurve or compound bow. Crossbows have the effect of a scaled down firearm method for use during the entire bow season. I am 61 and realize I may also be using a crossbow at some point but cherish the peace of bow hunting. It's starting to feel like firearms with all the hunting now using crossbows.	The Department's decision to allow crossbows as a legal method during the archery season was to help to recruit, retain, and reactivate hunters. As many of the baby-boomer generation slowly ages out of hunting, many states have seen hunter numbers decline. As such, state agencies around the country are trying to find ways to stem the tide. Crossbows are a tool that can get young hunters into the field earlier than vertical bows. With an aging hunter population, they are also a tool that can keep hunters in the field longer (i.e., more years) than they would if the tool was not permitted. When we look at the age distribution of vertical bow users vs. crossbow users in Missouri, there is a clear difference in the distribution. More teen-aged hunters through about age 50 use vertical bows than crossbows, but after age 50 (and before age 11) more hunters use crossbows. This provides compelling evidence to the effectiveness of crossbows to get hunters engaged in archery hunting at a younger age and to keep them archery hunting for longer. Success rates in Missouri are similar for hunters using crossbows and compound bows. Given similar success rates and our desire to provide ample hunting opportunity in our efforts to recruit, retain, and reactivate hunters, we do not feel that it would be advisable to create a separate crossbow season. Rather, we prefer to allow archery hunters to be able to pursue deer and turkeys during the entire season regardless of which specific archery method they choose to hunt with.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/24/20	Unknown Name		3 CSR 10- 5.360: Resident Archer's Hunting Permit	Amend this rule	There should be a separate fee for deer and turkey hunters should only be allowed one buck per season regardless of method	When the modern archery season was first established, hunters purchased archery deer and archery turkey permits separately. However, there were so few archery turkey permits purchased and so few turkeys harvested by archers that the permits were combined a few years later. Although the archery turkey harvest has increased considerably over the years, the harvest rate of turkeys during the fall season is very low and not jeopardizing the sustainability of the population. Most archers do not specifically pursue turkeys while bowhunting, but given the low harvest rates of turkeys during the archery season, we feel it is appropriate to afford archers this additional hunting opportunity. Regarding the buck limit during Missouri's deer hunting season – prior to 2016, the limit was three bucks per hunter. However, in 2016, based on feedback from hunters, we reduced the limit to two. During the process of determining the level of support for this reduction, we asked hunters whether they supported a one-buck limit and the majority did not support this change. Most hunters that we surveyed did support the reduction to two bucks and it is for this reason that the two-buck limit was chosen.
07/10/20	Bob McGeorge	St Charles	3 CSR 10- 5.551: Nonresident Firearms Any-Deer Hunting Permit	Amend this rule	Raise the price. At least to \$450	The Department recently raised the price for nonresident any-deer hunting permits for both archery and firearms permits. Prior to the 2020 deer hunting season, the cost of archery and firearms any-deer hunting permits was \$225. Beginning last year, the cost of these permits was raised to \$265. We feel that the price increase was appropriate, and we will continue to evaluate the cost of resident and nonresident deer hunting permits through time. It is important to recognize that nonresident hunters provide a benefit to our state due to their support of local economies when they travel and stay in Missouri to hunt. Despite the popularity and quality of deer hunting in Missouri, the vast majority of permits are acquired by residents each year. During most years, about 95% of the deer hunting permits are acquired by Missouri residents. As such, we feel we can provide over-the-counter permits at a reasonable cost for nonresidents without jeopardizing the quality of hunting for our resident hunters.
07/01/20	Mark Leonard	Bates City	3 CSR 10- 5.552: Nonresident Firearms Antlerless Deer Hunting Permit	Amend this rule	Raise the fee to \$100 as is similar to the small game permit fee	The Department recently raised the price for nonresident any-deer hunting permits for both archery and firearms permits. Prior to the 2020 deer hunting season, the cost of archery and firearms any-deer hunting permits was \$225. Beginning last year, the cost of these permits was raised to \$265. We feel that the price increase was appropriate, and we will continue to evaluate the cost of resident and nonresident deer hunting permits through time. Although we felt an increase in the cost of archery and firearms any-deer hunting permits was needed, we did not feel that an increase was needed for nonresident antlerless deer hunting permits. It is important to recognize that nonresident hunters provide a benefit to our state due to their support of local economies when they travel and stay in Missouri to hunt. Despite the popularity and quality of deer hunting in Missouri, the vast majority of permits are acquired by residents each year. During most years, about 95% of the deer hunting permits are acquired by Missouri residents. As such, we feel we can provide over-the-counter permits at a reasonable cost for nonresidents without jeopardizing the quality of hunting for our resident hunters.
07/01/20	Mark Leonard	Bates City	3 CSR 10- 5.554: Nonresident Archery Antlerless Deer Hunting Permit	Amend this rule	Raise the fee to \$100 as is similar to the small game permit fee	The Department recently raised the price for nonresident any-deer hunting permits for both archery and firearms permits. Prior to the 2020 deer hunting season, the cost of archery and firearms any-deer hunting permits was \$225. Beginning last year, the cost of these permits was raised to \$265. We feel that the price increase was appropriate, and we will continue to evaluate the cost of resident and nonresident deer hunting permits through time. Although we felt an increase in the cost of archery and firearms any-deer hunting permits was needed, we did not feel that an increase was needed for nonresident antlerless deer hunting permits. It is important to recognize that nonresident hunters provide a benefit to our state due to their support of local economies when they travel and stay in Missouri to hunt. Despite the popularity and quality of deer hunting in Missouri, the vast majority of permits are acquired by residents each year. During most years, about 95% of the deer hunting permits are acquired by Missouri residents. As such, we feel we can provide over-the-counter permits at a reasonable cost for nonresidents without jeopardizing the quality of hunting for our resident hunters.
07/22/20	Hagen Riche	unknown (zipcode = Vermilion Parish, Louisiana)	3 CSR 10- 5.554: Nonresident Archery Antlerless Deer Hunting Permit	Repeal this rule	As a non resident bow hunter. Will I not be able to apply for an antlerless permit because I am not a landowner? This means if we go up before rifle season, each person will only get one antlered deer?	Like Missouri residents, nonresident hunters can purchase archery antlerless permits in any number. Nonresidents, however, must first purchase a nonresident archer's hunting permit or a nonresident landowner archer's hunting permit. Archery antlerless permits can be filled at any time during the archery season in counties where their use is permitted. For both resident and nonresident archery hunters, only one antlered deer can be taken prior to the November portion of firearms deer season.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/01/20	Roger Smith	Bonne Terre	3 CSR 10- 6.405: General Provisions	Amend this rule	I feel we should come into compliance with other states by allowing the hunting of coyotes with an artificial light at night, Of course it could come with restrictions such as closed during Fall firearms season for Deer ETC, the number of coyotes are getting out of hand, causing casualties on calving operations, killing off fawn populations in early Summer and people have no incentive to hunt them due to the restrictions. Myself along with numerous other hunters and hunting organizations have discussed this and feel strongly it is an area that should be looked at. We as Sportsmen spending countless hours and dollars towards managing wildlife but with the current restrictions on coyote hunting we have no way of managing them and a lot of the work we put into other areas is in vain when coyotes are damaging what we are trying to manage	The <i>Wildlife Code</i> was recently amended (November 20, 2020) to allow properly licensed hunters to use artificial light, night vision, infrared, or thermal imagery equipment in conjunction with other legal hunting methods to pursue and take coyotes from February 1 through March 31 each year. The change was made in response to citizen requests to use these methods for coyote hunting.
07/01/20	Stephen McIntosh	New Madrid	3 CSR 10- 6.410: Fishing Methods	Amend this rule	Although I did not see the provision in this rule, there is a policy somewhere that in bass tournaments, bass may be culled after the limit has been reached. This is not the case for crappie tournaments, however. I'm sure that almost everyone does cull the smaller fish in crappie tournaments, so why not make it legal?	The culling rule referenced in the comment is 3 CSR 10-6.405 (3)(E), which applies to black bass and is not applicable to tournaments that target other species. Any fish caught is included in the anglers daily limit unless released unharmed immediately. Smaller fish in your possession may not be replaced with larger ones caught later. Anglers need to make a keep-or-release decision as soon as the fish is caught. The one exception is that from September through June, as a participant in a bona fide catch-and-release black bass tournament (one after which all bass are released alive) entrants are required to have a boat livewell with adequate capacity and a pump constantly adding fresh or recirculating water. Anglers may release black bass caught in these tournaments unharmed from the livewell, but at no time may the daily limit be exceeded. The desire for additional game fish species to this rule will be communicated to the regulations committee for consideration.
07/01/20	Kenny Hannaford	Gainesville	3 CSR 10- 6.410: Fishing Methods	Amend this rule	Border Lakes legal methods should include spearfishing for sportfish(minus black bass species). Lake specific regulations are common place so why couldnt border lake regulations reflect neighboring states regulations or at least honor thier legal take methods? I can purchase border lakes permit but can not fully utilize it since I can not possess legally taken fish from another state on the Missouri side of the lake. Specifically the problem I run into is when I leave my boat stall in Pontiac Missouri and spearfish in Arkansas I can not return to Missouri with speared sportfish. I have to run the risk of getting my cooler and fish stolen at an Arkansas access point while I dock my boat and drive to retrieve. I'd love to be able to return to the dock with my legally taken fish and not being in violation. Missouri sold me the border lake permit so that I can spearfish legally in Arkansas then does not allow me to possess the fish I harvested while there.	3 CSR 10-4.150 states that "The laws in effect where wildlife is taken shall determine the legal take and possession limits, except that Missouri limits shall apply on Missouri waters unless otherwise provided by reciprocal agreement. Fish taken in another state on a sport fishing permit by methods not permitted in Missouri may not be possessed on waters of the state..." Spearfishing is a lethal method of take in Missouri and cannot be used on game species, which typically have a length limit associated with them. Spearfishing does not allow fish under the legal length limit to be released unharmed immediately, so it is not a legal method of take for game fish in Missouri. Without this regulation, it would be impossible for conservation agents to determine if fish encountered on Missouri waters during compliance checks were taken in Arkansas or Missouri.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
					<p>I believe on the impoundments in the southern portion of our state which are fed by streams which fall under the "Ozark Stream" closed season from late February to late May something needs to be done to reduce the "gray" areas of this law. Almost all of our major impoundments fall in the "Ozark Stream" area of the state. During the time when the Ozark Streams are closed to bass fishing these impoundments are also extremely susceptible to flooding which significantly increases their size and the areas which can be accessed by anglers. The result is situations where anglers commonly violate the Ozark Stream closed bass season by fishing areas they believe are part of the impoundment. For the remainder of this comment I will use Bull Shoals Lake as an example though every impoundment is affected by this issue.</p> <p>According to the Wildlife code:</p> <p>"impoundments will extend to the lake contour that is commonly referred to as conservation pool, multipurpose pool or normal pool, or to specific locations identified by posting"</p> <p>In this example Bull Shoals has a power pool as listed by the Army Corp of Engineers in February of 659' above sea level. Yet we have continually seen in the last several years the lake level reach its max flood pool of 695'. Basic math tells us that the lake has an additional 36' of water from Flood pool compared to power pool. 36 vertical feet of water equates to miles of new shoreline and access to creeks and streams which trickle into the lake.</p> <p>To compound the problem, many tournament anglers have learned that the resident fish populations in the impoundments will follow the current and the rising lake levels and travel up the flooded creek arms making these areas lucrative to fish. Because there is no signage or easy way to determine where the "ozark stream" begins anglers are left to try and guess where the "normal pool" lake line would be. In the case of Bull Shoals at max pool this "normal pool" bench mark would be in 36 feet of water literally miles from where the lake's creek arm would begin to look and act like an "ozark stream". Local conservation agents are left to try and select semi-permanent markers to verbally instruct anglers they should not fish past. In the case of Bull Shoals, markers such as low water crossings or powerlines are used as unofficial markers that locals have been told through second or third hand information is the line which separates the lake from the stream. I don't think I need to explain the</p>	

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/07/20	Adam Johnson	Pontiac	3 CSR 10- 6.415: Restricted Zones	Amend this rule	<p>the code from the stream. I don't think I need to explain the inherent issues with using structures such as a power line or low water crossing with no signage or written documentation as a means of enforcement. This also creates significant issues from a competitive fishing situation where anglers who are unfamiliar with the lake are going to unknowingly keep and weigh fish from areas that other anglers believe to be a "closed" area based on their interpretation of where the impoundment ends from second hand information of a low water crossing under 30 feet of water.</p> <p>There are two relatively simple and easy ways to fix this problem. The easiest way to resolve this issue would be to amend the definition of impoundment within the code by replacing "normal pool" with "max flood pool". This would ensure that any areas being fished during times of high water would be considered an impoundment which from a practical application is what they are and how they feel when someone is out on the lake. If the commission did not want to change the regulation to "max flood pool" then at a minimum they need to increase public awareness and add signage. This could be done with signage at all the locations where impoundments become "Ozark streams" as well as additional signage at the boat ramps and marinas near these areas. Finally, these locations should be added as features on the MDC interactive map available on the MDC website so anglers could familiarize themselves with the areas they cannot fish past.</p>	<p>Fish populations in impoundments benefit from high water events, which provide more habitat for feeding and spawning but it also presents challenges. Some lake boundaries are highly visible during high water events, while others are not. The challenge with other boundary markers is marking them so they are visible throughout the year, regardless of water levels. Over the last few years this issue has become more prevalent and regional resource management staff are aware of the challenges and will keep these concerns in mind as they deal with this particular issue.</p>
07/01/20	Roger Wendel	Sugar Creek	3 CSR 10- 6.505: Black Bass	Amend this rule	<p>As a person who has fished/lived on the CpleCampCreek arm of LOZ for over 50+ years, I implore the MDC to make Smallmouth Bass a protected fish for 2 years.....the introduction of Stocking of certain species by the MDC has negatively affected the Smallmouth bass population. I base this off my creel samples over the last 5 years on two formerly strong spawning areas for Smallmouth bass, Cole Camp Creek and Turkey Creek. It has changed drastically....I believe the introduction of the Wiper(striped/white bass cross) is the main culprit in the Smallmouth bass competition for food and survival rate of Smallmouth new born fry....Please check with your fisheries biologist to confirm. The Wiper is a voracious eater and travels the same shallow tributary /spawning streams in the Spring....essentially, the artificial stocking of this species by MDC is not giving the Smallmouth a chance. TY for your time, Roger W Wendel (82 mile marker LOZ, ColeCamp Creek)</p>	<p>The Department regularly monitors the fish populations at Lake of the Ozarks and then uses this information to determine if regulation changes are needed to provide quality fishing opportunities for all species. Concerns from citizens, like yourself, are passed along to regional management staff for further consideration.</p>
07/01/20	Garett Richards	unknown (zipcode = Boonville)	3 CSR 10- 6.510: Channel Catfish, Blue Catfish, Flathead Catfish	Amend this rule	<p>As an avid fisherman I have seen tremendous improvement in the quality (size) of blue catfish in recent years. I believe this improvement is 100% due to the slot regulations put in place. I would like to see the regulation amended to allow only 1 fish per day over 34" to be kept.</p>	<p>The slot length limit for blue catfish went into effect in 2014 and was based off a harvest study conducted from 2003 to 2009. A post regulation evaluation is set to begin approximately eight years after the effective date of the current slot length limit restriction (2022). Once the evaluations have been completed and analyzed, then current regulations on blue catfish may be reevaluated.</p>

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/13/20	adam brandes	prairie home	3 CSR 10- 6.510: Channel Catfish, Blue Catfish, Flathead Catfish	Amend this rule	Bowfishing should be an acceptable method to the harvesting of all catfish in missouri public waters.	Bowfishing is a lethal method of take in Missouri and cannot be used on game species which typically have a length limit associated with them. Bowfishing does not allow fish under the legal length limit to be released unharmed immediately, so it is not a legal method of take for game fish in Missouri. Because of this, there are currently no plans to change regulations to allow for bowfishing on game species.
07/01/20	Greg Risinger	Saint Peters	3 CSR 10- 6.515: Crappie	Amend this rule	I would like to see the minimum length limit on Crappie increased to 10" on Lake of The Ozark.	Lake of the Ozarks is a popular destination for many fishermen and offers a variety of sportfishing opportunities. Crappie fishing on Lake of the Ozarks has been and continues to be one of the most popular angling opportunities. In 1989, a 9-inch minimum length limit was established on crappie at Lake of the Ozarks following a multi-year study. Since that time, the Missouri Department of Conservation has continued to regularly monitor the fish populations at Lake of the Ozarks and use this information to determine if regulation changes are needed to provide quality fishing opportunities. Currently no change has been recommended.
07/03/20	Sam Potter	ROLLA	3 CSR 10- 6.535: Trout	Amend this rule	ADD: Restrict fishing methods on the 9 Blue Ribbon Trout sections to single barbless hooks. Barbless hooks would include barbs on hooks removed or pinched down. Treble hooks can easily be replaced with single hooks on spinners and artificial lures. This restriction would minimize damage to the fish and help decrease infection mortality from wounds.	Trout populations are managed by regional staff using restrictions that focus on daily and possession limits, and fishing methods to manage trout in the Blue Ribbon areas. Mortality rates in trout associated with catch and release fishing vary and are dependent on many variables. At this time there, is no plan to change regulations for the Blue Ribbon trout areas.
07/06/20	Kevin L CARRIL	Overland Park	3 CSR 10- 6.535: Trout	Amend this rule	The members of our club would like two changes to the regulations that apply to the Blue Ribbon/Wild Trout areas to help protect this fishery. We would like treble hooks not be allowed. Secondly, we would like single hooks to be barbless or debarbed. This would help ensure the health and survival of fish when they are released. It is so sad to catch fish that have deformed or damaged mouths from previously being caught on a treble hook or carelessly released from a barbed hook. Thanks	Trout populations are managed by regional staff using restrictions that focus on daily and possession limits, and fishing methods to manage trout in the Blue Ribbon areas. Mortality rates in trout associated with catch and release fishing vary and are dependent on many variables. At this time there, is no plan to change regulations for the Blue Ribbon trout areas.
07/10/20	Michael Reddy	SAINT CHARLES	3 CSR 10- 6.535: Trout	Amend this rule	SINGLE POINT BARB-LESS HOOKS WHEREVER TROUT ARE NOT STOCKED. CATCH AND RELEASE ONLY WHEREVER TROUT ARE NOT STOCKED.	Trout populations are managed by regional staff using restrictions that focus on daily and possession limits, and fishing methods to manage trout throughout the state. Mortality rates in trout associated with catch and release fishing vary and are dependent on many variables. At this time there, is no plan to change these regulations.
07/13/20	Paul Eggeman	Columbia	3 CSR 10- 6.535: Trout	Amend this rule	I would like to see you change the winter trout catch and keep to start on March 1 instead of February 1. It does not take long for the anglers to remove the trout. A March 1 opener would relieve some of the pressure because anglers would have a choice between the trout parks and the winter trout lakes. It would also give anglers another month to enjoy the winter trout.	Urban Winter Trout Fishing Areas are managed by regional staff who have taken into consideration the different fishing opportunities available to Missouri citizens in their management areas. Your suggestion will be forwarded to staff for consideration as they continually evaluate fishing programs and how they benefit the citizens being served.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/20/20	Erik Griffen	Ashland	3 CSR 10- 6.535: Trout	Leave this rule intact	<p>A recent comment by Sam Potter proposed appealing the current regulation by implementing a single, barbless hook rule on Blue Ribbon regulated trout streams. I fish articulated streamers for fly fishing that consist of 2 separate barbless hooks connected via wire/beads to imitate small fish that larger trout prey upon. Implementing a regulation of a single hook would outlaw the use of this ethical tactic. I stand behind the current regulations because a change in Sam Potter's favor would need clarification for anglers like me and many others I know as well. If there was a change, clarification and re-wording would be necessary. There is no scientific data that shows more hooks on a lure increases post release mortality. Hook size and bait are more important factors that affect mortality of trout when angling (Taylor & White, 1992).</p> <p>Taylor, M. J., & White, K. R. (1992). A meta-analysis of hooking mortality of nonanadromous trout. North American Journal of Fisheries Management, 12(4), 760-767.</p>	<p>Trout populations are managed by regional staff using restrictions that focus on daily and possession limits, and fishing methods to manage trout in the Blue Ribbon areas. Mortality rates in trout associated with catch and release fishing vary and are dependent on many variables. At this time, there is no plan to change regulations for the Blue Ribbon trout areas.</p>
07/09/20	Danny Marshall	Steelville	3 CSR 10- 6.550: Other Fish	Amend this rule	<p>Fall snagging season for suckers should be in conjunction with gigging season. It has been that way for at least three decades but was changed last year. Gigging season was extended to February 15 but snagging was left at Jan. 15. Please extend fall snagging season to February 15. This will give us additional opportunities to enjoy our sport. Thanks</p>	<p>Historically, gigging and snagging seasons have coincided with each other. Department staff are currently working through the regulations process to once again bring these two fishing methods into agreement.</p>
07/06/20	Eric Kurzejeski	Columbia	3 CSR 10- 6.605: Live Bait	Amend this rule	<p>Consider allowing invasive spp a live bait on the Mo and Miss rivers. Asian carp in particular. I can see no reason that putting a few live carp on a bank line will result in any issue as the species is already firmly established in these waters.</p> <p>(6) Invasive fish may not be used as live bait but may be used as dead or cut bait.</p>	<p>Prior to 2020 amendments to the fishing regulations, anglers were allowed to use grass and common carp as live bait, and silver and bighead carp could only be used as dead or cut bait. In early 2020 the Department made changes to the regulations that defined common, grass, silver and bighead carp as invasive fish and prohibited all invasive fish from being uses as live bait. As the rule went into effect, the Department received feedback from a significant number of anglers, bait dealers and other interested parties that opposed the change. After listening to their concerns, the decision was made to propose amendments to the regulations to allow the use of common and grass carp as live bait.</p>
08/07/20	Robert James Almendares	unknown (zipcode = Pulaski County)	3 CSR 10- 6.605: Live Bait	Amend this rule	<p>Allow us to use Asian Carp as live bait as long as the fins are cut off.</p>	<p>Asian Carp are an invasive species that are causing significant harm to Missouri's native fish populations. Asian carp are currently present in Missouri's major river systems; however, the most likely way that invasive carp will spread throughout the system, or reach Missouri lakes, is through anglers using them as live bait. To protect Missouri's native fish populations, the use of live Asian Carp (regardless if the fins have been removed) is prohibited.</p>

**Periodic Review Comments
July 1 - August 31, 2020**

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/01/20	Jack Wiley	Craig	3 CSR 10- 7.415: Quail: Seasons, Limits	Amend this rule	Upland season should be changed to run from 15 November thru January 31st and limit should be 6. This would work better with agricultural seasons and also temperatures on dogs that occur in early November. Limit should decrease to 6 due to decrease in numbers.	<p>From 1950-1981 MO's quail season opened on Nov. 10 and closed between Dec. 15 and Jan. 15, with the longest season being 66 days. The hunting regulations were set each year based on population indices and typically ended in December. The December closure was based on research done in Illinois (Roseberry) that showed hunting losses in January added to natural mortality and risked a further decline in birds available to breed in the following spring. Despite changing the regulations annually, quail continued to decline due to large scale and widespread loss of habitat. In 1982, it was recommended that the season be set as it is now, Nov. 1 to January 15. In 1987 this season was placed in the Wildlife Code. The reasoning for this was to shift the focus from regulations alone to restore quail to habitat management efforts. The Jan. 15th closure was a compromise between having a longer season, and trying to limit the additive nature of hunting mortality on birds during the harsh winter season. More recent research has supported the findings from research in Illinois that quail are more sensitive to over harvest as food and cover become more limited by winter weather. Extending the season later into the winter would likely result in fewer quail carried over into the spring. Using the biological data to restrict the closing date, the opening date was placed on Nov. 1st to increase the recreational opportunity, and having the harvest date closer to the end of the reproductive season accomplishes this goal. As far as reducing the bag limit on quail, this topic has also received a large amount of research. Many states, including Missouri have found that limiting harvest does little to increase the population the following year. Because quail are not long-lived birds, generally birds that are spared from the gun will die from other causes over the winter months. Bobwhite quail have an annual mortality rate of about 80% per year. Even as the quail population has declined, the daily bag for hunters has remained fairly stable, at between 1.5 and 2 for the last 20 years. Leaving the bag limit at 8 allows hunters to take advantage of the resource in places where birds are present in good numbers.</p>
07/01/20	Jack Wiley	Craig	3 CSR 10- 7.415: Quail: Seasons, Limits	Amend this rule	Upland season should be changed to run from 15 November thru January 31st and limit should be 6. This would work better with agricultural seasons and also temperatures on dogs that occur in early November. Limit should decrease to 6 due to decrease in numbers.	<p>From 1950-1981 MO's quail season opened on Nov. 10 and closed between Dec. 15 and Jan. 15, with the longest season being 66 days. The hunting regulations were set each year based on population indices and typically ended in December. The December closure was based on research done in Illinois (Roseberry) that showed hunting losses in January added to natural mortality and risked a further decline in birds available to breed in the following spring. Despite changing the regulations annually, quail continued to decline due to large scale and widespread loss of habitat. In 1982, it was recommended that the season be set as it is now, Nov. 1 to January 15. In 1987 this season was placed in the Wildlife Code. The reasoning for this was to shift the focus from regulations alone to restore quail to habitat management efforts. The Jan. 15th closure was a compromise between having a longer season, and trying to limit the additive nature of hunting mortality on birds during the harsh winter season. More recent research has supported the findings from research in Illinois that quail are more sensitive to over harvest as food and cover become more limited by winter weather. Extending the season later into the winter would likely result in fewer quail carried over into the spring. Using the biological data to restrict the closing date, the opening date was placed on Nov. 1st to increase the recreational opportunity, and having the harvest date closer to the end of the reproductive season accomplishes this goal. As far as reducing the bag limit on quail, this topic has also received a large amount of research. Many states, including Missouri have found that limiting harvest does little to increase the population the following year. Because quail are not long-lived birds, generally birds that are spared from the gun will die from other causes over the winter months. Bobwhite quail have an annual mortality rate of about 80% per year. Even as the quail population has declined, the daily bag for hunters has remained fairly stable, at between 1.5 and 2 for the last 20 years. Leaving the bag limit at 8 allows hunters to take advantage of the resource in places where birds are present in good numbers.</p>

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/01/20	Jack Wiley	Craig	3 CSR 10- 7.415: Quail: Seasons, Limits	Amend this rule	Upland season should be changed to run from 15 November thru January 31st and limit should be 6. This would work better with agricultural seasons and also temperatures on dogs that occur in early November. Limit should decrease to 6 due to decrease in numbers.	From 1950-1981 MO's quail season opened on Nov. 10 and closed between Dec. 15 and Jan. 15, with the longest season being 66 days. The hunting regulations were set each year based on population indices and typically ended in December. The December closure was based on research done in Illinois (Roseberry) that showed hunting losses in January added to natural mortality and risked a further decline in birds available to breed in the following spring. Despite changing the regulations annually, quail continued to decline due to large scale and widespread loss of habitat. In 1982, it was recommended that the season be set as it is now, Nov. 1 to January 15. In 1987 this season was placed in the Wildlife Code. The reasoning for this was to shift the focus from regulations alone to restore quail to habitat management efforts. The Jan. 15th closure was a compromise between having a longer season, and trying to limit the additive nature of hunting mortality on birds during the harsh winter season. More recent research has supported the findings from research in Illinois that quail are more sensitive to over harvest as food and cover become more limited by winter weather. Extending the season later into the winter would likely result in fewer quail carried over into the spring. Using the biological data to restrict the closing date, the opening date was placed on Nov. 1st to increase the recreational opportunity, and having the harvest date closer to the end of the reproductive season accomplishes this goal. As far as reducing the bag limit on quail, this topic has also received a large amount of research. Many states, including Missouri have found that limiting harvest does little to increase the population the following year. Because quail are not long-lived birds, generally birds that are spared from the gun will die from other causes over the winter months. Bobwhite quail have an annual mortality rate of about 80% per year. Even as the quail population has declined, the daily bag for hunters has remained fairly stable, at between 1.5 and 2 for the last 20 years. Leaving the bag limit at 8 allows hunters to take advantage of the resource in places where birds are present in good numbers.
07/01/20	Michael Keller	Piedmont	3 CSR 10- 7.420: Rabbits: Seasons, Limits	Amend this rule	I would like to see the season extended to the end of February. As long as it would not hinder the rabbit mating season.	The current rabbit season dates were put into effect in 1971, when the season was reduced from 8 ½ months to 4 ½ months, in response to a declining rabbit population. Rabbit numbers continue to decline due to the loss of early successional habitat. The season closing was moved back to February 15th from March 1st after research showed that the onset of reproduction was generally in late February (earlier, as you move south). Many rabbits taken in late February had well-developed fetuses in them, prompting the decision to close the season earlier.
07/01/20	Michael Keller	Piedmont	3 CSR 10- 7.420: Rabbits: Seasons, Limits	Amend this rule	I would like to see the season extended to the end of February. As long as it would not hinder the rabbit mating season.	The current rabbit season dates were put into effect in 1971, when the season was reduced from 8 ½ months to 4 ½ months, in response to a declining rabbit population. Rabbit numbers continue to decline due to the loss of early successional habitat. The season closing was moved back to February 15th from March 1st after research showed that the onset of reproduction was generally in late February (earlier, as you move south). Many rabbits taken in late February had well-developed fetuses in them, prompting the decision to close the season earlier.
07/11/20	Josh Stromatt	unknown	3 CSR 10- 7.420: Rabbits: Seasons, Limits	Repeal this rule	As a fan of reintroducing native species to Missouri, I am excited to see our Elk population growing, I've even had the opportunity to spot a large bull elk standing in the water of the current river which was one of the most awesome sights I have ever seen. I do my best to be informed of the regulations that Missouri has for hunting and usually I am a supporter of the regulations you have. However the regulation that you have decided to put in place that forbids the use of dogs during the Elk firearm season (currently for 5 people) in 3 entire counties is ridiculous and I believe MDC is overstepping. I could see this being enforced in a few certain areas when Elk season is open to the entire state, but we all know that is very far away, and very well may never happen. I beg you to reconsider and I will be sharing this on every rabbit hunting page I follow on Facebook until this regulation is changed.	The decision to not allow use of dogs to hunt rabbits and squirrels during the firearms portion of the elk hunting season in Carter, Reynolds, and Shannon counties was to maintain consistency with our regulations during the November portion of firearms deer season which also prohibit use of dogs to hunt these species. Although only five hunters were able to pursue elk during last year's season, that number will continue to increase through time as the elk population increases in number and range. We recognize and appreciate that we have a diverse hunting community that enjoys pursuing a wide range of species, and we attempt to do our best to balance the desires of all hunters and minimize as much potential conflict as possible when establishing regulations. Given that the rabbit hunting season spans about a four-and-a-half-month period, we deemed it reasonable to not allow use of dogs to hunt these species during the 9-day firearms elk season without greatly affecting the overall amount of opportunity for hunters to pursue small game. However, we do review our regulations annually to determine when change is warranted. As such, your comments will be shared with members of the Regulations Committee for consideration during the next regulatory evaluation cycle.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/11/20	Noah	Ellsinore	3 CSR 10- 7.420: Rabbits: Seasons, Limits	Repeal this rule	Restricting dogs from running on government land in areas that's never seen a elk I high disagree maybe close half the county down by Van Buren and on the river but not this big amount of area	The decision to not allow use of dogs to hunt rabbits and squirrels during the firearms portion of the elk hunting season in Carter, Reynolds, and Shannon counties was to maintain consistency with our regulations during the November portion of firearms deer season which also prohibit use of dogs to hunt these species. Although only five hunters were able to pursue elk during last year's season, that number will continue to increase through time as the elk population increases in number and range. We recognize and appreciate that we have a diverse hunting community that enjoys pursuing a wide range of species, and we attempt to do our best to balance the desires of all hunters and minimize as much potential conflict as possible when establishing regulations. Given that the rabbit hunting season spans about a four-and-a-half-month period, we deemed it reasonable to not allow use of dogs to hunt these species during the 9-day firearms elk season without greatly affecting the overall amount of opportunity for hunters to pursue small game. However, we do review our regulations annually to determine when change is warranted. As such, your comments will be shared with members of our Regulations Committee for consideration during the next regulatory evaluation cycle.
07/12/20	Jamie Lee Norris	Piedmont	3 CSR 10- 7.420: Rabbits: Seasons, Limits	Repeal this rule	I really hate the fact that you chose to shorten rabbit season by several days in a select few counties over five elk tags. A lot of people in these counties didn't want elk to begin with and now we get more special regulations to make it worse. Just because MDC can't catch a few deer dog hunters you feel the need to punish legitimate houndsman. I sincerely hope there is a vote to defund MDC or make changes so your commission has to answer to the people.	The decision to not allow use of dogs to hunt rabbits and squirrels during the firearms portion of the elk hunting season in Carter, Reynolds, and Shannon counties was to maintain consistency with our regulations during the November portion of firearms deer season which also prohibit use of dogs to hunt these species. Although only five hunters were able to pursue elk during last year's season, that number will continue to increase through time as the elk population increases in number and range. We recognize and appreciate that we have a diverse hunting community that enjoys pursuing a wide range of species, and we attempt to do our best to balance the desires of all hunters and minimize as much potential conflict as possible when establishing regulations. Given that the rabbit hunting season spans about a four-and-a-half-month period, we deemed it reasonable to not allow use of dogs to hunt these species during the 9-day firearms elk season without greatly affecting the overall amount of opportunity for hunters to pursue small game. However, we do review our regulations annually to determine when change is warranted. As such, your comments will be shared with members of our Regulations Committee for consideration during the next regulatory evaluation cycle.
07/01/20	william kist	unknown	3 CSR 10- 7.425: Squirrels: Seasons, Limits	Amend this rule	No reason to have a season on these animals.	Squirrel are considered wildlife by the <i>Wildlife Code</i> , and as such, they have seasons and limits prescribed. The season for squirrels is one of MO's longest seasons, starting in late May and going through mid-February. Bag limits are liberal as well, with 10 squirrels allowed per day, with a possession limit of 20. Squirrels provide a great way to introduce youth into hunting activities and provide plenty of opportunities to get outdoors. Squirrel provides delicious food as well. The <i>Wildlife Code</i> also provides for removal of nuisance animals on private property.
07/01/20	William Kist	unknown	3 CSR 10- 7.427: Groundhogs: Seasons, Limits	Repeal this rule	No reason to have a season on these animals.	The <i>Wildlife Code</i> classifies the groundhog as a game species that may be taken during the prescribed seasons. The season runs from May 10 to Dec. 15th. There is no daily or possession limit on the number of groundhogs that may be taken. The <i>Wildlife Code</i> also provides for removal of nuisance groundhogs out of season, without a permit.
07/04/20	Russell Schuster	Maryville	3 CSR 10- 7.430: Pheasants: Seasons, Limits	Amend this rule	Why not add daily times of when you can hunt pheasants? Iowa has done this successfully for years. Start when the sun has risen any where in Missouri and stop before the sun sets anywhere in Missouri. Iowa, I believe, uses 8 AM to 4:30 PM. Why do this? When I have hunted at the Bilby Conservation Area in Nodaway County in the past, hunters were shooting in the morning when it was dark and you couldn't identify if a pheasant was a hen or rooster. This was also dangerous as you couldn't see where other hunters were. Please give it some serious consideration.	Aside from rabbits and migratory birds, most small game species in Missouri do not have prescribed shooting hours. This is because the habits of the species being hunted dictate when hunters will choose to pursue them, and makes a shooting hours regulation unnecessary. Additionally, restrictions on the use of an artificial light for hunting most species, make it impossible/impractical to hunt small game outside of daylight hours. The situation described at Bilby Ranch Conservation Area is the exception, and not the general rule when it comes to pheasant hunting. The majority of upland bird hunting in Missouri occurs in locations where the hunter density is much lower.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/01/20	william kist	unknown	3 CSR 10- 7.431: Deer Hunting Seasons: General Provisions	Repeal this rule	<p>Youth season: Age of six is absurd. Ten y should be minimum. Upper limit on y, 15. Everyone knows a six year old with a picture of a monster buck in the paper was shot by an adult.</p> <p>If you keep youths (peak of rut) before modern firearms.....does only. You are letting children shoot bucks that are bigger than many hunters get in a lifetime.</p> <p>(A) Youth portions: November 2 through 3, 2019, and November 29 through December 1, 2019; for persons at least six (6) but not older than fifteen (15) years of age; use any legal deer hunting method to take one (1) deer statewide during the November 2 through 3, 2019, portion; use any legal deer hunting method to take deer statewide during the November 29 through December 1, 2019,</p>	<p>The minimum age to hunt deer and turkeys in Missouri is currently 6 years old. Although some hunters may not choose to hunt until later than 6 years of age, we feel that the current minimum age is appropriate. Because the development and maturity level of youth hunters varies, it is quite possible that an older youth hunter (e.g., 10 years old) may be less ready to hunt deer or turkeys than a younger hunter (e.g., 6 years old). As such, rather than increasing the minimum age, we would rather allow the parents or mentors of youth hunters be able to decide whether a particular youth hunter is ready to participate. With the proper training and mentoring, we feel that a 6-year-old hunter is perfectly capable of harvesting a deer or turkey. It is important to note that our regulations require youth hunters that are not hunter-education certified to hunt in the immediate presence of an adult mentor. Because hunter-education certification cannot be obtained until a hunter is 11 years old, this ensures that the youngest deer and turkey hunters (ages 6-10) are not able to hunt by themselves. Moreover, regardless of age, youth hunters must be able to hold, aim, and shoot by themselves. Like many other states, firearms deer hunter numbers are declining in Missouri. As such, efforts to recruit hunters are more important now than ever. We believe one of the ways we can do so is to provide youths with the opportunity to participate in hunting at a young age before their lives become increasingly busy with other types of activities. We believe that the regulations and requirements that we have in place allow youths as young as 6 years old to be able to safely and effectively become involved in deer and turkey hunting. The youth portions of firearms deer season are designed to provide young hunters with an opportunity to see deer and have a good chance of harvesting a deer. As such, timing of the early youth portion of firearms deer season is designed to put young hunters in the woods when deer movement is high (i.e., pre-rut). Because hunter success can influence future participation, it is our desire to allow hunters during the youth seasons to be able to harvest any deer that they would like to whether it be a buck or a doe. We also remove the antler-point restriction during the youth portions so that hunters can harvest young bucks if they should so choose. Given our desire to provide a high-quality hunting experience for our youth hunters with a good chance of success, we do not think it would be appropriate to not allow the harvest of bucks during the youth seasons.</p>
07/01/20	Zachary	Warrenton	3 CSR 10- 7.431: Deer Hunting Seasons: General Provisions	Amend this rule	<p>Allow us to shine like wisconsin. All night during the spring and summer and then til 10pm during season</p>	<p>The regulation was enacted more than 20 years ago to address the concerns of landowners who had grown tired of the disruption of having lights shined onto their property. Additionally, the Department was spending a significant amount of staff time responding to complaints related to the activity. When promulgating regulations, the Department must account for the management of fish and wildlife populations, the desires of all citizens (including landowners), and public safety. Additionally, the Department has a responsibility to manage the resources entrusted to it, including staff time, in a manner that promotes the greatest benefits to wildlife. Considering that approximately 90% of all lands in Missouri are held in private ownership, the current demands on department staff, and wildlife populations are not positively impacted by harassment/disturbance with lights; the current regulation is necessary to protect and manage the wildlife resources of Missouri.</p>

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/01/20	Drew Happel	unknown (zipcode = Jefferson County)	3 CSR 10- 7.431: Deer Hunting Seasons: General Provisions	Amend this rule	The baiting rule needs to be gone. Placing bait is legal in other states and does nothing to curb CWD. Deer congregate on food plots, scrapes and licking branches. They are social creatures and contact is gonna happen. You mean to tell me that I can plant all the corn I want but as soon as i dump some from a bag, it's illegal. Some hunters don't have the time, money or equipment that it takes to plant food plots, let these hunters feed their deer making them healthier and have the same chance as other hunters who plant food plots.	The use of bait to lure deer for hunting opportunities is not considered fair chase in Missouri. Although a pile of corn (i.e., baiting) and food plots both provide food for deer and an attractant for hunting, we believe that there are important distinctions between the two practices – enough so that one practice is permitted and the other prohibited. As opposed to placing a pile of corn on the ground to attract deer, establishment of a food plot is a process with no guarantees that the process will end in a satisfactory result (e.g., drought causing poor germination or growth). As such, it is much more difficult to establish a food plot than it is to place a bait pile for deer, making it more in line with fair chase practices. Whereas baiting is most often conducted to increase hunter success, food plots can provide nutrition beyond what is naturally available in a manner that is natural (planted and growing). As such, food plot plantings, on average, provide much more benefit to wildlife than does baiting. Food plots can be used to increase the health of wildlife populations and are also often a practice that gets landowners and hunters interested in creating additional habitat for deer and other wildlife species. Another important distinction between baiting and food plots is disease transmission risk. Unlike a bait site that attracts deer to a very specific location, which is often devoid of vegetation due to the level of concentrated activity, deer forage much more widely in a food plot. In addition to being much more dispersed when foraging in a food plot, the fact that deer are consuming vegetation above the soil level in a food plot rather than consuming corn or another food source from the ground at a bait site is significant from a disease risk standpoint. Deer are certainly social animals that contact each other directly or indirectly at sites such as scrapes and licking branches. However, although we cannot control all forms of deer contact, we feel it would be irresponsible if we did not do our best to minimize disease risk where we can.
07/02/20	Ryan Hesse	Strafford	3 CSR 10- 7.431: Deer Hunting Seasons: General Provisions	Amend this rule	Move firearms season to start the 2nd Saturday after Thanksgiving.	Timing of the various portions of Missouri's deer seasons are based primarily on the desires of our hunters. Each year the Department surveys over 50,000 deer hunters to obtain their input about the deer population, deer management, and our hunting regulations. On hunter surveys, we routinely ask about season timing preferences. As recently as last year, we asked deer hunters if they would be supportive of moving the November portion later in the fall, of which most were opposed. The peak of the rut typically occurs during or near the start of the November portion and we suspect that most hunters prefer the current season timing because of the increased deer movement and greater chance of harvesting a buck that occurs during this time of year. The Department will continue to conduct surveys of our hunters to determine, among other things, their preference for the timing of deer seasons and will use the information we receive to help us develop regulations that continue to satisfy the majority of our hunters.
07/02/20	Tim Clements	unknown	3 CSR 10- 7.431: Deer Hunting Seasons: General Provisions	Amend this rule	Move the firearms portion of the season to open on the Saturday after Thanksgiving. This would help to allow more young bucks to get older as well as allow more time for most of the does to be bred. Also bring back the urban portions as well as the extra antlerless tags. The doe numbers are too high.	Timing of the various portions of Missouri's deer seasons are based primarily on the desires of our hunters. Each year we survey over 50,000 deer hunters to obtain their input about the deer population, deer management, and our hunting regulations. On hunter surveys, we routinely ask about season timing preferences. As recently as last year, we asked our deer hunters if they would be supportive of moving the November portion later in the fall, of which most were opposed. The peak of the rut typically occurs during or near the start of the November portion and we suspect that most hunters prefer the current season timing because of the increased deer movement and greater chance of harvesting a buck that occurs during this time of year. Biologically, we are not concerned with the timing of the November portion in terms of its effect on deer breeding. Data we have collected recently from the deer population indicates that the vast majority (>90%) of adult does are bred each year. Regarding the urban zone portion of firearms deer season – it was rescinded because it was not having the desired effect of increasing deer harvest in urban areas where use of firearms is prohibited. However, in response to increasing deer numbers, beginning this fall, the length of the antlerless portion of firearms deer season will be increased from 3 to 9 days. This increase in season length should help to increase antlerless harvest and curb population growth. In addition to increasing the length of the antlerless portion, we have also increased the number of firearms antlerless permits and landowner firearms antlerless permits in many counties recently in response to the growing deer population. We will continue to use this strategy to increase harvest of antlerless deer in select counties to help us achieve our goal of maintaining deer numbers at acceptable levels for our stakeholders.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/03/20	Bob Sullivan	Portland	3 CSR 10- 7.431: Deer Hunting Seasons: General Provisions	Amend this rule	I hope you can find a way to give us some relief from the deer damage we have on our crops. Seeing deer is nice but seeing 20-30 eating on my soybeans and corn is not.	In response to increasing deer numbers across much of the state, the length of the antlerless portion of firearms deer season will be increased from 3 to 9 days starting in the fall of 2021. This increase in season length should help to increase antlerless harvest and curb population growth. In addition to increasing the length of the antlerless portion, we have also increased the number of firearms antlerless permits and landowner firearms antlerless permits in many counties recently in response to the growing deer population. We will continue to use this strategy to increase harvest of antlerless deer in select counties to help us achieve our goal of maintaining deer numbers at acceptable levels for our stakeholders. We have also recently established a Deer Management Assistance Program (DMAP) that provides qualifying landowners with the ability to acquire additional firearms antlerless permits above what is permitted at the county-level. The program is currently being piloted and is scheduled to be available to landowners in all counties by next year. For additional information about the DMAP program, please feel free to contact Kevyn Wiskirchen, MDC Private Land Deer Biologist, at Kevyn.Wiskirchen@mdc.mo.gov.
07/01/20	Michael Buechler	Jefferson City	3 CSR 10- 7.432: Deer: Archery Hunting Season	Amend this rule	Should not have a 4 point restriction in Jefferson City. Very limited.	The antler-point restriction (APR) is a popular regulation in the counties where it is in place because it does allow many young bucks to be recruited into older age-classes. To determine which counties to implement the APR, we send surveys to deer numbers to gauge their level of support. In counties where most hunters support the APR, like Cole County, we put the regulation in place; in counties where most hunters are opposed to the APR, it is not instated. Therefore, the distribution of the APR across Missouri is driven by hunter support or opposition for the regulation at the county-level. In addition to hunter support, another factor that determines whether counties have the APR is proximity to detection of chronic wasting disease (CWD). Any counties where we have detected the disease, and those counties within 10 miles of positive detections, do not have the APR. These counties form our CWD Management Zone. The APR does not exist within the CWD Management Zone because yearling bucks typically disperse from the area in which they were born. As such, the APR does not make sense in these areas from a disease management standpoint. Taken collectively, we use the APR to satisfy the desires of our hunters where there is majority support for the regulation, while also making sure to implement the regulation only in areas where it will not compromise our disease management goals. Despite having county-level support for the APR, we can understand your desire to have the regulation rescinded in Jefferson City which certainly is a different landscape than most of the county. Just last year, we rescinded the APR in Columbia to allow harvest of young bucks within city limits (the APR is still in effect outside of the city limits). Based on the success of this change, we will consider rescinding the APR in other municipalities in the future as appropriate/needed. As such, it is possible that the APR may be rescinded in Jefferson City at some point in the future after we've evaluated its success in Columbia.
07/02/20	John Dougan	unknown (zipcode = Ashland)	3 CSR 10- 7.432: Deer: Archery Hunting Season	Amend this rule	Begin archery season in October when average temperatures are low enough that meat is less likely to spoil. Compare share the harvest figures for September to other 15 day periods to approximate spoilage rates.	In addition to maintaining deer numbers at levels that are acceptable to our stakeholders, another goal of our deer management program is to provide as much opportunity as possible for our hunters to pursue deer. This was the reason that we moved the start date of the archery season from October 1 to September 15. Although the last two weeks of September are not the most popular time for archers to pursue deer in Missouri, there are a number of hunters that enjoy the earlier start to the season. Given the movement patterns of deer at that time of year, the first couple weeks of the archery season can be a great time of year to harvest a mature buck. Although the temperatures can be warm in late September, we do not feel that the additional two weeks of archery hunting (i.e., last two weeks of September) lead to a higher rate of deer that are unfit for consumption. Additionally, it is unlikely that most archers would be supportive of shortening the length of the archery season and reducing their opportunity to hunt. It is for these reasons that we feel the current starting date of our archery season is appropriate at this time.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/01/20	David Cartner	Richland	3 CSR 10- 7.433: Deer: Firearms Hunting Seasons	Amend this rule	Give us a Traditional Weapons season starting in late October through the first 10 days of November, excluding the Youth Hunt weekend. I envision 14-18 days. Allowable methods limited to Sidelock percussion and flintlock muzzleloading rifle and pistol (minimum .40 caliber), longbows, non-compound crossbows, atlatl, spears, bolos. Modern inline muzzleloading rifles can be used during firearms season or the Alternative Methods seasons already established.	Although the Department understands your desire to have a separate traditional weapons portion of deer season, we are not considering establishment of such a season at this time. It may not be as appealing as hunting during a portion dedicated to the exclusive use of the methods you mention (sidelock percussion, flintlocks, and pistols) can already be used during any of the firearms portions of deer season, and longbows and atlatls can be used during any portion of the archery or firearms seasons. At present, there are already five firearms portions of deer season, and we must balance the desires of firearms hunters with archery hunters and hunters pursuing other species. We feel that an archery season, two youth portions, a November portion, an antlerless portion, and an alternative methods portions provide a diversity of hunting opportunities for our hunters based on whatever preferences they might have.
07/01/20	Kyle Whanger	unknown (zipcode = Callaway County)	3 CSR 10- 7.433: Deer: Firearms Hunting Seasons	Amend this rule	I would like to see Missouri follow firearm season dates that are similar to surround states. Moving rifle season out of the rut would increase our state's buck's age structure.	Timing of the various portions of Missouri's deer seasons are based primarily on the desires of our hunters. Each year the department surveys over 50,000 deer hunters to obtain their input about the deer population, deer management, and our hunting regulations. On hunter surveys, we routinely ask about season timing preferences. As recently as last year, we asked our deer hunters if they would be supportive of moving the November portion later in the fall, of which most were opposed. The peak of the rut typically occurs during or near the start of the November portion and we suspect that most hunters prefer the current season timing because of the increased deer movement and greater chance of harvesting a buck that occurs during this time of year. Although we do not wish to shift timing of the November portion because most of our hunters would not support it, we do have other regulations that help to increase the age-structure of the buck segment of the population. One of these regulations is the antler-point restriction that we have in place in counties where most hunters support it. The reduction in the buck bag-limit from three bucks to two bucks several years ago was also motivated by hunter desires to pursue older bucks. As such, we feel that we have struck a balance between offering the November portion during a time of year that most hunters desire while also instating some additional regulations to help improve buck age-structure.
07/01/20	michael hoots	st louis	3 CSR 10- 7.433: Deer: Firearms Hunting Seasons	Amend this rule	i am a land owner with more than 100 acres Ste Genevieve co you are giving out to many antler less tags, deer are not as abundant as they were 20, 30, or 40 years ago on my property. To many hunters in a given area with to many antler less tags have taken a huge toll on the deer population. Even CWD does not justify the amount of antler less deer killed. maybe landowners only should be issued the tags per acres to be used on their property. Most of the time the word i hear from others who don't like killing all the antler less deer is each tag means money for you. Most of us limit the # of deer taken on our property, but not all the neighbors feel that way and kill all they can	When developing hunting regulations, the Department assesses the status of the deer population in each county and then make any necessary changes to the regulations based on how the deer population is doing. There are a variety of data that we look at to determine population status in each county. We look at the number of deer harvested, estimated population size, and population trend. Hunter opinions are also very important in our decision-making process. Each year we send surveys to 50,000-85,000 deer hunters to determine their opinions about deer numbers, satisfaction with their hunting experience, and support of our regulations. We then take all this information and determine if the current regulations are in line with what our data are telling us about the county-level deer population. Based on the latest available data, the deer population trend in Ste. Genevieve County is currently stable to slightly increasing. Results from last year's survey of hunters in the county indicated that most hunters feel the deer population currently exists at acceptable levels. Therefore, we feel the regulations for the county are in line with management goals at this time. We are sorry to hear that you are not seeing the number of deer that you are accustomed to seeing. In a situation like yours, the recommendation would be to reduce doe harvest on the property where you hunt, which it sounds like you might already be doing. You could also reach-out to neighboring landowners to ask them if they have noticed a reduction in deer numbers, and to see if they would be willing to reduce doe harvest as well. Having a landowner cooperative where neighboring landowners communicate about deer management goals and work together is a powerful way to influence changes in the deer population. The good news is that deer populations have the ability to grow quickly, so with reduced doe harvest, numbers should rebound nicely.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/02/20	John Dougan	unknown (zipcode = Ashland)	3 CSR 10- 7.433: Deer: Firearms Hunting Seasons	Amend this rule	Calibers used for hunting of deer should be .243 or greater. Muzzle-loading and air powered season should be extended and separated from a special weekend pistol and shotgun season. Call it single shot season, heritage season..but that will allow the two different styles of hunting to be separated.	The Department offers a range of methods to hunt deer, some of which have the potential to be more effective (e.g., allow harvest at greater distances) than others, and as such, it is up to each individual hunter to assess their skill and proficiency with a particular method in order to hunt ethically. A hunter's level of skill and proficiency has great bearing on allowing them to make a vital shot on a deer. Therefore, the ability of a particular hunting method to be effective lies not only with the inherent capability of the method, but also with the proficiency of its user. It should be every hunter's desire to deliver a shot to the vital area so as to result in a quick kill. Although the Department can strongly advocate that hunters practice and become proficient with their hunting method prior to entering the field, this type of hunter behavior cannot be easily regulated. As with any hunting method, hunters that use smaller calibers must understand the limitations of their chosen firearm. Just as with any hunting method, factors such as shot distance and angle are important factors in determining the likelihood that a lethal shot will be made. As such, a skilled marksman using a smaller caliber who takes shots within their capabilities could be better able to deliver a lethal shot than a hunter using a larger caliber who does not understand his or her limitations or the limitations of their firearm. It is for this reason that the Department does not place restrictions on calibers that can be used to hunt deer other than the restriction that only centerfire rifles and handguns are permitted. Rather, the regulations allow methods that have the potential to be effective given a proficient user that understands the capabilities of their hunting equipment. We can understand your desire to have a separate heritage portion of deer season, however, we are not considering establishment of such a season at this time. There are five firearms portions of deer season, and the Department must balance the desires of firearms hunters with archery hunters and hunters pursuing other species. We feel that an archery season, two youth portions, a November portion, an antlerless portion, and an alternative methods portion provide a diversity of hunting opportunities for hunters based on whatever preferences they might have.
07/02/20	Will Gabbert	unknown (zipcode = Pettis County)	3 CSR 10- 7.433: Deer: Firearms Hunting Seasons	Amend this rule	The Missouri firearms season must be moved out of the rut. Missouri will never reach its full potential of mature bucks and trophy caliber deer with the general rifle season remaining in the middle of the rut. Opening weekend should be moved back to early December. This is a minor change that would have a huge impact on our bucks age structure and will allow more bucks to reach maturity and their full potential.	Timing of the various portions of Missouri's deer seasons are based primarily on the desires of our hunters. Each year the Department surveys over 50,000 deer hunters to obtain their input about the deer population, deer management, and our hunting regulations. On hunter surveys, we routinely ask about season timing preferences. As recently as last year, we asked deer hunters if they would be supportive of moving the November portion later in the fall, of which most were opposed. The peak of the rut typically occurs during or near the start of the November portion and we suspect that most hunters prefer the current season timing because of the increased deer movement and greater chance of harvesting a buck that occurs during this time of year. Although we do not wish to shift timing of the November portion because most of our hunters would not support it, we do have other regulations that help to increase the age-structure of the buck segment of the population. One of these regulations is the antler-point restriction that we have in place in counties where most hunters support it. The reduction in the buck bag-limit from three bucks to two bucks several years ago was also motivated by hunter desires to pursue older bucks. As such, we feel that we have struck a balance between offering the November portion during a time of year that most hunters desire while also instating some additional regulations to help improve buck age-structure.

Periodic Review Comments
July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/02/20	Kiley Harpster	Atlanta	3 CSR 10- 7.433: Deer: Firearms Hunting Seasons	Amend this rule	Move it to a later date, out of the heart of the rut!	Timing of the various portions of Missouri’s deer seasons are based primarily on the desires of our hunters. Each year the Department surveys over 50,000 deer hunters to obtain their input about the deer population, deer management, and our hunting regulations. On hunter surveys, we routinely ask about season timing preferences. As recently as last year, we asked deer hunters if they would be supportive of moving the November portion later in the fall, of which most were opposed. The peak of the rut typically occurs during or near the start of the November portion and we suspect that most hunters prefer the current season timing because of the increased deer movement and greater chance of harvesting a buck that occurs during this time of year. Although we do not wish to shift timing of the November portion because most of our hunters would not support it, we do have other regulations that help to increase the age-structure of the buck segment of the population. One of these regulations is the antler-point restriction that we have in place in counties where most hunters support it. The reduction in the buck bag-limit from three bucks to two bucks several years ago was also motivated by hunter desires to pursue older bucks. As such, we feel that we have struck a balance between offering the November portion during a time of year that most hunters desire while also instating some additional regulations to help improve buck age-structure.
07/02/20	Tim Clements	unknown	3 CSR 10- 7.433: Deer: Firearms Hunting Seasons	Amend this rule	Move the firearms portion to open on the Saturday after Thanksgiving.	Timing of the various portions of Missouri’s deer seasons are based primarily on the desires of our hunters. Each year the Department surveys over 50,000 deer hunters to obtain their input about the deer population, deer management, and our hunting regulations. On hunter surveys, we routinely ask about season timing preferences. As recently as last year, we asked deer hunters if they would be supportive of moving the November portion later in the fall, of which most were opposed. The peak of the rut typically occurs during or near the start of the November portion and we suspect that most hunters prefer the current season timing because of the increased deer movement and greater chance of harvesting a buck that occurs during this time of year. Although we do not wish to shift timing of the November portion because most of our hunters would not support it, we do have other regulations that help to increase the age-structure of the buck segment of the population. One of these regulations is the antler-point restriction that we have in place in counties where most hunters support it. The reduction in the buck bag-limit from three bucks to two bucks several years ago was also motivated by hunter desires to pursue older bucks. As such, we feel that we have struck a balance between offering the November portion during a time of year that most hunters desire while also instating some additional regulations to help improve buck age-structure.
07/13/20	adam brandes	prairie home	3 CSR 10- 7.433: Deer: Firearms Hunting Seasons	Amend this rule	Youth rifle seasons need to be moved out of the rut along with rifle season. First youth season should fall the friday after thanksgiving through that sunday. Rifle season should start the monday after thanksgiving and run for 14 days. Second youth season should then be the final weekend of december, beginning on the final friday and go to that sunday. These changes will decrease the overall numbers of deer being taken during firearms portions, but will also allow deer numbers to increase in many areas they have fallen. It also allows more breeding to occur, and for an increased buck to doe ratio.	Timing of the various portions of Missouri’s deer seasons are based primarily on the desires of our hunters. Each year the Department surveys over 50,000 deer hunters to obtain their input about the deer population, deer management, and our hunting regulations. On hunter surveys, we routinely ask about season timing preferences. As recently as last year, we asked deer hunters if they would be supportive of moving the November portion later in the fall, of which most were opposed. The peak of the rut typically occurs during or near the start of the November portion and we suspect that most hunters prefer the current season timing because of the increased deer movement and greater chance of harvesting a buck that occurs during this time of year. Although we do not wish to shift timing of the November portion because most of our hunters would not support it, we do have other regulations that help to increase the age-structure of the buck segment of the population. One of these regulations is the antler-point restriction that we have in place in counties where most hunters support it. The reduction in the buck bag-limit from three bucks to two bucks several years ago was also motivated by hunter desires to pursue older bucks. As such, we feel that we have struck a balance between offering the November portion during a time of year that most hunters desire while also instating some additional regulations to help improve buck age-structure.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
08/16/20	rusty	moberly	3 CSR 10- 7.433: Deer: Firearms Hunting Seasons	Amend this rule	why are so many conservation lands banning firearm hunting for deer. For a non landowner it's really hard to find a place close and the ones that are open to firearm hunting get swamped with people. I bow hunt Bee Hollow area and it would be a perfect rifle hunting place sense it's mostly draws of woods with most open fields	Prior to 2016, deer hunting regulations on MDC Conservation Areas (CAs) were considerably more complicated. To simplify regulations on CAs, beginning in 2016, the number of options were reduced to three (archery only, archery and muzzleloader, archery and firearms). During this process, we attempted to determine which CAs were most suited for each of the three options and to tried to provide a diversity of these various options throughout each region of the state. Some of the factors that we considered during this process included CA size, proximity to urban areas, hunting pressure, and landscape composition.
07/01/20	Sandra Chambers	Salem	3 CSR 10- 7.434: Deer: Landowner Privileges	Repeal this rule	there was no reason to bump the land owner permit to 20 ac.... You could have bumped it up to 15 ac. That would have gotten you what you wanted with out hurting most of the small land owners... what you did was wrong. Many of us bought our land so we could hunt on it as land owners. You should have gotten more in put on it before you changed the rules...	The Department has offered no-cost hunting privileges to resident landowners since the inception of the modern firearms deer hunting season in 1944. The primary rationale for offering these privileges has been that private landowners, as defined in the Wildlife Code, provide space and resources for wildlife. In the early years, it was also hoped that these privileges would serve as an incentive to landowners; if they could hunt on their land for free, perhaps they would also invest in creating wildlife habitat. Over the years, free privileges have been promoted by the Department as a type of landowner recognition for contributions of habitat. The Department has consistently adhered to this rationale over time, although the definition of landowner and privileges offered have changed periodically in response to changing wildlife populations, land ownership patterns, and social considerations. Land use patterns and wildlife populations have changed significantly from those existing when free landowner privileges were established with the intent to impact wildlife like small-game, deer, and turkey, and to recognize the landowners with acreages large enough to impact the habitat needs of deer and turkey. As an example, with respect to deer, a 5-acre threshold is typically not a meaningful acreage requirement for this species and does not reflect their broad habitat needs. A healthy deer density in Missouri equates to about 1 deer for every 20-25 acres. To arrive at the 20-acre requirement, we reached out to the public and received responses from about 14,600 individuals. The average response when asked what size acreage should be required to qualify for landowner permits was 21 acres. As such, we choose 20 acres as the cut-off. In addition to the 20-acre requirement being supported by the public input we received, we feel that the new acreage requirement is also biologically appropriate in terms of deer and turkey habitat needs.
07/01/20	Paul Arnote	Independence	3 CSR 10- 7.434: Deer: Landowner Privileges	Amend this rule	There was a recent rule change to "limit" landowner permits to only those who own 20 contiguous acres or more of land. Previously, the rule applied to landowners who own 5 contiguous acres or more. The rule change will dissuade owners of the smaller parcels from increasing or providing deer habitat. The rule change should be rolled back, either to the previous 5 acre size, or to more than 10 acres if the 5 acre stipulation makes the rule too broad.	The Department has offered no-cost hunting privileges to resident landowners since the inception of the modern firearms deer hunting season in 1944. The primary rationale for offering these privileges has been that private landowners, as defined in the Wildlife Code, provide space and resources for wildlife. In the early years, it was also hoped that these privileges would serve as an incentive to landowners; if they could hunt on their land for free, perhaps they would also invest in creating wildlife habitat. Over the years, free privileges have been promoted by the Department as a type of landowner recognition for contributions of habitat. The Department has consistently adhered to this rationale over time, although the definition of landowner and privileges offered have changed periodically in response to changing wildlife populations, land ownership patterns, and social considerations. Land use patterns and wildlife populations have changed significantly from those existing when free landowner privileges were established with the intent to impact wildlife like small-game, deer, and turkey, and to recognize the landowners with acreages large enough to impact the habitat needs of deer and turkey. As an example, with respect to deer, a 5-acre threshold is typically not a meaningful acreage requirement for this species and does not reflect their broad habitat needs. A healthy deer density in Missouri equates to about 1 deer for every 20-25 acres. To arrive at the 20-acre requirement, we reached out to the public and received responses from about 14,600 individuals. The average response when asked what size acreage should be required to qualify for landowner permits was 21 acres. As such, we choose 20 acres as the cut-off. In addition to the 20-acre requirement being supported by the public input we received, we feel that the new acreage requirement is also biologically appropriate in terms of deer and turkey habitat needs.

**Periodic Review Comments
July 1 - August 31, 2020**

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/02/20	John Dougan	unknown (zipcode = Ashland)	3 CSR 10- 7.434: Deer: Landowner Privileges	Amend this rule	All landowners should have the same rights no matter the acreage they own. Either everyone has free tags or no one has free tags based on ownership. If there is a need for depredation because of an unsustainable population caused by deer or other animals then the landowner can ask for a free permit from Conservation and accomplish the same goal as the current free permits without setting an acreage requirement.	The Department has offered no-cost hunting privileges to resident landowners since the inception of the modern firearms deer hunting season in 1944. The primary rationale for offering these privileges has been that private landowners, as defined in the Wildlife Code, provide space and resources for wildlife. In the early years, it was also hoped that these privileges would serve as an incentive to landowners; if they could hunt on their land for free, perhaps they would also invest in creating wildlife habitat. Over the years, free privileges have been promoted by the Department as a type of landowner recognition for contributions of habitat. The Department has consistently adhered to this rationale over time, although the definition of landowner and privileges offered have changed periodically in response to changing wildlife populations, land ownership patterns, and social considerations. Land use patterns and wildlife populations have changed significantly from those existing when free landowner privileges were established with the intent to impact wildlife like small-game, deer, and turkey, and to recognize the landowners with acreages large enough to impact the habitat needs of deer and turkey. As an example, with respect to deer, a 5-acre threshold is typically not a meaningful acreage requirement for this species and does not reflect their broad habitat needs. A healthy deer density in Missouri equates to about 1 deer for every 20-25 acres. To arrive at the 20-acre requirement, we reached out to the public and received responses from about 14,600 individuals. The average response when asked what size acreage should be required to qualify for landowner permits was 21 acres. As such, we choose 20 acres as the cut-off. In addition to the 20-acre requirement being supported by the public input we received, we feel that the new acreage requirement is also biologically appropriate in terms of deer and turkey habitat needs.
08/23/20	Steve	Pevely	3 CSR 10- 7.434: Deer: Landowner Privileges	Amend this rule	The land owner area for deer should be returned to 5 acres. I own a 9.8 acres in Jefferson county In a fairly urban area that has a higher deer population than 20-40 acre plots I have hunted in central mo. This is an area we desperately need hunters to control the population. Public feedback will not be accurate since the 5-20 acre owners are a small % of the population. Please reconsider.	The Department has offered no-cost hunting privileges to resident landowners since the inception of the modern firearms deer hunting season in 1944. The primary rationale for offering these privileges has been that private landowners, as defined in the Wildlife Code, provide space and resources for wildlife. In the early years, it was also hoped that these privileges would serve as an incentive to landowners; if they could hunt on their land for free, perhaps they would also invest in creating wildlife habitat. Over the years, free privileges have been promoted by the Department as a type of landowner recognition for contributions of habitat. The Department has consistently adhered to this rationale over time, although the definition of landowner and privileges offered have changed periodically in response to changing wildlife populations, land ownership patterns, and social considerations. Land use patterns and wildlife populations have changed significantly from those existing when free landowner privileges were established with the intent to impact wildlife like small-game, deer, and turkey, and to recognize the landowners with acreages large enough to impact the habitat needs of deer and turkey. As an example, with respect to deer, a 5-acre threshold is typically not a meaningful acreage requirement for this species and does not reflect their broad habitat needs. A healthy deer density in Missouri equates to about 1 deer for every 20-25 acres. To arrive at the 20-acre requirement, we reached out to the public and received responses from about 14,600 individuals. The average response when asked what size acreage should be required to qualify for landowner permits was 21 acres. As such, we choose 20 acres as the cut-off. In addition to the 20-acre requirement being supported by the public input we received, we feel that the new acreage requirement is also biologically appropriate in terms of deer and turkey habitat needs.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
08/07/20	Robert James Almendares	unknown (zipcode = Pulaski County)	3 CSR 10- 7.435: Deer: Special Harvest Provisions	Amend this rule	Change the antler point restrictions from a minimum of 4 times to 3 times so that we can take older, mature deer that have bad genetics.	The antler-point restriction (APR) is among our most popular deer hunting regulations, and based on our evaluation of harvest data, the APR is having the desired effect on buck age-structure. In the counties where the APR exists, we have seen an increase in the number of older age-class males, so we are hesitant to make changes to what has been a successful regulation. Although older bucks with fewer than four antler points on a side are protected by the APR, it is not likely that this would affect the genetic potential of the local herd. There is constant mixing of the genetic pool as yearling deer (primarily bucks) disperse many miles across the landscape each year. It is also important to remember that does have an equally significant genetic contribution in terms of influencing the potential of a buck to grow large antlers. And of course, age and nutrition also heavily influence antler growth. As such, it is unlikely in a free-ranging herd to have inferior bucks (in terms of antler quality) suppressing the genetic potential of the local herd. That is not to say that there are not mature deer with less than four points on a side on the landscape because they are protected from the APR, but having those deer in the population is not likely to be a detriment to the quality of the overall herd.
07/01/20	Kyle Lairmore	unknown	3 CSR 10- 7.436: Deer: Managed Hunts	Amend this rule	Managed hunt regulations and hunter education requirement should follow the general hunting regulation. For hunter recruitment efforts, hunter education should be exempt based on age (15 and under) or with an apprentice license, both requiring a mentor who is hunter education certified. Managed hunts could be a recruitment tool if regulations didn't create a barrier to those interested in hunting by requiring a hunter education certification. Regulations need to be consistent and aligned statewide. There also needs to be a easier process for approving mentored hunts on conservation areas.	The Department has reviewed this topic and is in the process of implementing a process to address this concern.
08/10/20	Michael Steward	Marshall	3 CSR 10- 7.438: Deer: Regulations for Department Areas	Amend this rule		Thank you for your suggestion to amend this rule.
07/01/20	Lane Sanazaro	Cuba	3 CSR 10- 7.439: Deer: Chronic Wasting Disease Management Program; Permit Availability, Methods, Limits	Amend this rule	I believe we should be able to have bait stations year round in Crawford county. I agree that you should not be ale to hunt the baited area, but believe you should be able to provide the deer with mineral and proteins they need during the year. Deer are community animals, and I don't believe a bait station would have any impact on spreading CWD. They all share licking branches, watering holes, and natural mineral licks. Also, only 2 miles from my house in Phelps county you CAN have a bait station. What sense does that make? We spend thousands of dollars a year on food plots to maintain the local deer and wildlife heard, so what is a mineral lick or a bag of corn the I paid for, being dumped on the land I OWN, going to hurt?? Just a thought. I hope you take the time to consider my comment and I'm sure many others	Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD) is a deadly illness in white-tailed deer and other members of the deer family, and although it remains relatively rare in Missouri at this time, the Department is working hard to find cases and limit its spread. CWD is transmitted through direct and indirect animal contact, such as contact with an infected animal or contact with soil elements that contain CWD prions. Providing feed, bait, or mineral supplements in the wild increases the likelihood of direct and indirect transmission of CWD. A recent field study in Wisconsin determined that mineral licks can serve as reservoirs for CWD prions and facilitate disease transmission. This regulation is part of a larger strategy (removal of antler-point restrictions, antlerless permit availability, carcass transportation, sampling efforts) to manage and monitor the deer herd in counties that are within 10 miles from the location where a case of CWD has been found. Feeding deer or placing minerals for deer unnaturally concentrates animals and can contribute to the spread of CWD.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
08/18/20	michael rogers	independence	3 CSR 10- 7.440: Migratory Game Birds and Waterfowl: Seasons, Limits	Amend this rule	In regards to opening day of dove season. I have heard the last few decades about the importance/significance of introducing the next generation of hunters to the sport of hunting. I have six grandchildren that I would like for them to enjoy the outdoor experience in the field as I have grown up with. While doing so it is important for them to have a good experience to keep and hold their interest in the sport. One of the best ways I have found is dove hunting with quick and often shooting and not having to be so quiet and still as in turkey and deer hunting. My comment to the MDC to enhance this experience for them is to have the season open up on a Saturday (an off school day and also when the birds have not been hunted by the locals and retirees) when the opportunity for the optimal hunt can be had. Any one who has hunted dove in a particular area knows that with several days hunting migratory birds, dove included that can and will change their flight patterns. There are other states, an example Mississippi has revised their opening dove season date to the first Saturday in September. I would really appreciate MDC looking into and revising the opening day of the season to the first Saturday of September thereby enhancing the opportunity for our next generation of hunters. Thank you	When promulgating regulations, the Department must account for the management of fish and wildlife populations, providing quality hunting opportunities for everyone, and public safety. While the Conservation Commission has not elected to adjust the dove hunting season dates to specifically encourage youth involvement, the Department certainly cares about promoting youth involvement in hunting, fishing and trapping. As evidence, youth are generally not required to obtain any kind of license for fishing, trapping, or hunting small game, and can obtain permits for deer, turkey, and trout at significantly reduced fees. Additionally, the Conservation Commission has promulgated regulations to create special youth-only hunting seasons for deer, turkey, pheasant, quail, and waterfowl to provide quality opportunities for youth to get involved with hunting and fishing.
08/19/20	Maureen	unknown (zipcode = Dent County)	3 CSR 10- 7.440: Migratory Game Birds and Waterfowl: Seasons, Limits	Amend this rule	Hopefully, this rule can be amended to include using an air rifle to harvest doves. I find it odd (but good) that a hunter can harvest a deer/elk with an air rifle (.40 cal or above) but not a dove with say a .22 cal to .35 cal air rifle.	Both state and federal laws prohibit the use of a rifle for hunting migratory birds. The federal migratory bird hunting regulations do not specifically whether a rifle includes those powered by air; however, the <i>Wildlife Code</i> of Missouri defines rifles powered by "spring, air, or gas" as a firearm. While some air-powered rifles are only effective at relatively short distances, others on the market are very powerful, and rival traditional .22 rimfire firearms. The nature of dove hunting is different than deer and elk (fast-flying targets, shooting into the air without a backstop, high numbers of hunters concentrate in close proximity to each other, etc.). Because of this, the safety risks (regardless of whether the projectile is powered by gunpowder or air) of allowing a single-projectile firearm for dove hunting, are much higher than allowing this method for hunting species such as deer and elk.
07/01/20	william kist	unknown	3 CSR 10- 7.441: Crows: Seasons, Methods, Limits	Repeal this rule	No reason to have a season on these birds. Who eats any?	Crow seasons are allowed according to federal regulations (50 CFR Parts 20 and 21). Section 20.133 provides states with the opportunity to set sport-hunting seasons, and Section 21.43 covers depredation situations. Although there is a longstanding tradition of crow hunting in Missouri, less than 10,000 people crow hunt each year. With this few people crowing hunting, it is unlikely this season negatively impacts crow populations. This season provides hunting opportunity and crows can be eaten.
07/01/20	Tyler Speth	Glen Allen	3 CSR 10- 7.450: Furbearers: Hunting Seasons, Methods	Amend this rule	Need a longer coon season getting over populated	The Department plans to evaluate the length of furbearer hunting and trapping opportunities in light of expanding populations and requests from the public.
07/01/20	william kist	unknown	3 CSR 10- 7.450: Furbearers: Hunting Seasons, Methods	Amend this rule	MAKE SURE FIREARMS DEER HUNTERS CANNOT SHOOT YOTES, BOBCATS, ETC.	Firearms deer hunters must follow specific regulations if they intend to harvest a coyote or bobcat during the firearms deer. In order to be eligible to harvest a furbearer, the hunter must hold a permit that would allow the harvest of a furbearer, for example, a Small Game Hunting Permit. During the November and antlerless portions, other wildlife may be hunted only with a shotgun and shot not larger than No. 4 or a .22 or smaller caliber rimfire rifle. If hunting furbearers during daylight hours during firearms deer season, only deer hunting methods may be used and the hunter must possess an unfilled firearms deer hunting permit. Additionally, all bobcat harvested must be reported to the Department.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/01/20	Tyler Fisher	Independence	3 CSR 10- 7.450: Furbearers: Hunting Seasons, Methods	Amend this rule	<p>I would like to see the prohibition of Night vision equipment and artificial lighting eliminated for hunting coyotes. I see this primarily as a safety issue. Most predator hunters prefer low light or night hunting due to the behavior and habits of the species hunted. Under the current regs, this leaves us in a bad situation at times regarding target identification. I can't count how many times I've had to give up on a coyote hunt because I couldn't safely identify my target and beyond. I'm sure there are some out there not as careful as I.</p> <p>I've always heard the justification for prohibition of these methods was to prevent poaching. That doesn't pass the smell test for me. A poacher is a criminal, and by definition, breaks the law....if they want to use NV or lights, then they already are. These regs only restrict the efficacy of law abiding hunters.</p> <p>PLEASE remove this restriction and allow us to hunt and control the population more effectively.</p> <p>Thanks for taking time to consider.</p> <p>Tyler Fisher</p>	<p>The <i>Wildlife Code</i> was recently amended (November 20, 2020) to allow properly licensed hunters to use artificial light, night vision, infrared, or thermal imagery equipment in conjunction with other legal hunting methods to pursue and take coyotes from February 1 through March 31 each year. The change was made in response to citizen requests to use these methods for coyote hunting. It is true that poachers will break the law, regardless of what regulations are in place. However, restrictions and limitations are necessary to give conservation agents the ability to hold poachers accountable, while also offering additional opportunities for law abiding citizens to pursue coyotes.</p>
07/02/20	Bradley Raney	unknown (zipcode = Pike County)	3 CSR 10- 7.450: Furbearers: Hunting Seasons, Methods	Amend this rule	<p>The use of artificial light or night vision should be allowed during the time frame jan 5 (or end of deer season) to the beginning of turkey season with the purchase of a permit.</p>	<p>The <i>Wildlife Code</i> was recently amended (November 20, 2020) to allow properly licensed hunters to use artificial light, night vision, infrared, or thermal imagery equipment in conjunction with other legal hunting methods to pursue and take coyotes from February 1 through March 31 each year. The change was made in response to citizen requests to use these methods for coyote hunting, and no additional permit is required to utilize these methods to pursue and take coyotes during this time period.</p>
07/12/20	Tom macomber	Lathrop	3 CSR 10- 7.450: Furbearers: Hunting Seasons, Methods	Amend this rule	<p>C 10-7.410 please give us the permission to hunt coyote/preditors, with the aid of nite vision or thermal scopes. My turkey are not doing well nor are my quail or phesant.</p>	<p>The <i>Wildlife Code</i> was recently amended (November 20, 2020) to allow properly licensed hunters to use artificial light, night vision, infrared, or thermal imagery equipment in conjunction with other legal hunting methods to pursue and take coyotes from February 1 through March 31 each year. The change was made in response to citizen requests to use these methods for coyote hunting.</p>
07/13/20	adam brandes	prairie home	3 CSR 10- 7.450: Furbearers: Hunting Seasons, Methods	Amend this rule	<p>Hunters should be authorized to hunt coyote with the use of thermal/night vision optics year round and without special permits or authorization. Several states in the U.S. allow one or the other, and sometimes both. Coyote populations are at an all time high and need to be brought back down, and the legal use of these specialty optics will significantly increase the ability to control these numbers.</p>	<p>The <i>Wildlife Code</i> was recently amended (November 20, 2020) to allow properly licensed hunters to use artificial light, night vision, infrared, or thermal imagery equipment in conjunction with other legal hunting methods to pursue and take coyotes from February 1 through March 31 each year. The change was made in response to citizen requests to use these methods for coyote hunting.</p>

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/15/20	Michael Storie	Marble Hill	3 CSR 10- 7.450: Furbearers: Hunting Seasons, Methods	Repeal this rule	I as a resident of Missouri, hunt raccoons with coon hounds as do many of my friends. I run and train them during the off season and hunt raccons with them during the open furbearer season. I believe that the furbearers seaso start date needs to earlier than November 14th and also the season needs to be lengthened. I do not like the fact that furbearer season opens the second night of the November rifle deer season and runs through out the entire November rifle season. I do not like running my hound dogs during this time due to all the non-local hunters, the poachers, and the ethical hunters themselves. It can or could produce uneasy situations or circumstances if a dog were to get lost, picked up, shot, or shot at. I myself hunt raccoons on several areas of conservation land because I do not own my own property. So therefore I am limited to public land. I believe the season also needs to be lengthened because of the portion of furbearers season that is open during November rifle season. With the two season being opened at the same time it makes us houndsman who run dogs during the first 10 days of the season uneasy, and for those who don't hunt those first 10 days of the season it makes our season even shorter. Would you all please consider opening the furbearer season on November 1st and run through Febuary 28th? If you can not extend it through February could you at least please open furbearer season on November 1st? Thank you for giving me the oprotunity to speak my opinion and thank you for taking the time to understand and consider this all.	The Department plans to evaluate the length of furbearer hunting and trapping opportunities in light of expanding populations and requests from the public.
08/06/20	Lawrence Hinnen	Dawn	3 CSR 10- 7.450: Furbearers: Hunting Seasons, Methods	Amend this rule	I would like to see the racoon season extended for running dogs. The current season is during several firearms deer seasons making it difficult to find land to hunt without upsetting other hunters and late season the weather is usually rough leaving about 30 days of decent hunting. Several states have a daily bag limit starting earlier in the year around September and a full season similar to the Missouri season. In north Missouri the population is high causing an over abundance of crop, live stock and property damage. The racoons killed 25 of my mother-in-laws chickens in 2 months destroyin their chicken coop to get to them. I believe the current regulations could be evaluated and compared to other states with a well regulated population.	The Department plans to evaluate the length of furbearer hunting and trapping opportunities in light of expanding populations and requests from the public.
08/11/20	Jay Williams	GREENVILLE	3 CSR 10- 7.450: Furbearers: Hunting Seasons, Methods	Amend this rule	Amend rule to allow harvest of one raccoon per night from February 01 thru November 15.	The Department plans to evaluate the length of furbearer hunting and trapping opportunities in light of expanding populations and requests from the public.
07/01/20	william kist	unknown	3 CSR 10- 7.455: Turkeys: Seasons, Methods, Limits	Amend this rule	Start the season on a Saturday so people that work can have the same chance as those whom can hunt on the opening Monday. Be fair. Any proof that hunting accidents will increase by doing this?	Missouri's regular spring turkey hunting season has always opened on a weekday to reduce the amount of hunting pressure on opening day. This reduced hunting pressure on opening day is important for maintaining low hunter interference rates, and improving hunter safety, especially on public lands. Interference from other hunters can greatly reduce the quality of the turkey hunting experience. Our regular spring turkey hunting season structure—opening the season on a weekday and only being able to fill one tag during the first week—is designed to distribute hunting pressure across the season, which is key to providing a quality spring turkey hunting experience in Missouri.

**Periodic Review Comments
July 1 - August 31, 2020**

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/01/20	Kyle Rhodes	unknown (zipcode = Cass County)	3 CSR 10- 7.455: Turkeys: Seasons, Methods, Limits	Amend this rule	Make the hunting hours from dusk til dawn Allow 2 birds to be harvested on the same day.	The Department strives to provide the most hunting opportunity possible while also ensuring that harvest rates are sustainable given turkey population trends. Extending hunting hours from sunrise to sunset is something we are continuing to evaluate, though no decision has been made at this time. Additionally, our regular spring turkey hunting season structure is designed to distribute hunting pressure and harvest across the season. Several aspects of the season structure, such as opening the season on a week day, only allowing one tag to be filled during the first week of the season, and only allowing one tag to be filled per day during the last 2 weeks of the season, are key to spreading out hunting pressure and harvest. Spreading out hunting pressure is important for maintaining low hunter interference rates, especially on public lands, as interference from other hunters can greatly reduce the quality of the spring turkey hunting experience.
07/01/20	DAVID	unknown	3 CSR 10- 7.455: Turkeys: Seasons, Methods, Limits	Amend this rule	Make the wild Turkey hen protected. A hen killed in fall has a 0% chance to have a successful hatch. I get the fall numbers are not high and natural death would still occur, but hunting hens is great for population control. Let's not end up like Arkansas or have a drop like Kansas	The Department evaluates the turkey hunting regulations each year to ensure harvest is sustainable given current turkey population trends. The declining turkey population appears to be driven by poor production rather than overharvest during the hunting seasons. Recently concluded research in Missouri shows that our harvest rates—during both the spring and fall turkey seasons—are low, relative to harvest rates observed in the 1980s and 1990s, and these rates are sustainable given the status of the turkey population. Using recently collected information on turkey survival and reproduction in Missouri, we were able to estimate how the turkey population would respond to more conservative hunting regulations, including reduced bag limits or if we closed the fall season entirely. What we found is that even if we closed the fall season entirely, which was the most conservative scenario and would essentially eliminate legal harvest of hens, the turkey population would not substantially increase in abundance and would continue to decline in some parts of the state. Therefore, more conservative regulations would contribute to fewer hunting opportunities without having the desired effect on turkey abundance.
07/01/20	David	Saint Clair	3 CSR 10- 7.455: Turkeys: Seasons, Methods, Limits	Amend this rule	Make the wild Turkey hen protected. A hen killed in fall has a 0% chance to have a successful hatch. I get the fall numbers are not high and natural death would still occur, but hunting hens is great for population control. Let's not end up like Arkansas or have a drop like Kansas	The Department evaluates the turkey hunting regulations each year to ensure harvest is sustainable given current turkey population trends. The declining turkey population appears to be driven by poor production rather than overharvest during the hunting seasons. Recently concluded research in Missouri shows that our harvest rates—during both the spring and fall turkey seasons—are low, relative to harvest rates observed in the 1980s and 1990s, and these rates are sustainable given the status of the turkey population. Using recently collected information on turkey survival and reproduction in Missouri, we were able to estimate how the turkey population would respond to more conservative hunting regulations, including reduced bag limits or if we closed the fall season entirely. What we found is that even if we closed the fall season entirely, which was the most conservative scenario and would essentially eliminate legal harvest of hens, the turkey population would not substantially increase in abundance and would continue to decline in some parts of the state. Therefore, more conservative regulations would contribute to fewer hunting opportunities without having the desired effect on turkey abundance.
07/01/20	Russell Lane	Jackson	3 CSR 10- 7.455: Turkeys: Seasons, Methods, Limits	Amend this rule	I think fall turkey season should be closed to help get the numbers up. We should not be killing hens. I would be ok for bow hunting of turkey remain the same. Killing hens is wrong and we all love spring turkey season and that would allow more birds the next spring	The Department evaluates the turkey hunting regulations each year to ensure harvest is sustainable given current turkey population trends. The declining turkey population appears to be driven by poor production rather than overharvest during the hunting seasons. Recently concluded research in Missouri shows that our harvest rates—during both the spring and fall turkey seasons—are low, relative to harvest rates observed in the 1980s and 1990s, and these rates are sustainable given the status of the turkey population. Using recently collected information on turkey survival and reproduction in Missouri, we were able to estimate how the turkey population would respond to more conservative hunting regulations, including reduced bag limits or if we closed the fall season entirely. What we found is that even if we closed the fall season entirely, which was the most conservative scenario and would essentially eliminate legal harvest of hens, the turkey population would not substantially increase in abundance and would continue to decline in some parts of the state. Therefore, more conservative regulations would contribute to fewer hunting opportunities without having the desired effect on turkey abundance.

**Periodic Review Comments
July 1 - August 31, 2020**

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/01/20	Russell Lane	Jackson	3 CSR 10- 7.455: Turkeys: Seasons, Methods, Limits	Amend this rule	I think fall turkey season should be closed to help get the numbers up. We should not be killing hens. I would be ok for bow hunting of turkey remain the same. Killing hens is wrong and we all love spring turkey season and that would allow more birds the next spring	The Department evaluates the turkey hunting regulations each year to ensure harvest is sustainable given current turkey population trends. The declining turkey population appears to be driven by poor production rather than overharvest during the hunting seasons. Recently concluded research in Missouri shows that our harvest rates—during both the spring and fall turkey seasons—are low, relative to harvest rates observed in the 1980s and 1990s, and these rates are sustainable given the status of the turkey population. Using recently collected information on turkey survival and reproduction in Missouri, we were able to estimate how the turkey population would respond to more conservative hunting regulations, including reduced bag limits or if we closed the fall season entirely. What we found is that even if we closed the fall season entirely, which was the most conservative scenario and would essentially eliminate legal harvest of hens, the turkey population would not substantially increase in abundance and would continue to decline in some parts of the state. Therefore, more conservative regulations would contribute to fewer hunting opportunities without having the desired effect on turkey abundance.
07/01/20	Russell Lane	Jackson	3 CSR 10- 7.455: Turkeys: Seasons, Methods, Limits	Amend this rule	I think fall turkey season should be closed to help get the numbers up. We should not be killing hens. I would be ok for bow hunting of turkey remain the same. Killing hens is wrong and we all love spring turkey season and that would allow more birds the next spring	The Department evaluates the turkey hunting regulations each year to ensure harvest is sustainable given current turkey population trends. The declining turkey population appears to be driven by poor production rather than overharvest during the hunting seasons. Recently concluded research in Missouri shows that our harvest rates—during both the spring and fall turkey seasons—are low, relative to harvest rates observed in the 1980s and 1990s, and these rates are sustainable given the status of the turkey population. Using recently collected information on turkey survival and reproduction in Missouri, we were able to estimate how the turkey population would respond to more conservative hunting regulations, including reduced bag limits or if we closed the fall season entirely. What we found is that even if we closed the fall season entirely, which was the most conservative scenario and would essentially eliminate legal harvest of hens, the turkey population would not substantially increase in abundance and would continue to decline in some parts of the state. Therefore, more conservative regulations would contribute to fewer hunting opportunities without having the desired effect on turkey abundance.
07/02/20	Tim Clements	unknown	3 CSR 10- 7.455: Turkeys: Seasons, Methods, Limits	Amend this rule	Reduce the spring season to two weeks and reduce the limit to one gobbler. Eliminate fall firearms turkey season as well as archery until the turkey flock begins to rebound from bad hatches.	The Department evaluates the turkey hunting regulations each year to ensure harvest is sustainable given current turkey population trends. The declining turkey population appears to be driven by poor production rather than overharvest during the hunting seasons. Recently concluded research in Missouri shows that our harvest rates—during both the spring and fall turkey seasons—are low, relative to harvest rates observed in the 1980s and 1990s, and these rates are sustainable given the status of the turkey population. Using recently collected information on turkey survival and reproduction in Missouri, we were able to estimate how the turkey population would respond to more conservative hunting regulations, including reduced bag limits or if we closed the fall season entirely. What we found is that even if we closed the fall season entirely, which was the most conservative scenario and would essentially eliminate legal harvest of hens, the turkey population would not substantially increase in abundance and would continue to decline in some parts of the state. Therefore, more conservative regulations would contribute to fewer hunting opportunities without having the desired effect on turkey abundance.
07/02/20	Mitch Milleville	unknown	3 CSR 10- 7.455: Turkeys: Seasons, Methods, Limits	Amend this rule	Remove the requirement to stop at 1pm, at least on private ground. If the goal is to get more people into hunting this rule doesn't make much sense. Most other states with poorer turkey populations don't have this regulation.	The Department strives to provide the most hunting opportunity possible while also ensuring that harvest rates are sustainable given turkey population trends. Extending hunting hours from sunrise to sunset is something we are continuing to evaluate, though no decision has been made at this time.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/04/20	Allen Barnett	KEARNEY	3 CSR 10- 7.455: Turkeys: Seasons, Methods, Limits	Amend this rule	Do away with the 1 turkey a week in the 1st week and then only 1 turkey a day in weeks 2 and 3. Allow both birds to be taken on the same day in any week. The 2 turkey limit is fine. What I see on my farm is that seasons are so different that some times I never see any turkeys in the last week(s) or none in the 1st week(s). I have no thoughts about the stopping at 1 PM even though other state allow it.	The regular spring turkey hunting season structure is designed to distribute hunting pressure and harvest across the season. Several aspects of the season structure, such as opening the season on a week day, only allowing one tag to be filled during the first week of the season, and only allowing one tag to be filled per day during the last 2 weeks of the season, are key to spreading out hunting pressure and harvest. Spreading out hunting pressure is important for maintaining low hunter interference rates, especially on public lands, as interference from other hunters can greatly reduce the quality of the spring turkey hunting experience. Additionally, our spring season is timed to begin around the average peak of incubation. Opening the season any earlier would create additional breeding and nesting disturbance, and illegal hen mortality. Once hens have begun incubating, they are less likely to come to a hunter's call or abandon their nest. Even during early springs, when vegetation leafs out earlier than average, the timing of wild turkey nesting does not vary noticeably. Nesting is more dependent on the length of daylight hours than the timing of spring green-up. Therefore, opening the spring turkey season earlier may negatively impact nesting activity throughout the state. Since turkey production has been on a long-term declining trend, and has been particularly poor in recent years, we would not want to alter the regulations in a way that would negatively affect production even further.
07/09/20	Randy Martin	RUTLEDGE	3 CSR 10- 7.455: Turkeys: Seasons, Methods, Limits	Amend this rule	Leave season open till one-half hour past sunset and open two days earlier on Saturday instead of Monday. Thanks for your time.	The Department strives to provide the most hunting opportunity possible while also ensuring that our harvest rates are sustainable given turkey population trends. Extending hunting hours from sunrise to sunset is something we are continuing to evaluate, though no decision has been made at this time. Additionally, Missouri's regular spring turkey hunting season has always opened on a weekday to reduce the amount of hunting pressure on opening day. This reduced hunting pressure on opening day is important for maintaining low hunter interference rates, especially on public lands. Interference from other hunters can greatly reduce the quality of the turkey hunting experience. Our regular spring turkey hunting season structure—opening the season on a weekday and only being able to fill one tag during the first week—is designed to distribute hunting pressure across the season, which is key to providing a quality spring turkey hunting experience here in Missouri.
07/10/20	Jeff Craig	Liberty	3 CSR 10- 7.455: Turkeys: Seasons, Methods, Limits	Amend this rule	Please allow turkey hunting to take place all day in the spring. This is supported by over 50% of turkey hunters and has been for decades. There is NO biological or population reason to limit hunting to 1pm.	The Department strives to provide the most hunting opportunity possible while also ensuring that harvest rates are sustainable given turkey population trends. Extending hunting hours from sunrise to sunset is something we are continuing to evaluate, though no decision has been made at this time.
08/07/20	Mark Kendall	Ellisville	3 CSR 10- 7.455: Turkeys: Seasons, Methods, Limits	Amend this rule	Shorten the seasons and bag limit until our numbers improve. Out of state hunters should be limited to 1 turkey and their permit prices should be increased to reflect how MO residents are treated if they hunt elsewhere.	The Department evaluates the turkey hunting regulations each year to ensure harvest is sustainable given current turkey population trends. The declining turkey population appears to be driven by poor production rather than overharvest during the hunting seasons. Recently concluded research in Missouri shows that our harvest rates—during both the spring and fall turkey seasons—are low, relative to harvest rates observed in the 1980s and 1990s, and these rates are sustainable given the status of the turkey population. Additionally, fewer than 5% of hunters each spring fill both of their turkey tags. This means that the number of turkeys harvested on a 2nd tag accounts for a very small proportion of the overall spring turkey harvest. If the spring bag limit was lowered to one bird, it would not have an appreciable effect on overall turkey abundance.
08/07/20	Mark Kendall	Ellisville	3 CSR 10- 7.455: Turkeys: Seasons, Methods, Limits	Amend this rule	Shorten the seasons and bag limit until our numbers improve. Out of state hunters should be limited to 1 turkey and their permit prices should be increased to reflect how MO residents are treated if they hunt elsewhere.	The Department evaluates the turkey hunting regulations each year to ensure harvest is sustainable given current turkey population trends. The declining turkey population appears to be driven by poor production rather than overharvest during the hunting seasons. Recently concluded research in Missouri shows that our harvest rates—during both the spring and fall turkey seasons—are low, relative to harvest rates observed in the 1980s and 1990s, and these rates are sustainable given the status of the turkey population. Additionally, fewer than 5% of hunters each spring fill both of their turkey tags. This means that the number of turkeys harvested on a 2nd tag accounts for a very small proportion of the overall spring turkey harvest. If the spring bag limit was lowered to one bird, it would not have an appreciable effect on overall turkey abundance.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
08/21/20	Daniel J Witter	Holts Summit	3 CSR 10- 7.455: Turkeys: Seasons, Methods, Limits	Amend this rule	<p>The effects of this rule--in addition to the optics of this rule--need to be given serious consideration, given the apparent wide regional variations in turkey populations--perhaps variations within micro-habitats, such as Callaway County. I've witnessed plummeting numbers of turkeys over the last 6 years in Callaway. I grant reproduction may vary across the county, but dramatic weather events--especially consistently wet, cool springs during nesting--have pounded the local populations (confirmed by data I submit in my turkey brood survey). And our local reality is made even more painful by the optics of a 31-day fall season--and yes, I know the standard (frankly tired) explanation is that hunter participation is low and harvest presumably does not affect populations--but the optics are progressively dismal spring seasons, with few gobblers--and then this 31-day fall season where (especially in the era of Covid and so many hunters getting afield all day, every day) a hunter can shoot 2 long-beards in the same instant. A reverse rationale for greatly reducing the length of the fall season is that so few hunters participate, why make special provision for these few participants--with that hope that the few birds we have will have one less threat of making it through to the premiere spring season. As for the spring season, why 3 weeks? This year, 2 unemployed (COVID) young men adjoining my property hunted virtually every day of the spring season (by they way, with serious safety implications that presented a new situation) until they limited out, taking 4 gobblers from our ridges that had very few birds to begin with. Reduce this season to 2 weeks, and consider the option of returning to a 1 bird limit until populations can rebound (if they ever do). The standard explanations offered by MDC and NWTf as to why Missouri should continue to have extraordinarily liberal seasons (at least compared to other Midwestern states) have grown thin, hackneyed, and frustrating. Come spring turkey hunting with me, and I'll show you the diminishing quality of our traditionally extraordinary turkey experience first-hand. Thank you for your consideration. Dan Witter.</p>	<p>The Department evaluates the turkey hunting regulations each year to ensure harvest is sustainable given current turkey population trends. The declining turkey population appears to be driven by poor production rather than overharvest during the hunting seasons. Recently concluded research in Missouri shows that our harvest rates--during both the spring and fall turkey seasons--are low, relative to turkey rates observed in the 1980s and 1990s, and these rates are sustainable given the status of the turkey population. Additionally, fewer than 5% of hunters each spring fill both of their turkey tags. This means that the number of turkeys harvested on a 2nd tag accounts for a very small proportion of the overall spring turkey harvest. If we lowered the spring bag limit to one bird, it would not have an appreciable effect on overall turkey abundance. Additionally, using recently collected information on turkey survival and reproduction in Missouri, we were able to estimate how the turkey population would respond to more conservative hunting regulations, including reduced bag limits or if we closed the fall season entirely. What we found is that even if we closed the fall season entirely, which was the most conservative scenario and would essentially eliminate legal harvest of hens, the turkey population would not substantially increase in abundance and would continue to decline in some parts of the state. Therefore, more conservative regulations would contribute to fewer hunting opportunities without having the desired effect on turkey abundance. There are several factors potentially contributing to the poor production observed in recent years, including weather, predators, and habitat. Improving nesting & brood-rearing habitat is probably the best way a landowner can help the turkey population.</p>
07/01/20	Michael Chrane	Lathrop	3 CSR 10- 8.510: Use of Traps	Amend this rule	<p>I am requesting the rule regarding foot-hold traps to be changed from 6" outside spread to 6 1/2" outside spread. This increase of 1/2" will allow trappers greater variety of traps from manufacturers. It will also give trappers a very slight advantage of catching the animal. Many trap manufacturers have 5.5" or 6.5" traps leaving Missouri trappers with a 1/2" disadvantage if they choose to use those traps. This increase will also help trap dealers in selling slightly larger traps, often at a greater profit. This means the tax revenue will also help the Conservation Department.</p>	<p>Foot-hold traps of any size with smooth or rubber jaws may be used under the current trapping regulations. The six inch (6") restriction contained in 3 CSR 10-8.510(1) only applies to the openings for colony traps, and not to the jaw spread of foot-hold traps.</p>

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/01/20	Gus Wehmeier	Center	3 CSR 10- 8.515: Furbearers: Trapping Seasons	Amend this rule	Expand trapping season to include fawning and nesting seasons for deer, turkey, quail, etc. Fur prices are dirt cheap so people aren't doing it like they used to. Research by several biologists (including a study by Charles Ruth in South Carolina and many others) show that trapping during fawning/nesting season have an impact on fawn recruitment and poult survival.	The Department plans to evaluate the length of furbearer hunting and trapping opportunities in light of expanding populations and requests from the public. Trapping season dates will continue to take into account furbearer populations, opportunity, pelt primeness, and the desires of various groups. Although predators influence prey populations, the degree to which that happens is often variable and depends on the species in question and local conditions. In addition, there are a variety of other factors that can influence both deer and turkey populations at the local level including habitat quality, habitat availability, and weather. Although it may appear that reducing predator populations may have a direct effect on turkey or deer populations, this may not always be the case, or the level to which predator numbers would need to be reduced may be impractical, unattainable, or for many Missourians, undesirable. For that reason, the Department encourages landowners to maintain high quality habitat for the benefit of turkey and deer and utilize the current hunting and trapping season framework if there is a desire to reduce predator numbers. That being said, the Department will also take into account the concerns for other wildlife populations when evaluating furbearer trapping and hunting seasons.
07/01/20	Robert McNulty	Lebanon	3 CSR 10- 8.515: Furbearers: Trapping Seasons	Amend this rule	I would like to see the trapping season changed to November 1 through March 31 for all fur bearers.	The Department plans to evaluate the length of furbearer hunting and trapping opportunities in light of expanding populations and requests from the public. Trapping season dates will continue to take into account furbearer populations, opportunity, pelt primeness, and the desires of various groups. Although predators influence prey populations, the degree to which that happens is often variable and depends on the species in question and local conditions. In addition, there are a variety of other factors that can influence both deer and turkey populations at the local level including habitat quality, habitat availability, and weather. Although it may appear that reducing predator populations may have a direct effect on turkey or deer populations, this may not always be the case, or the level to which predator numbers would need to be reduced may be impractical, unattainable, or for many Missourians, undesirable. For that reason, the Department encourages landowners to maintain high quality habitat for the benefit of turkey and deer and utilize the current hunting and trapping season framework if there is a desire to reduce predator numbers. That being said, the Department will also take into account the concerns for other wildlife populations when evaluating furbearer trapping and hunting seasons.
07/01/20	DAVID R CHURCH	ST CLAIR	3 CSR 10- 8.515: Furbearers: Trapping Seasons	Amend this rule	With deer season going to January 15th I don't like trapping until after. Deer and human activity dont work. Need to extend trapping season longer to give land owners more opportunities after deer season is over. I would also love to see allowing trapping during nesting and fawning season. Give the turkeys more of a chance..	The Department plans to evaluate the length of furbearer hunting and trapping opportunities in light of expanding populations and requests from the public. Trapping season dates will continue to take into account furbearer populations, opportunity, pelt primeness, and the desires of various groups. Although predators influence prey populations, the degree to which that happens is often variable and depends on the species in question and local conditions. In addition, there are a variety of other factors that can influence both deer and turkey populations at the local level including habitat quality, habitat availability, and weather. Although it may appear that reducing predator populations may have a direct effect on turkey or deer populations, this may not always be the case, or the level to which predator numbers would need to be reduced may be impractical, unattainable, or for many Missourians, undesirable. For that reason, the Department encourages landowners to maintain high quality habitat for the benefit of turkey and deer and utilize the current hunting and trapping season framework if there is a desire to reduce predator numbers. That being said, the Department will also take into account the concerns for other wildlife populations when evaluating furbearer trapping and hunting seasons.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/10/20	Todd Henry	HUNTSVILLE	3 CSR 10- 8.515: Furbearers: Trapping Seasons	Amend this rule	I would like to see a longer furbearer season for species that are becoming too numerous and out of balance due to low fur prices. This would allow more time for landowners and land managers to control over population issues on their properties. Raccoons and opossums being examples of nest predators protected by furbearer seasons that are likely to be reducing productivity of ground nesting birds like quail and turkeys .	The Department plans to evaluate the length of furbearer hunting and trapping opportunities in light of expanding populations and requests from the public. Trapping season dates will continue to take into account furbearer populations, opportunity, pelt primeness, and the desires of various groups. Although predators influence prey populations, the degree to which that happens is often variable and depends on the species in question and local conditions. In addition, there are a variety of other factors that can influence both deer and turkey populations at the local level including habitat quality, habitat availability, and weather. Although it may appear that reducing predator populations may have a direct effect on turkey or deer populations, this may not always be the case, or the level to which predator numbers would need to be reduced may be impractical, unattainable, or for many Missourians, undesirable. For that reason, the Department encourages landowners to maintain high quality habitat for the benefit of turkey and deer and utilize the current hunting and trapping season framework if there is a desire to reduce predator numbers. That being said, the Department will also take into account the concerns for other wildlife populations when evaluating furbearer trapping and hunting seasons.
07/10/20	Bob McGeorge	St Charles	3 CSR 10- 8.515: Furbearers: Trapping Seasons	Leave this rule intact	NA	Thank you for your support of this rule.
07/24/20	John Burk	Steedman	3 CSR 10- 8.515: Furbearers: Trapping Seasons	Amend this rule	Otter and muskrat season ought to run concurrently until the end of March like beaver. You cannot avoid capturing muskrats and otters when trapping beaver and the majority of the trapping methods used to capture beaver are lethal. Therefore, it makes NO sense to put the trapper in a position where they either commit want and waste or lie about when the capture occurred. In most cases, folks that are trapping for beaver, otter, and muskrats, today are doing so as animal damage control where local extirpation is the goal. Therefore, the biological justification for having the season dates where they currently are is also not a valid justification for maintaining them. We're not trying to manage a local population we ARE trying to eliminate it. If fur prices go back up followed by participation and harvest rates we can go back to a more conservative season structure. Right now there is NO valid reason to restrict this opportunity.	The Department plans to evaluate the length of furbearer hunting and trapping opportunities in light of expanding populations and requests from the public. Trapping season dates will continue to take into account furbearer populations, opportunity, pelt primeness, and the desires of various groups.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/24/20	Steve Remspecher	Ballwin	3 CSR 10- 8.515: Furbearers: Trapping Seasons	Amend this rule	<p>As a hunter, conservationist and CRP land owner, I would like to suggest the following. Extend the trapping season for raccoons and possum to year around on private land. I continue to read articles on wildlife populations and how they are declining. Although there are many factors that can impact quail, pheasant, turkey and other ground nesting birds, the fall back position to solve the problem is habitat according to the wildlife Biologist. They will mention wet springs for turkeys, the lack of habitat and predators as all having some type of impact of the survival of these birds. We can't control the weather, but we can improve habitat (CRP) and trap predators in the fall. Trapping in the fall does reduce the predator population, but by the time nesting season starts all of my neighbors predators have moved into my food rich property. Trapping is very time consuming, so the average private landowner will not participate in a year long season, but for those willing to put in the effort, why not make it an option? I would be willing to purchase an extended season license, which could generate additional revenue for the MDC. I fail to see the risk in taken this approach, since fur trapping continues to decline and isolated private land trapping would have very little impact on the overall populations of these nest predators. There are States in the country that allow trapping year around, so why not give it a chance in Missouri.</p>	<p>The Department plans to evaluate the length of furbearer hunting and trapping opportunities in light of expanding populations and requests from the public. Trapping season dates will continue to take into account furbearer populations, opportunity, pelt primeness, and the desires of various groups. Although predators influence prey populations, the degree to which that happens is often variable and depends on the species in question and local conditions. In addition, there are a variety of other factors that can influence both deer and turkey populations at the local level including habitat quality, habitat availability, and weather. Although it may appear that reducing predator populations may have a direct effect on turkey or deer populations, this may not always be the case, or the level to which predator numbers would need to be reduced may be impractical, unattainable, or for many Missourians, undesirable. For that reason, the Department encourages landowners to maintain high quality habitat for the benefit of turkey and deer and utilize the current hunting and trapping season framework if there is a desire to reduce predator numbers. That being said, the Department will also take into account the concerns for other wildlife populations when evaluating furbearer trapping and hunting seasons.</p>
07/29/20	Wayne Cunninghamham	NORBORNE	3 CSR 10- 8.515: Furbearers: Trapping Seasons	Amend this rule	<p>Recent years have seen huge increases in racoon populations, as well as other mesomammal populations along with the loss of a market for the fur. In light of this, there is simply no scientific or economic reasons for the current seasons. Coyotes and groundhogs have very unrestrictive seasons, and yet don't cause near the problems or damage racoons do. Under the current regulations racoon numbers are very difficult to control, and as a result people are killing them out of season constantly, oftentimes resorting to such tactics like fly bait that everyone has heard about. Bottomline is, people shouldn't have to constantly ask for permission, in order to be legal, to control racoon numbers to reduce damage and nuisance activities. Frankly, under current conditions there is really no reason for a season at all, other than not allowing them to be taken when they're having young. At a bare minimum, there is no reason to not allow trapping through february. Certainly, if the market was ever to return regulations might need to be revisited, but until that actually happens there is simply no justification for the current regulations.</p>	<p>The Department plans to evaluate the length of furbearer hunting and trapping opportunities in light of expanding populations and requests from the public. Trapping season dates will continue to take into account furbearer populations, opportunity, pelt primeness, and the desires of various groups. The <i>Wildlife Code</i> contains a provision (3 CSR 10-4.130) that allows property owners, or their authorized representative, to kill or trap raccoons or other furbearers that are causing property damage. No prior approval or permission is required to address property damage by these animals.</p>

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/27/20	Terry j Amschler	Silex	3 CSR 10- 9.560: Licensed Hunting Preserve Permit	Amend this rule	<p>(A) Game Bird Hunting Preserve. 1. A game bird hunting preserve shall be a single body of land not less than one hundred sixty (160) acres and no more than six hundred forty (640) acres in size. I have 5 Dog Training Area Permits that allow me 1 trainer and 2 shooters per permit. I have 74 acres and control my training to 20 acres of that property. The Licensed Hunting Preserve Permit would allow me nearly the same dog training privileges with the flexibility of adding trainers or shooters at any time. The Dog Training Area Permit forces me to confine training to 40 acres while the Licensed Hunting Preserve Permit requires a minimum 160 acres. The 160 acre minimum should be reduced to match the requirements for Dog Training Area Permits.</p>	<p>As the permit names imply, the Game Bird Hunting Preserve Permit and the Dog Training Area Permit were created for different purposes. The Game Bird Hunting Preserve Permit provides the opportunity to conduct/sell hunts to the public for captive reared game birds, while the purpose of the Dog Training Area Permit is to provide an opportunity for individual hunters, or persons engaged in the business of training hunting dogs, to train their dogs with live captive reared game birds throughout the year. Consequently, the acreage requirements, permitting of shooters or hunters, and privileges are designed to correspond to the intended purpose of the permit.</p>
07/25/20	Terry j Amschler	Silex	3 CSR 10- 9.627: Dog Training Area Permit	Amend this rule	<p>10-9.627 To operate a dog training area, and to purchase, hold, release and shoot on the training area only legally obtained and captive-reared: pheasants, exotic partridges, quail, and mallard ducks. 10-9.628 (4) All shooters shall possess the prescribed hunting permit. 10-5.205 Any person who chases, pursues, takes, transports, ships, buys, sells, possesses, or uses wildlife in any manner must first obtain the prescribed hunting, fishing, trapping, or other permit. 10-5.345 To chase, pursue, take, possess, and transport birds (except wild turkey), mammals (except deer and elk) and frogs, and to sell furbearers taken by hunting.</p> <p>Under 10-9.628, a dog training permit, you require all shooters of captive reared birds to have an additional permit for wild birds.</p> <p>I would argue that captive reared birds are not wildlife and when shooting birds under the dog training permit you are not taking them by hunting. Under 10-5.205, permits are required for wildlife. Under 10-5.345, the permit is for birds taken by hunting. A shooter under 10-9.628, is not shooting wildlife and they are not hunting.</p> <p>You are requiring a small game permit, that has seasons and limits, to shoot captive reared birds year round without limits. How would someone buy a daily small game permit between March 3 and May 23? While I am training from March thru May there is not active small game season and I have non-resident shooters that would like to buy daily small game permits.</p>	<p>Article IV Section 40(a) of the Missouri Constitution explicitly grants authority to the Conservation Commission for the “control”, “management”, “conservation”, “regulation”, and “the administration of all laws pertaining thereto” for the bird, fish, game, forestry, and wildlife resources of the state...” The Missouri Supreme Court has held that this regulatory authority extends to both free-ranging wildlife and wildlife held in confinement (<i>Hill v. Missouri Department of Conservation</i>, 550 S.W.3d 463 (Mo. banc. 2018)). In its decision, the court also held that whether an animal is classified as “game” or “wildlife” is determined on a species-by-species basis and not an animal-by-animal basis. In short, a bobwhite quail, regardless of whether it is free-ranging or captive-reared, is still “game” or “wildlife”, and subject to the regulations contained in the <i>Wildlife Code</i>. Additionally, the definition of “take” in the <i>Wildlife Code</i> (3 CSR 10-20.805) includes the killing, pursuing, or capturing of wildlife in any manner. Captive reared birds used on dog training areas are wildlife and shooters are “taking” game birds on dog training areas. The privileges of a small game hunting permit are not limited to the take of birds from the wild, but also extend to the take of birds on dog training areas or game bird hunting preserves. Small game hunting permits are available for purchase throughout the year online or at any permit vendor, regardless of whether the statewide quail or pheasant hunting seasons are open.</p>

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/27/20	Terry j Amschler	Silex	3 CSR 10- 9.627: Dog Training Area Permit	Amend this rule	<p>All shooters shall possess the prescribed hunting permit. 10-5.345 To chase, pursue, take, possess, and transport birds (except wild turkey), mammals (except deer and elk), and frogs, and to sell furbearers taken by hunting. 10-5.205 (1) Any person who chases, pursues, takes, transports, ships, buys, sells, possesses, or uses wildlife in any manner must first obtain the prescribed hunting, fishing, trapping, or other permit.</p>	<p>The definition of “take” in the <i>Wildlife Code</i> (3 CSR 10-20.805) includes the killing, pursuing, or capturing of wildlife in any manner. Captive reared birds used on dog training areas are wildlife, and shooters are “taking” game birds on dog training areas. The privileges of a small game hunting permit are not limited to the take of birds from the wild, but also extent to the take of birds on dog training areas or game bird shooting preserves. Small game hunting permits are available for purchase throughout the year online or at any permit vendor, regardless of whether the statewide quail or pheasant hunting seasons are open.</p>
07/21/20	John Henderson	Elsberry	3 CSR 10-11.105: Title; Authority	Repeal this rule	<p>There is a rule that game/trail cameras may not be used on conservation areas. I would very much like to see this rule repealed. This is a very effective method of wildlife & nature photography. It's amazing what you can see and learn. It's an activity of it's own. It in no way damages the environment or wildlife. I feel that this rule serves no useful purpose.</p> <p>This site needs work – it's difficult to use. As a mater of fact, I had to dig deep to find the rule against cameras. Had I not heard that it might be prohibited elsewhere I would not have looked for it.</p>	<p>It is true that cameras are everywhere within the modern world, but it is also true that people visit conservation areas to escape from the modern world and connect with nature. While privacy concerns were a factor in the decision to prohibit the use of trail cameras on department areas, there are other factors that significantly contributed to the decision. The rule is also aimed at promoting wildlife health and reducing the potential for conflicts between area users. Even though trail cameras can be used without an attractant (such as feed or bait), trail cameras tend to promote the use of feed or bait to improve the chances of bringing wildlife into view of the camera. Feeding wildlife or placing minerals for deer unnaturally concentrates wildlife and can contribute to the spread of a variety of wildlife diseases. It also minimizes the potential of user conflicts by reducing the risk of "spot saving" or staking claim to a portion of an area at the exclusion of other users.</p>
07/01/20	Henry Ray Long	Bonne Terre	3 CSR 10-11.110: General Provisions	Amend this rule	<p>Please get rid of the requirement to plug shotguns so they can only hold 3 shells when hunting small game like squirrels and coyotes. You can hunt them with a rifle with a 40 round magazine, but can only have 3 rounds in your shotgun. The only reason for this absurd regulation is to make it easy to fine hunters.</p>	<p>The magazine capacity restrictions on the use of shotguns is designed to minimize the wounding or crippling of game. Shotguns are effective for taking wildlife at much shorter distances than rifles, and are typically utilized for game that present fast moving or flying targets. Game animals that are within shotgun range when the first shot is taken, can quickly be outside of effective shotgun range if the hunter misses within the first few shots. By restricting the magazine capacity, it encourages hunters to ensure the game animal is within range when they decide to shoot, and also reduces the risks of wounding or crippling game from continuing to shoot after the animal is outside of effective shotgun range.</p>

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/12/20	Barton O Ives	Kansas City	3 CSR 10-11.110: General Provisions	Amend this rule	<p>I am requesting MDC amend 3 CSR 10-11.110 To allow the use of trail cameras on certain MDC area lands. It appears that trail cameras were banned from MDC lands a few years back in part because of "privacy concerns" associated with cameras placed in even remote department areas. Camera's are ubiquitous in our society. You can't get gas, go to any store, or ATM without being on camera. It makes no sense that these trail cameras are being restricted from their legitimate use. I believe trail cameras should be treated as any other aid to hunting such as tree stands, decoy's, etc. Also, as a retired elderly sportsman, just "checking" my trail cameras gives me a healthy recreational experience on MDC lands.</p> <p>Specifically I request that paragraph 3 CSR 10-11.110(1)(B) be amended to add "16. Trail Cameras" (see 3 CSR 10-11.15X Use of Trail Cameras on certain MDC lands). Further amend 3 CSR 10-11 to add new paragraph 3 CSR 10-11.15X Use of Trail Cameras on certain department areas. "Purpose: to prescribe the use and restrictions of trail cameras on department areas. 1) Trail camera use is permitted in approved areas 365 days per year. 2) Trail camera use is prohibited xx yards from major roadways and trails; 3) Trail camera use is prohibited within xx yards of administrative, common, and specifically designated areas.</p> <p>I am available and willing to speak to anyone on your staff as appropriate regarding my proposed amendment(s). - Bart</p>	<p>It is true that cameras are everywhere within the modern world, but it is also true that people visit department areas to escape from the modern world and connect with nature. While privacy concerns were a factor in the decision to prohibit the use of trail cameras on department areas, there are other factors that significantly contributed to the decision. The rule is also aimed at promoting wildlife health and reducing the potential for conflicts between area users. Even though trail cameras can be used without an attractant (such as feed or bait), trail cameras tend to promote the use of feed or bait to improve the chances of bringing wildlife into view of the camera. Feeding wildlife or placing minerals for deer unnaturally concentrates wildlife and can contribute to the spread of a variety of wildlife diseases. It also minimizes the potential of user conflicts by reducing the risk of "spot saving" or staking claim to a portion of an area at the exclusion of other users.</p>
07/12/20	Jacobs beaven	Belton	3 CSR 10-11.110: General Provisions	Amend this rule	<p>I believe that we should be allowed to use trail cameras on MDC public land. They are a very useful tool and they don't interfere with privacy since cameras are every where bow days and they give another tool to see what is out there also some people just like to collect the photos and would enjoy eplaring areas even more.</p>	<p>It is true that cameras are everywhere within the modern world, but it is also true that people visit department areas to escape from the modern world and connect with nature. While privacy concerns were a factor in the decision to prohibit the use of trail cameras on department areas, there are other factors that significantly contributed to the decision. The rule is also aimed at promoting wildlife health and reducing the potential for conflicts between area users. Even though trail cameras can be used without an attractant (such as feed or bait), trail cameras tend to promote the use of feed or bait to improve the chances of bringing wildlife into view of the camera. Feeding wildlife or placing minerals for deer unnaturally concentrates wildlife and can contribute to the spread of a variety of wildlife diseases. It also minimizes the potential of user conflicts by reducing the risk of "spot saving" or staking claim to a portion of an area at the exclusion of other users.</p>

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/13/20	John Damon moore	unknown (zipcode = Fort Smith, Arkansas)	3 CSR 10-11.110: General Provisions	Repeal this rule	<p>Cameras are used everywhere, this is public land that I've helped paid for and although I don't live in the state atm I plan on returning soon as possible. If I go into any public building that used my funds to maintain and they use cameras it's no different than being in the woods I helped pay for.</p> <p>Folks: A few years back the state of Missouri banned the use of trail cameras on millions of acres of department lands. Seems there were some vague concerns about "privacy". At any rate, a process has opened up for the public to comment on the department's rules. This "ban" is recent enough that it has only the last couple of years shown up in the brochures for specific area regulations. I have therefore floated a proposed amendment that would once again allow their use once again.</p> <p>I don't know if anyone else has any interest, but I've included my submission on the topic. Feel free to cut, paste, embellish as you see fit. The url below is MDC's link to the public review and comment process.</p> <p>short.mdc.mo.gov/Zia</p> <p>I am requesting MDC amend 3 CSR 10-11.110 To allow the use of trail cameras on certain MDC area lands. It appears that trail cameras were banned from MDC lands a few years back in part because of "privacy concerns" associated with cameras placed in even remote department areas. Camera's are ubiquitous in our society. You can't get gas, go to any store, or ATM without being on camera. It makes no sense that these trail cameras are being restricted from their legitimate use. I believe trail cameras should be treated as any other aid to hunting such as tree stands, decoy's, etc. Also, as a retired elderly sportsman, just "checking" my trail cameras gives me a healthy recreational experience on MDC lands.</p> <p>Specifically I request that paragraph 3 CSR 10-11.110(1)(B) be amended to add "16. Trail Cameras" (see 3 CSR 10-11.15X Use of Trail Cameras on certain MDC lands). Further amend 3 CSR 10-11 to add new paragraph 3 CSR 10-11.15X Use of Trail Cameras on certain department areas. "Purpose: to prescribe the use and restrictions of trail cameras on department areas. 1) Trail camera use is permitted in approved areas 365 days per year. 2) Trail camera use is prohibited xx yards from major roadways and trails; 3) Trail camera use is prohibited within xx yards of administrative, common, and specifically designated areas.</p>	<p>It is true that cameras are everywhere within the modern world, but it is also true that people visit department areas to escape from the modern world and connect with nature. While privacy concerns were a factor in the decision to prohibit the use of trail cameras on department areas, there are other factors that significantly contributed to the decision. The rule is also aimed at promoting wildlife health and reducing the potential for conflicts between area users. Even though trail cameras can be used without an attractant (such as feed or bait), trail cameras tend to promote the use of feed or bait to improve the chances of bringing wildlife into view of the camera. Feeding wildlife or placing minerals for deer unnaturally concentrates wildlife and can contribute to the spread of a variety of wildlife diseases. It also minimizes the potential of user conflicts by reducing the risk of "spot saving" or staking claim to a portion of an area at the exclusion of other users.</p>

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
08/10/20	Aaron Bland	Truesdale	3 CSR 10-11.110: General Provisions	Amend this rule	A few years ago trail cameras were effectively made illegal on MDC public lands. This was done due to a "privacy" concern. With modern daily technology we use in our daily lives this is an indie burn on public land hunters as it sets an privacy expectation that folks don't even have in their own homes, cars, etc. A person's personal cell phone gathers more "private" information in a few seconds than any legal trail camera used by a hunter would ever collect. Please amend the general provisions to allow for the legal use of trail camera on MDC grounds.	It is true that cameras are everywhere within the modern world, but it is also true that people visit department areas to escape from the modern world and connect with nature. While privacy concerns were a factor in the decision to prohibit the use of trail cameras on department areas, there are other factors that significantly contributed to the decision. The rule is also aimed at promoting wildlife health and reducing the potential for conflicts between area users. Even though trail cameras can be used without an attractant (such as feed or bait), trail cameras tend to promote the use of feed or bait to improve the chances of bringing wildlife into view of the camera. Feeding wildlife or placing minerals for deer unnaturally concentrates wildlife and can contribute to the spread of a variety of wildlife diseases. It also minimizes the potential of user conflicts by reducing the risk of "spot saving" or staking claim to a portion of an area at the exclusion of other users.
07/11/20	Charles Luke Holcombe	Birch Tree	3 CSR 10-11.115: Closings	Repeal this rule	What is the mindset behind closing small game hunting with dogs in Shannon, Carter and Reynolds during an firearm elk hunt that has 5 hunters in total on the ground in an area encompassing 3 counties? Since when should 5 hunters being in the field, shut down privileges for 10,20 times that many people? As well as the fact that these elk are no where close to being spread out in these three counties but being concentrated in a very small area in comparison to the area of the counties in whole. I live south of birchtree and hunt a lot in the mark twain national forest surrounding fisher pond as well as CA places that there is not a elk within 10 miles of. Consequently its logical there will be no elk hunters there either but my privileges are closed for what now? REDICULUS regulation and an needless act against those who hunt with dogs.	The decision to not allow use of dogs to hunt rabbits and squirrels during the firearms portion of the elk hunting season in Carter, Reynolds, and Shannon counties was to maintain consistency with our regulations during the November portion of firearms deer season which also prohibit use of dogs to hunt these species. Although only five hunters were able to pursue elk during last year's season, that number will continue to increase through time as the elk population increases in number and range. We recognize and appreciate that we have a diverse hunting community that enjoys pursuing a wide range of species, and we attempt to do our best to balance the desires of all hunters and minimize as much potential conflict as possible when establishing regulations. Given that the rabbit hunting season spans about a four-and-a-half-month period, we deemed it reasonable to not allow use of dogs to hunt these species during the 9-day firearms elk season without greatly affecting the overall amount of opportunity for hunters to pursue small game. However, we do review our regulations annually to determine when change is warranted. As such, your comments will be shared with members of our Regulations Committee for consideration during the next regulatory evaluation cycle.
08/13/20	Caleb Schneider	Defiance	3 CSR 10-11.130: Vehicles, Bicycles, Horses, and Horseback Riding	Leave this rule intact	I have a question along this regulation, it says nothing about an electric golf cart. For example If I wanted to hunt sandy island, the road is part of the core of engineering, so does that mean I can use a electric golf cart b it it just can not enter into the ground of the conservation or can I use an electric golf cart on the conservation island? Thank you please reply back to Cmsch1026@gmail.com to answer my question	Vehicle use on department areas, including vehicles powered by an electric motor (golf carts, etc.), is restricted to gravel or paved roads and parking areas, unless otherwise posted. Operating a golf cart on the conservation island is not permitted.
07/02/20	Brandon Gallaher	LaBelle	3 CSR 10-11.145: Tree Stands	Amend this rule	Missouri Dept. of Conservation how about allowing ground blinds to be set up just like tree stands some of us to do injuries can't climb a tree all carry a ground blind in and out every time yes I know they can get stolen and tore up but no different than a tree blind	The use of ground blinds on department areas present a different set of challenges than the use of tree stands. Tree stands are only allowed on department areas where black bear, deer, or elk hunting is permitted. They are primarily used only for hunting these species during their open seasons, and placement or removal dates can easily be established. However, ground blinds are allowed on all department areas that are open for public use. They are commonly used for hunting all species (including waterfowl, turkey, and furbearers), and also for non-consumptive wildlife related activities (wildlife viewing, wildlife photography, etc.). The seasons and/or time periods where these activities take place span the entire year, and are not limited to the fall hunting season. The current regulation that requires the removal of blinds daily (3 CSR 10-11.115) also minimizes the potential for user conflicts by reducing the risk of "spot saving" or staking claim to a portion of an area at the exclusion of other area users.
08/24/20	Terry Kleoppel	unknown (zipcode = Johnson County)	3 CSR 10-11.145: Tree Stands	Amend this rule	I have more of a question than a comment. Does this rule prohibit the use of climbers? As they have teeth that dig into the bark as you climb. If it does I believe that this should be amended to allow climbers. If not could we update it to make it clear that climbers and stands with teeth are ok.	The tree stand regulation (3 CSR 10-11.145) prohibits the use of nails, screw-in steps, or any material or method that would damage the tree. Provided the climbing tree stand does not damage the tree, they are allowed.

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/06/20	James L Schmitz	Linn	3 CSR 10-11.180: Hunting, General Provisions and Seasons	Amend this rule	A section needs to be added to the wildlife code to make it legal to kill armadillos. I know these are not considered an invasive species and therefore they are protected in Missouri. The population is growing rather quickly and they need to be kept under control as they can cause considerable damage to lawns and gardens. Making it legal to kill armadillos would eliminate the need and confusion of protection from causing property damage.	The <i>Wildlife Code</i> contains a provision (3 CSR 10-4.130) that allows property owners, or their authorized representative, to kill most wildlife species that are causing property damage. While there are some species (deer, turkey, endangered species, bear, etc.) that require prior authorization before killing them, armadillos are not one of those species. Armadillos are a protected species; however, those that are causing property damage may be trapped or killed in accordance with the provisions of 3 CSR 10-4.130.
07/08/20	Wayne Probst	Owensville	3 CSR 10-11.180: Hunting, General Provisions and Seasons	Amend this rule	Why are air guns excluded from methods for taking small game such as rabbits and squirrels? Air guns are safer than firearms and more effective than sling shots...both legal methods. This exclusion is evident here and also in the small game methods in the deer regulations. A quick search on YouTube will provide copious information regarding hunting of small game with air rifles. While some air guns are mere toys, some are very high powered as evidenced by their legal use on deer. You may need to set a minimal standard of power but excluding them all together does not seem justified.	In general, air powered firearms (definition of "firearm" in 3 CSR 10-20.805 includes those powered by spring, air, or gas) may be used for hunting on the vast majority of department areas in accordance with the seasons, methods, and limits established in the <i>Wildlife Code</i> . However, firearms firing a single projectile (including those powered by spring, gas, or air) are prohibited on some department areas. This restriction is necessary to address public safety concerns and the decision to implement this regulation is based on a variety of factors (size of the area, amount of public use, population near the area, etc.). While some air-powered rifles are only effective at relatively short distances, others on the market are very powerful, and rival traditional twenty-two caliber(.22) rimfire firearms. On department areas with this regulation, the use of air rifles is prohibited.
07/10/20	Bob McGeorge	St Charles	3 CSR 10-11.185: Dove Hunting	Leave this rule intact	NA	Thank you for your support of this regulation.
07/10/20	Bob McGeorge	St Charles	3 CSR 10-11.185: Dove Hunting	Leave this rule intact	NA	Thank you for your support of this regulation.
					<p>My name is John Boschert and I live in the Kansas City area on the Kansas side -- I am a Kansas resident. I grew up in Missouri, went to college in Missouri (Rolla) and formerly lived in Missouri after college. During that time, I purchased a Lifetime Resident Small Game Hunting Permit. Since that time, I moved to Kansas but I continue to use some of the MDC waterfowl areas for duck hunting. My son (13-years old) has recently begun waterfowl hunting as well. I understand that the regulations planned for the MDC areas for 2020 essentially excludes all out-of-state hunters (for levels red, orange and yellow). I feel that this is unjust, however my situation is even more frustrating because I hold a Lifetime Permit and yet I cannot access these areas.</p> <p>The Lifetime Resident Small Game License has the following descriptions. The title of the license itself includes the term "resident", I was a resident at the time of purchase and I paid a lot of money for this license. The language on the MDC website states that this permit "carries the same privileges as the Resident...", see below. https://huntfish.mdc.mo.gov/huntfish/permits/lifetime</p>	

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
08/04/20	John Boschert	Overland Park	3 CSR 10-11.186: Waterfowl Hunting	Amend this rule	<p>Yet based on the current regulations I cannot utilize Four Rivers, Schell-Osage, Nodaway Valley, Fountain Grove, Grand Pass, etc because my home address is in Kansas. The idea that excluding hunters like me from these areas due to COVID is in my view unjustified and just plain unfair.</p> <p>Can you please initiate a change in the regulations to allow holders of the Lifetime Small Game Permit to access these areas and be treated the same as a resident (as noted in the language describing the license itself) regardless of home state address? For future general regulations (non-Covid related) for drawings and access to waterfowl hunting areas, the regulations should be amended to treat all holders of the Lifetime Permit the same as residents based on description of the license.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p>	<p>For the purpose of the managed waterfowl hunting program in Missouri, persons who do not currently qualify to obtain resident permits are excluded from applying. Non-residents can participate by going with a Missouri Resident that has received a drawing to hunt, and can participate in the "poor line" drawing. An internal MDC Committee, the Waterfowl Hunt Committee, discusses this topic twice a year when that Committee meets and will continue to do so.</p>
08/08/20	Matt	unknown	3 CSR 10-11.186: Waterfowl Hunting	Amend this rule	<p>First and foremost, please, please STOP changing the draw procedure. It has worked for many many years before and the 2019-2020 season draw system went smoothly. Bacteria and viruses are not a new thing for 2020 so stop changing procedures that have been in place for years and actually work great. People that don't feel safe need to stay home during these times. The online draw is okay for a very small few but I have never seen more than 50% of online allocated draws ever show up in the morning. This being said poor line is the best way to get the most hunters out and eliminate the no shows for the reservations. Stop the online draws. The more online draws, the more waste of spots will happen. Creating more rules and regulations has only made hunting worse. If this red yellow green system for the draw areas stays in place, whatever spots don't show for a reservation leave green cards out for open spots to reduce the wasting of spots.</p> <p>Second teal season shooting hours, the sunrise to sunset makes no sense. It is 30 minutes before during regular duck season, there are still birds and limits that you can not shoot and or can not shoot over your limit. It is expected to know what your shooting at before you shoot. Teal season should be no different, most teal fly within the first hour before sunrise and an hour after. Teal hunting success would go up and the competency of hunters should go up as well, it should be an expectation to be able to discern whatever you are going to shoot before you pull the trigger. Teal and duck season are no different make the shooting hours 30 minutes before sunrise to sunset for both seasons.</p>	<p>The procedures for the managed waterfowl drawings were modified for the 2020 season in response to a global pandemic. The goal of these modifications was to ensure hunting opportunities still existed in a managed fashion, and staff and the public were kept as safe as possible. Shooting hours for teal are established by the USFWS and are from sunrise to sunset as a measure to protect ducks that are not teal.</p>
07/10/20	Bob McGeorge	St Charles	3 CSR 10-11.220: Taking Feral Swine	Amend this rule	<p>The wild/ feral hogs are here. I dont think they can be eradicated.allow hunters to harvest and utilize the animal.</p>	<p>The Missouri Feral Hog Elimination Task Force is committed to eliminating feral hogs from Missouri. On Department owned and managed lands and federally owned lands in Missouri, feral hogs can be opportunistically taken during deer and turkey seasons by a hunter that has in their possession an unfilled deer or turkey permit. Outside of the deer and turkey hunting seasons, feral hogs may not be taken. This is because with hunting, only a few hogs are killed. By utilizing specific trapping techniques, we are able to catch the entire sounder (group) of hogs. These restrictions do not apply to privately owned land in Missouri.</p>

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2020

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
07/10/20	John Dougan	unknown (zipcode = Ashland)	3 CSR 10-12.101: Title; Authority	Amend this rule	No wonder people don't want to go fishing. The number of possible variations in this rule is in the thousands. Remember that managements purpose is for use. When management eliminates use then they also eliminate the need for the practice.	The Department has conducted statistically accountable attitude, opinion, satisfaction, and participation surveys for more than 30 years. The results of the 2020 monitor survey indicated that only about one (1) in ten (10) Missourians say a lack of understanding of the regulations keeps them from fishing in Missouri, and nearly six (6) in ten (10) Missourians do not consider this a barrier to fishing. Approximately one million (1,000,000) Missourians connect with the outdoors by participating in angling endeavors. The regulations that are in place are necessary to maintain healthy and sustainable fishing opportunities for these anglers to enjoy.