

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 7/1/15-8/31/15	Notes
Chapter 1	Wildlife Code: Organization										
3 CSR 10-1.010	Organization and Methods of Operation	3/1/2016	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y	1	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review. Additional changes are pending at this time. A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
Chapter 2	Wildlife Code: Forest Crop Lands										
3 CSR 10-2.010	Requirements for Managing Forest Crop Lands Classified Before December 1974	1/1/1947	N	Y	N	N	Y	N/A	Y		Rescission of this rule is pending. Lands classified prior to 1974 had a twenty-five (25) year enrollment and have since either been declassified or renewed under 3 CSR 10-2.020

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 7/1/15-8/31/15	Notes
3 CSR 10-2.020	Classification and Requirements of Forest Crop Lands After December 1974	12/7/1974	Y	N	N	N	Y	N/A	Y		Proposed changes to this rule are currently pending. This rule will be modified to improve landowner eligibility and management of the program.
Chapter 3	Wildlife Code: Monetary Values for Fish and Wildlife										
3 CSR 10-3.010	Monetary Values Established for Fish and Wildlife	3/1/2014	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y		
Chapter 4	Wildlife Code: General Provisions										
3 CSR 10-4.105	Title; Authority	1/1/1988	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-4.110	General Prohibition; Applications	7/30/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		Proposed changes to this rule are currently pending.
3 CSR 10-4.111	Endangered Species	8/30/2014	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		Proposed changes to this rule are currently pending.
3 CSR 10-4.113	Ginseng	3/30/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-4.117	Prohibited Species	3/1/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-4.118	Public Use of Certain Department Buildings	3/1/1999	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-4.120	Boundary Waters	12/31/1957	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-4.125	Inspection	3/1/2000	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-4.130	Owner May Protect Property; Public Safety	3/1/2014	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-4.135	Transportation	7/1/2011	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-4.136	Giving Away Wildlife	1/30/2006	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		

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 7/1/15-8/31/15	Notes
3 CSR 10-4.137	Wildlife Identification	1/30/2006	Y	N	N	N	Y	N/A	Y		The Department of Conservation will amend this rule to allow individuals to use their Conservation ID number rather than their full name, address, and permit number to identify and label their game.
3 CSR 10-4.138	Possession and Daily Limit	1/1/1996	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-4.140	Possession, Storage and Processing	1/30/2006	Y	N	N	N	Y	N/A	Y		The Department of Conservation will amend this rule to allow individuals to use their Conservation ID number rather than their full name, address, and permit number to identify and label their game.
3 CSR 10-4.141	Right to Possess Wildlife	3/1/2003	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-4.145	Preparing and Serving Wildlife	2/28/2007	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-4.150	Legality of Wildlife Taken Outside of Missouri	1/15/1993	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
Chapter 5	Wildlife Code: Permits										

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 7/1/15-8/31/15	Notes
3 CSR 10-5.205	Permits Required: Exceptions	3/1/2016	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review.
3 CSR 10-5.210	Permits to be Signed and Carried	7/30/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.215	Permits and Privileges: How Obtained; Not Transferable	7/1/2011	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.216	Permits and Privileges: Revocation	3/1/2001	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.220	Resident and Nonresident Permits	3/1/2012	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-5.222	Youth Pricing: Deer and Turkey Permits	10/30/2012	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.225	Permits: Permit Issuing Agents; Service Fees; Other Provisions	3/1/2011	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.250	Daily Hunting or Fishing Tags	1/1/1996	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.300	Apprentice Hunter Authorization	4/30/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.310	Resident Lifetime Conservation Partner Permit	7/1/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-5.315	Resident Lifetime Fishing Permit	2/29/2008	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.320	Resident Lifetime Small Game Hunting Permit	7/1/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.330	Resident Small Game Hunting and Fishing Permit	2/28/2007	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.331	Resident National Guard and Reserve Service Small Game Hunting and Fishing Permit	6/30/2006	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		

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 7/1/15-8/31/15	Notes
3 CSR 10-5.340	Resident Fishing Permit	3/30/2004	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.345	Resident Small Game Hunting Permit	3/30/2004	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.351	Resident Firearms Any-Deer Hunting Permit	2/28/2007	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.352	Resident Firearms Antlerless Deer Hunting Permit	2/28/2007	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.359	Resident Managed Deer Hunting Permit	3/1/2003	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.360	Resident Archer's Hunting Permit	3/1/2003	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.365	Resident Turkey Hunting Permits	3/30/2004	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.370	Resident Trapping Permit	1/1/1996	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.425	Resident Archery Antlerless Deer Hunting Permit	9/30/2004	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.430	Trout Permit	3/1/2014	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.435	Migratory Bird Hunting Permit	1/30/2010	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.436	Resident Conservation Order Permit	3/1/2011	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.440	Daily Fishing Permit	2/28/2007	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.445	Daily Small Game Hunting Permit	3/30/2004	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.460	Licensed Hunting Preserve Hunting Permit	4/1/2007	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.465	Three-Day Licensed Hunting Preserve Hunting Permit	4/1/2007	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.535	White River Border Lakes Permit	3/1/2001	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.540	Nonresident Fishing Permit	7/1/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.545	Nonresident Small Game Hunting Permit	7/1/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.551	Nonresident Firearms Any-Deer Hunting Permit	7/1/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y	3	Responses to comments received are provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-5.552	Nonresident Firearms Antlerless Deer Hunting Permit	7/1/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		

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 7/1/15-8/31/15	Notes
3 CSR 10-5.554	Nonresident Archery Antlerless Deer Hunting Permit	7/1/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.559	Nonresident Managed Deer Hunting Permit	7/1/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.560	Nonresident Archer's Hunting Permit	7/1/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.565	Nonresident Turkey Hunting Permits	7/1/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.567	Nonresident Conservation Order Permit	3/1/2011	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-5.570	Nonresident Furbearer Hunting and Trapping Permit	7/1/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
Chapter 6	Wildlife Code: Sport Fishing: Seasons, Methods, Limits										
3 CSR 10-6.405	General Provisions	2/28/2007	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-6.410	Fishing Methods	3/1/2011	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-6.415	Restricted Zones	3/1/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-6.505	Black Bass	3/1/2016	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review.
3 CSR 10-6.510	Channel Catfish, Blue Catfish, Flathead Catfish	3/1/2014	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y	6	Responses to comments received are provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-6.515	Crappie	2/28/2007	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-6.520	Muskellunge, Northern Pike, Grass Pickerel, Chain Pickerel	2/28/2007	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-6.525	Paddlefish	3/1/2011	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-6.530	Goggle-eye (Ozark Bass, Rock Bass and Shadow Bass) and Warmouth	4/30/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-6.533	Shovelnose Sturgeon	4/30/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-6.535	Trout	1/30/2011	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		

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 7/1/15-8/31/15	Notes
3 CSR 10-6.540	Walleye and Sauger	4/30/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-6.545	White Bass, Yellow Bass, Striped Bass	3/1/2014	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-6.550	Other Fish	8/30/2014	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-6.605	Live Bait	3/1/2011	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-6.610	Mussels and Clams	3/1/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-6.615	Bullfrogs and Green Frogs	4/30/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-6.620	Turtles	4/30/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
Chapter 7	Wildlife Code: Hunting: Seasons, Methods, Limits										
3 CSR 10-7.405	General Provisions	7/30/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-7.410	Hunting Methods	3/1/2016	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review. Additional changes are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-7.415	Quail: Seasons, Limits	2/28/2007	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-7.420	Rabbits: Seasons, Limits	3/1/2001	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-7.425	Squirrels: Seasons, Limits	3/1/2010	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-7.427	Groundhogs: Seasons, Limits	2/28/2005	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-7.430	Pheasants: Seasons, Limits	3/1/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		

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 7/1/15-8/31/15	Notes
3 CSR 10-7.431	Deer Hunting Seasons: General Provisions	3/1/2016	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	2	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review. Responses to comments received are provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-7.432	Deer: Archery Hunting Season	7/30/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-7.433	Deer: Firearms Hunting Season	3/1/2016	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y	1	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review. Additional changes are pending at this time. A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-7.434	Deer: Landowner Privileges	3/1/2016	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review.
3 CSR 10-7.435	Deer: Special Harvest Provisions	7/1/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-7.436	Deer: Managed Hunts	5/15/2004	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-7.437	Deer: Antlerless Deer Hunting Permit Availability	7/1/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-7.438	Deer: Regulations for Department Areas	3/1/2011	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y		
3 CSR 10-7.440	Migratory Game Birds and Waterfowl: Seasons, Limits	9/1/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-7.441	Crows: Seasons, Methods, Limits	3/1/2001	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		

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 7/1/15-8/31/15	Notes
3 CSR 10-7.445	Bullfrogs and Green Frogs: Seasons, Methods, Limits	3/1/2011	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-7.450	Furbearers: Hunting Seasons, Methods	3/1/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y	1	A response to the comment received is provided in Appendix A.
3 CSR 10-7.455	Turkeys: Seasons, Methods, Limits	3/1/2016	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y	3	Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review. Additional changes are pending at this time. Responses to comments received are provided in Appendix A.
Chapter 8	Wildlife Code: Trapping: Seasons, Methods										
3 CSR 10-8.505	Trapping	8/30/2010	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-8.510	Use of Traps	8/30/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-8.515	Furbearers: Trapping Seasons	7/1/2011	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
Chapter 9	Wildlife Code: Confined Wildlife: Privileges, Permits, Standards										
3 CSR 10-9.105	General Provisions	3/1/2014	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.106	Confined Wildlife Permits: How Obtained, Replacements	3/1/2003	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.110	General Prohibition; Applications	3/1/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.220	Wildlife Confinement Standards	7/30/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.230	Class I Wildlife	5/30/2003	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.240	Class II Wildlife	2/28/2005	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.350	Class I Wildlife Breeder Permit	1/1/1994	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.351	Class II Wildlife Breeder Permit	2/28/2007	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.353	Privileges of Class I and Class II Wildlife Breeders	7/30/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		

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 7/1/15-8/31/15	Notes
3 CSR 10-9.359	Class I and Class II Wildlife Breeder: Records Required	7/30/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.415	Wildlife Rehabilitation Permit	4/30/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.420	Wildlife Hobby Permit	3/1/2001	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.425	Wildlife Collector's Permit	3/1/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.430	Bird Banding	3/1/2011	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.440	Resident Falconry Permit	3/1/2011	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.442	Falconry	3/1/2014	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.560	Licensed Hunting Preserve Permit	7/30/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.565	Licensed Hunting Preserve: Privileges	7/30/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.566	Licensed Hunting Preserve: Records Required	7/30/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.570	Hound Running Area Operator and Dealer Permit	2/28/2005	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.575	Hound Running Area: Privileges, Requirements	4/30/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.625	Field Trial Permit	3/1/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.627	Dog Training Area Permit	4/1/2007	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.628	Dog Training Area: Privileges	4/30/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.640	Licensed Trout Fishing Area Permit	7/1/2001	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-9.645	Licensed Trout Fishing Area Permit: Privileges, Requirements	3/1/2010	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
Chapter 10	Wildlife Code: Commercial Permits: Seasons, Methods, Limits										
3 CSR 10-10.705	Commercialization	3/1/2014	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-10.707	Resident Fur Dealer's Permit	8/30/2006	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-10.708	Nonresident Fur Dealer's Permit	8/30/2006	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		

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 7/1/15-8/31/15	Notes
3 CSR 10-10.715	Resident and Nonresident Fur Dealers: Reports, Requirements	4/30/2009	Y	N	N	N	Y	N/A	Y		The Department of Conservation will amend this rule to remove the requirement for notarized reports from fur dealers.
3 CSR 10-10.720	Commercial Fishing Permit	2/29/2008	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-10.722	Resident Roe Fish Commercial Harvest Permit	3/1/2016	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review.
3 CSR 10-10.724	Nonresident Mississippi River Roe Fish Commercial Harvest Permit	8/30/2010	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-10.725	Commercial Fishing: Seasons, Methods	8/30/2013	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-10.726	Reciprocal Privileges: Commercial Fishing; Commercial Waters	8/30/2010	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-10.727	Record Keeping and Reporting Required: Commercial Fishermen	3/1/2010	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-10.728	Roe Fish Dealer Permit	7/1/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-10.732	Tag and Release Fishing Promotion Permit	2/28/2005	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-10.735	Sale of Live Bait	4/30/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-10.743	Commercial Establishments	8/30/2010	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-10.744	Commercial Deer Processing: Permit, Privileges, Requirements	3/1/2014	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-10.767	Taxidermy; Tanning: Permit, Privileges, Requirements	3/1/2010	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		

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 7/1/15-8/31/15	Notes
3 CSR 10-10.768	Sales and Possession of Wildlife Parts and Mounted Specimens	3/30/2004	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
3 CSR 10-10.771	Commercial Permits: How Obtained, Replacements	7/1/1994	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y		
Chapter 11	Wildlife Code: Special Regulations for Department Areas										
3 CSR 10-11.105	Title; Authority	9/30/2001	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		
3 CSR 10-11.110	General Provisions	3/1/2012	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		
3 CSR 10-11.115	Closings	3/1/2016	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review. Additional changes are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-11.120	Pets and Hunting Dogs	8/30/2012	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		
3 CSR 10-11.125	Field Trials	3/1/2012	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		
3 CSR 10-11.130	Vehicles, Bicycles, Horses, and Horseback Riding	3/1/2016	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review. The Department of Conservation will review this regulation ensure compliance with American's with Disabilities Act language.
3 CSR 10-11.135	Wild Plants, Plant Products, and Mushrooms	2/29/2008	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		
3 CSR 10-11.140	Camping	3/1/2012	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		
3 CSR 10-11.145	Tree Stands	2/28/2005	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		
3 CSR 10-11.150	Target Shooting and Shooting Ranges	4/30/2009	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/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 7/1/15-8/31/15	Notes
3 CSR 10-11.155	Decoys and Blinds	3/1/2011	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N/A		The Department of Conservation will amend this rule to accurately incorporate by reference the Upper Mississippi Conservation Area Hunting Information booklet published biannually.
3 CSR 10-11.160	Use of Boats and Motors	3/1/2012	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		
3 CSR 10-11.165	Bullfrogs and Green Frogs	3/1/2012	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		
3 CSR 10-11.180	Hunting, General Provisions and Seasons	3/1/2016	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N/A		Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review. Additional changes are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-11.181	Turkeys: Special Hunts	3/1/2011	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N/A		
3 CSR 10-11.182	Deer Hunting	3/1/2011	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N/A		
3 CSR 10-11.184	Quail Hunting	3/1/2014	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		
3 CSR 10-11.185	Dove Hunting	3/1/2014	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		Proposed changes to this rule are currently pending.
3 CSR 10-11.186	Waterfowl Hunting	3/1/2016	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review. Additional changes are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-11.187	Trapping	2/28/2005	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		
3 CSR 10-11.200	Fishing, General Provisions and Seasons	3/1/2013	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/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 7/1/15-8/31/15	Notes
3 CSR 10-11.205	Fishing, Methods and Hours	3/1/2016	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review.
3 CSR 10-11.210	Fishing, Daily and Possession Limits	3/1/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		
3 CSR 10-11.215	Fishing, Length Limits	3/1/2015	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		
Chapter 12	Wildlife Code: Special Regulations for Areas Owned by Other Entities										
3 CSR 10-12.101	Title; Authority	9/30/2001	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		Proposed changes to this rule are currently pending.
3 CSR 10-12.105	Wildlife Refuges	9/30/2001	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		
3 CSR 10-12.109	Closed Hours	3/1/2016	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review.
3 CSR 10-12.110	Use of Boats and Motors	3/1/2016	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review.
3 CSR 10-12.115	Bullfrogs and Green Frogs	3/1/2016	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review.
3 CSR 10-12.125	Hunting and Trapping	3/1/2016	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review. Additional changes are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-12.130	Fishing, General Provisions and Seasons	3/1/2012	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		Proposed changes to this rule are currently pending.

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 7/1/15-8/31/15	Notes
3 CSR 10-12.135	Fishing, Methods	3/1/2016	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review. Additional changes are pending at this time.
3 CSR 10-12.140	Fishing, Daily and Possession Limits	3/1/2016	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review.
3 CSR 10-12.145	Fishing, Length Limits	3/1/2016	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		Changes to this regulation were pending at the time of the review.
3 CSR 10-12.150	Fishing, Trout Parks	3/1/2012	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		
3 CSR 10-12.155	Fishing, Stone Mill Spring Branch	1/30/2011	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		
Chapter 20	Wildlife Code: Definitions										
3 CSR 10-20.805	Definitions	8/30/2013	Y	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A		

**APPENDIX A
Periodic Review Comments
July 1 - August 31, 2015**

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
7/7/15	Jeffrey Donathan	unknown (zip=Wappapello)	3 CSR 10-5.310: Resident Lifetime Conservation Partner Permit	Undecided	I would like to see Missouri implement a fully encompassing Lifetime Conservation Permit. By that I mean one that covers all of my hunting and/or fishing for my lifetime, not just a small game and general fishing permit. I feel that if I can give my kids the gift of hunting and fishing then chances are they will continue into their adult years. At least they wouldn't have to bother with purchasing permits each year, just head out and pursue whatever is in season. I can see having waterfowl, trout stamps, etc. as a continuing and separate requirement since those are for specific programs.	<p>Missouri's Lifetime permits are set up for annual small game and fishing permits. These permits have no tagging or telecheck requirements for harvested animals. However, deer and turkey permits require individual telecheck ID's for the animals harvested and these numbers change each year to allow for calculations on how many animals were harvested, the type of animal harvested (buck, doe, gobbler, hen, points), and the county of harvest. Adding these permits to the Lifetime permit would make this information difficult to collect and to verify legal harvest. Also, the price of the permits are based on the price of the annual permits with a breakeven point in years based on the age of the person purchasing the permit.</p> <p>For example: An individual age sixteen (16) to twenty-nine (29) pays four hundred dollars (\$400) for a Lifetime small game hunting permit. This includes small game ten dollars (\$10), migratory bird six dollars (\$6), and conservation order five dollars (\$5). That is a total of twenty-one dollars (\$21). The break even in years for this permit is nineteen (19) years. To add deer and turkey hunting privileges to this Lifetime permit we would need to adjust the price to include the deer and turkey permits. If we add firearm anydeer seventeen dollars (\$17), archery nineteen dollars (\$19), spring/fall firearm turkey seventeen dollars (\$17) and thirteen dollars (\$13). That would increase the total by sixty-six dollars (\$66) each year. If we multiple that over nineteen (19) years for the breakeven, we would need increase the price by at least one thousand two hundred fifty-four dollars (\$1,254). If adjusted as suggested, it's likely that the permits would only be attractive to individuals that are moving out of state to lock in their deer/turkey permits for when they return.</p>

**Periodic Review Comments
July 1 - August 31, 2015**

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
7/15/15	Jeff Craig	unknown (zip=Liberty)	3 CSR 10-7.455: Turkeys: Seasons, Methods, Limits	Oppose	The 1 pm cutoff for spring turkey hunting is an outdated, scientifically unproven relic and should be done away with. No state has shown a decrease in hen productivity or a significant increase in harvest when extending hunting hours. Extending hours would allow for more opportunity for hunters, and specifically youth hunters to participate at a higher rate with no negative impacts to the resource. In fact, most turkey regulations, limits, and seasons could be expanded in MO without much if any negative impact to the resource.	The Department of Conservation has considered "all-day" turkey hunting during the spring season for the several years, including what a regulation change might look like (i.e., public land, private land, all land). The Department is currently conducting a research project to examine turkey population dynamics to help determine what effects an "all-day" season might have on the population.
7/17/15	Frank Luck	Mountain View	3 CSR 10-7.450: Furbearers: Hunting Seasons, Methods	Support	electronic calls should be allowed at night with artificial lights for furbearers	The Department of Conservation currently allows the use of electronic calls at night in the hunting of furbearers. It also allows the use of artificial light when hunting furbearers with the use of a dog and such animals have been treed by a dog. However, using artificial light in the pursuit of furbearers in situations other than where an animal has already been treed by a dog is considered unfair chase by the hunter, and too advantageous to the hunter in pursuing furbearers. Additionally, unscrupulous hunters may use this as an argument as to why they are spotlighting, when in fact they are attempting to poach deer. Not allowing spotlighting in general takes away the ability to make such claims.
7/17/15	Frank Luck	Mountain View	3 CSR 10-7.455: Turkeys: Seasons, Methods, Limits	Support	electronoc call should be allowed	The Department of Conservation considers using a turkey call as part of the challenge and a skill necessary to be a successful turkey hunter. The use of elctronic calls is also considered part of the "fair-chase" argument of persuing certain wildlife, and in the case of turkey hunting, the Department considers the use of an electronic call an unfair advatage for the hunter.

**Periodic Review Comments
July 1 - August 31, 2015**

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
7/22/15	Jeff Faulkenberry	Clinton	3 CSR 10-6.510: Channel Catfish, Blue Catfish, Flathead Catfish	Oppose	The slot limit on blue cats on Lake of the Ozarks and Truman is a redundant and unneeded law. Besides loss of revenue the science behind the reg is bogus	<p>For a number of years, Department of Conservation staff had been concerned about potential overharvest of blue catfish in Truman Reservoir and Lake of the Ozarks, especially larger blue catfish. Anglers had also expressed concern about the decline in the numbers of large blue catfish. Due to high fishing pressure and angler harvest, the numbers of larger blue catfish in Truman and Lake of the Ozarks had steadily declined since the mid-1990s. These conditions were preventing blue catfish from reaching their full growth potential. In the Department's 2002 Statewide Catfish Angler Survey, nearly thirty-five percent (35%) of respondents indicated the quality of catfishing at Truman Reservoir had declined over the last ten (10) years, while about twelve percent (12%) indicated catfishing had improved. Department staff had also documented very high harvest and slow growth of blue catfish at Truman Reservoir during our Reservoir Catfish Evaluation Project from 2004 to 2008. Research showed a blue catfish harvest rate two-to-three (2-3)-times higher than reported in similar studies nationwide. Research shows that it takes a blue catfish in Truman and Lake of the Ozarks about fifteen (15) years to reach thirty-one inches (31") in length and a weight of about twelve (12) pounds. A fifteen (15) year old blue catfish that is thirty-one inches (31") today can easily live another ten to fifteen (10-15) years and reach sixty (60) or eighty (80) pounds. For that to happen, however, we have to make sure that anglers don't harvest them all. Data indicated that anglers were harvesting too many blue catfish before they reached their growth potential. As a top level predator, blue catfish can and do feed on a wide variety of aquatic organisms from zebra mussels to smaller blue catfish. As a rule, like any predatory game fish, blue catfish will feed on the prey that are the most abundant and easily caught. In Truman Reservoir and Lake of the Ozarks, that is gizzard shad. In May 2010, the Department held stakeholder meetings to discuss potential regulation changes. Those in attendance included recreational and tournament anglers, catfishing guides, organized catfish angler groups, bait shop and marina owners, media representatives, judges and prosecuting attorneys, local chambers of commerce, state representatives and other government and non-government groups such as the Department of Natural Resources, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and Ameren UE. The majority of attendees were in favor of potential regulations. The regulation changes provide harvest protection for medium-size blue catfish, which will allow more blue catfish to reach larger sizes. Doubling the daily limit from five (5) to ten (10) also encouraged the harvest of smaller blue catfish. The numbers of smaller blue catfish in both reservoirs are adequate to allow for additional harvest. Encouraging more harvest of smaller blue catfish has the potential to reduce competition among blue catfish, which may actually improve growth. Encouraging the harvest of smaller blue catfish will still allow anglers to take fish home for the table. Because of the slow growth exhibited by blue catfish, it will take at least seven (7) or eight (8) years before the population will start to show any significant response to the regulation and a long-term evaluation will be conducted at that time. Missouri is nationally known for our fishery resources. We have no evidence that the local economy would be negatively impacted by this regulations change. In fact, it is our opinion that the local economy would improve as a result of this regulation drawing more anglers to the area as the fishery improves. The Department's history of regulations on reservoirs and streams have documented improved fishing. Examples include: The Lake Taneycomo twenty inch (20") minimum trout regulations on the upper three (3) miles of the lake, minimum length limits for crappie on Truman and other major reservoirs, banning commercial harvest of catfish on the Missouri River, and the striped bass fishery at Bull Shoals, just to name a few. All of these regulations have created "destination fisheries" for the state and local economies.</p>

**Periodic Review Comments
July 1 - August 31, 2015**

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
7/24/15	Lyle Stokes	Buffalo	3 CSR 10-6.510: Channel Catfish, Blue Catfish, Flathead Catfish	Support	Not only are the new regs on Lake Ozark and Truman the best thing that has happened for catfish in years, it should be put into effect right now on all Missouri water.	The Department of Conservation appreciates citizen support for regulations to better manage the fish, forest and wildlife of Missouri.

**Periodic Review Comments
July 1 - August 31, 2015**

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
7/28/15	Gary Burkemper	unknown (zip= O'Fallon)	3 CSR 10-6.510: Channel Catfish, Blue Catfish, Flathead Catfish	Oppose	The 26" to 34" slot limit on Truman Lake is terrible. It takes away from Missouri's fishermen and their families, the opportunity to enjoy the outdoor experience. Please rescind this unneeded law.	<p>For a number of years, Department of Conservation staff had been concerned about potential overharvest of blue catfish in Truman Reservoir and Lake of the Ozarks, especially larger blue catfish. Anglers had also expressed concern about the decline in the numbers of large blue catfish. Due to high fishing pressure and angler harvest, the numbers of larger blue catfish in Truman and Lake of the Ozarks had steadily declined since the mid-1990s. These conditions were preventing blue catfish from reaching their full growth potential. In the Department's 2002 Statewide Catfish Angler Survey, nearly thirty-five percent (35%) of respondents indicated the quality of catfishing at Truman Reservoir had declined over the last ten (10) years, while about twelve percent (12%) indicated catfishing had improved. Department staff had also documented very high harvest and slow growth of blue catfish at Truman Reservoir during our Reservoir Catfish Evaluation Project from 2004 to 2008. Research showed a blue catfish harvest rate two-to-three (2-3)-times higher than reported in similar studies nationwide. Research shows that it takes a blue catfish in Truman and Lake of the Ozarks about fifteen (15) years to reach thirty-one inches (31") in length and a weight of about twelve (12) pounds. A fifteen (15) year old blue catfish that is thirty-one inches (31") today can easily live another ten to fifteen (10-15) years and reach sixty (60) or eighty (80) pounds. For that to happen, however, we have to make sure that anglers don't harvest them all. Data indicated that anglers were harvesting too many blue catfish before they reached their growth potential. As a top level predator, blue catfish can and do feed on a wide variety of aquatic organisms from zebra mussels to smaller blue catfish. As a rule, like any predatory game fish, blue catfish will feed on the prey that are the most abundant and easily caught. In Truman Reservoir and Lake of the Ozarks, that is gizzard shad. In May 2010, the Department held stakeholder meetings to discuss potential regulation changes. Those in attendance included recreational and tournament anglers, catfishing guides, organized catfish angler groups, bait shop and marina owners, media representatives, judges and prosecuting attorneys, local chambers of commerce, state representatives and other government and non-government groups such as the Department of Natural Resources, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and Ameren UE. The majority of attendees were in favor of potential regulations. The regulation changes provide harvest protection for medium-size blue catfish, which will allow more blue catfish to reach larger sizes. Doubling the daily limit from five (5) to ten (10) also encouraged the harvest of smaller blue catfish. The numbers of smaller blue catfish in both reservoirs are adequate to allow for additional harvest. Encouraging more harvest of smaller blue catfish has the potential to reduce competition among blue catfish, which may actually improve growth. Encouraging the harvest of smaller blue catfish will still allow anglers to take fish home for the table. Because of the slow growth exhibited by blue catfish, it will take at least seven (7) or eight (8) years before the population will start to show any significant response to the regulation and a long-term evaluation will be conducted at that time. Missouri is nationally known for our fishery resources. We have no evidence that the local economy would be negatively impacted by this regulations change. In fact, it is our opinion that the local economy would improve as a result of this regulation drawing more anglers to the area as the fishery improves. The Department's history of regulations on reservoirs and streams have documented improved fishing. Examples include: The Lake Taneycomo twenty inch (20") minimum trout regulations on the upper three (3) miles of the lake, minimum length limits for crappie on Truman and other major reservoirs, banning commercial harvest of catfish on the Missouri River, and the striped bass fishery at Bull Shoals, just to name a few. All of these regulations have created "destination fisheries" for the state and local economies.</p>
7/29/15	Kirk Lee	Kidder	3 CSR 10-7.433: Deer: Firearms Hunting Seasons	Undecided	Consider changing acceptable calibers for air guns from 40 caliber and larger to 357 caliber and larger.	<p>The original proposal of the Department of Conservation's Regulations Committee included the 357 caliber airgun for hunting of deer . However , internal discussions and public input showed that there was concerns that the 357 caliber would not create a large enough hole to quickly and humanely kill a deer via blood loss. Thus, the Department decided that the larger 40 caliber air rifle was needed and the minimum sized caliber that was acceptable for this.</p>

**Periodic Review Comments
July 1 - August 31, 2015**

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
7/31/15	Jeff Jamieson	Germantown, TN	3 CSR 10- 5.220: Resident and Nonresident Permits	Oppose	I oppose this rule on non resident permits for non resident MO landowners with primary resident in another state. I think this should be overturned and offer true MO non resident landowners that pay taxes in the state of MO with at least 75 continuous acres a benefit of getting resident permits or at least a discounted permits for non resident landowners. I inherited land in the Ozarks from my grandfather and grew up hunting deer/turkey on it. Now the land that was left to me I have to pay full non resident permit fees. We pay taxes just like everyone else in MO on the land and do not get any permit benefits. It would be nice to get a discounted permit fee for a non resident landowner so we can have a vested interest in the conservation of MO. It is tough to teach my kids to hunt when my non resident permit fees are too expensive to afford. I hope this does not fall on deaf ears. This has been a uphill battle for some time since you all suspended the non resident landowner permits at a discounted rate.	The Department of Conservation routinely hears from Missouri residents who believe that nonresident permit prices are too low. Following a comprehensive review of permit pricing, nonresident permit fees were increased across the board in 2009 and reduced-cost nonresident landowner permits were eliminated. The logic for elimination of those permits was that nonresident landowners do not contribute to conservation on a daily basis the way resident landowners do. Since that time, the Department has been contacted by several nonresident landowners requesting that the reduced-cost permits be re-established. As a result, the Regulations Committee considered the topic in July 2015. Following discussion, they agreed that additional research and evaluation is necessary prior to formal consideration of reimplementation of those permit options.

**Periodic Review Comments
July 1 - August 31, 2015**

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
8/17/15	Brian Cogbille	Olathe, KS	3 CSR 10-5.551: Nonresident Firearms Any-Deer Hunting Permit	Undecided	I understand charging non-residents more than residents. However, Missouri charges non-residents higher fees related to resident fees than any of state that borders Missouri. While other states charge non-residents higher fees, the ratio of non-resident to resident fees is much less than the 12.8 of MO. While lowering fees to non-residents is not likely, it seems to me that as a non-resident, I am shouldering a disproportionate share of the costs, especially in a state with a significant portion of its conservation revenue provided by sales tax.	The Department of Conservation routinely hears from many Missouri residents who believe that nonresident permit prices are too low. Following a comprehensive review of permit pricing, nonresident permit fees were increased across the board in 2009 and reduced-cost nonresident landowner permits were eliminated. The logic for elimination of those permits was that nonresident landowners do not contribute to conservation on a daily basis the way resident landowners do. Since that time, the Department has been contacted by several nonresident landowners requesting that the reduced-cost permits be re-established. As a result, the Regulations Committee considered the topic in July 2015. Following discussion, they agreed that additional research and evaluation is necessary prior to formal consideration of reimplementation of those permit options.
8/17/15	Brian Cogbille	Olathe, KS	3 CSR 10-5.551: Nonresident Firearms Any-Deer Hunting Permit	Oppose	What is the rationale for no longer recognizing non-resident landowners for permitting purposes? I would support a reduced fee structure for non-resident landowners.	The Department of Conservation routinely hears from many Missouri residents who believe that nonresident permit prices are too low. Following a comprehensive review of permit pricing, nonresident permit fees were increased across the board in 2009 and reduced-cost nonresident landowner permits were eliminated. The logic for elimination of those permits was that nonresident landowners do not contribute to conservation on a daily basis the way resident landowners do. Since that time, the Department has been contacted by several nonresident landowners requesting that the reduced-cost permits be re-established. As a result, the Regulations Committee considered the topic in July 2015. Following discussion, they agreed that additional research and evaluation is necessary prior to formal consideration of reimplementation of those permit options.

**Periodic Review Comments
July 1 - August 31, 2015**

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
8/26/15	Linda M. Everhart	Henry County	3 CSR 10-1.010: Organization and Methods of Operation	Oppose	Commissioners should be elected by the people they are ruling, from at least 8 districts across Missouri. More would be better. It is unconstitutional for laws to be made by these 4 unelected, misinformed people who don't even try to educate themselves on the regulations they pass.	In 1936, the people of Missouri, through the initiative petition process, placed on the ballot and passed language that would create a non-political Conservation Commission with broad authority. Article IV: Sections 40-42 of the Constitution of the State of Missouri outlines the duties and privileges of the Conservation Commission. Section 40(a) specifies that the Commission shall consist of four (4) members appointed by the Governor, by and with the advice and consent of the senate, not more than two (2) of whom shall be of the same political party.

**Periodic Review Comments
July 1 - August 31, 2015**

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
8/26/15	Linda M. Everhart	Henry County	3 CSR 10-6.510: Channel Catfish, Blue Catfish, Flathead Catfish	Oppose	The blue catfish slot-ban on Truman Lake, Lake of the Ozarks and all their tributaries should be repealed. It was based on a lie and has harmed the economy and the welfare of Missouri citizens and businesses. It's cruel and wasteful to the slot fish that are caught and released multiple times, plus the overpopulation of blue catfish is sure to decimate the populations of other game fish. This regulation should have never been enacted and has created a deep and lasting hatred of the MDC in the lake region.	<p>For a number of years, Department of Conservation staff had been concerned about potential overharvest of blue catfish in Truman Reservoir and Lake of the Ozarks, especially larger blue catfish. Anglers had also expressed concern about the decline in the numbers of large blue catfish. Due to high fishing pressure and angler harvest, the numbers of larger blue catfish in Truman and Lake of the Ozarks had steadily declined since the mid-1990s. These conditions were preventing blue catfish from reaching their full growth potential. In the Department's 2002 Statewide Catfish Angler Survey, nearly thirty-five percent (35%) of respondents indicated the quality of catfishing at Truman Reservoir had declined over the last ten (10) years, while about twelve percent (12%) indicated catfishing had improved. Department staff had also documented very high harvest and slow growth of blue catfish at Truman Reservoir during our Reservoir Catfish Evaluation Project from 2004 to 2008. Research showed a blue catfish harvest rate two-to-three (2-3)-times higher than reported in similar studies nationwide. Research shows that it takes a blue catfish in Truman and Lake of the Ozarks about fifteen (15) years to reach thirty-one inches (31") in length and a weight of about twelve (12) pounds. A fifteen (15) year old blue catfish that is thirty-one inches (31") today can easily live another ten to fifteen (10-15) years and reach sixty (60) or eighty (80) pounds. For that to happen, however, we have to make sure that anglers don't harvest them all. Data indicated that anglers were harvesting too many blue catfish before they reached their growth potential. As a top level predator, blue catfish can and do feed on a wide variety of aquatic organisms from zebra mussels to smaller blue catfish. As a rule, like any predatory game fish, blue catfish will feed on the prey that are the most abundant and easily caught. In Truman Reservoir and Lake of the Ozarks, that is gizzard shad. In May 2010, the Department held stakeholder meetings to discuss potential regulation changes. Those in attendance included recreational and tournament anglers, catfishing guides, organized catfish angler groups, bait shop and marina owners, media representatives, judges and prosecuting attorneys, local chambers of commerce, state representatives and other government and non-government groups such as the Department of Natural Resources, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and Ameren UE. The majority of attendees were in favor of potential regulations. The regulation changes provide harvest protection for medium-size blue catfish, which will allow more blue catfish to reach larger sizes. Doubling the daily limit from five (5) to ten (10) also encouraged the harvest of smaller blue catfish. The numbers of smaller blue catfish in both reservoirs are adequate to allow for additional harvest. Encouraging more harvest of smaller blue catfish has the potential to reduce competition among blue catfish, which may actually improve growth. Encouraging the harvest of smaller blue catfish will still allow anglers to take fish home for the table. Because of the slow growth exhibited by blue catfish, it will take at least seven (7) or eight (8) years before the population will start to show any significant response to the regulation and a long-term evaluation will be conducted at that time. Missouri is nationally known for our fishery resources. We have no evidence that the local economy would be negatively impacted by this regulations change. In fact, it is our opinion that the local economy would improve as a result of this regulation drawing more anglers to the area as the fishery improves. The Department's history of regulations on reservoirs and streams have documented improved fishing. Examples include: The Lake Taneycomo twenty inch (20") minimum trout regulations on the upper three (3) miles of the lake, minimum length limits for crappie on Truman and other major reservoirs, banning commercial harvest of catfish on the Missouri River, and the striped bass fishery at Bull Shoals, just to name a few. All of these regulations have created "destination fisheries" for the state and local economies.</p>

Periodic Review Comments

July 1 - August 31, 2015

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
8/26/15	Ryan Moss	Sikeston	3 CSR 10-7.431: Deer Hunting Seasons: General Provisions	Oppose	By making the limit of bucks go down for your yearly limit you will drive down the revenue. Not only for the state but the farmers that lease there land as well for hunting parties. The revenue from the permits. As well as you wont have as many people travel to get one buck and then not able to get one in rifle season. That is what they want to hunt is that trophy and now you are wanting to take away from that. I think it s a horrible idea and will drive the revenue and result in lay offs for department of conservation and as well as less revenue to thrive the population.	The Department of Conservation considered numerous options for the 2016 deer season. One (1) option proposed was to limit deer hunters to one(1) buck only, regardless of how it was harvested (archery, firearm, alternative method, etc). However, based on public comments received, the Department decided for the 2016 season to allow hunters to be able to harvest two (2) bucks during archery and firearm seasons combined.
8/27/15	Shannon Henson	Exeter	3 CSR 10-7.431: Deer Hunting Seasons: General Provisions	Oppose	I strongly disagree with the proposed change on the shorting of the 2016-2017 firearms season. As I see it the season is to short to begin with, and this makes it even worse when you have a job and family to take care of.	The proposed shortening of the November portion of the firearms deer season was not approved by Conservation Commission. The eleven (11) day structure that has been the traditional length of the November firearm season will remain unchanged for the 2016 season based on public comment received.
8/27/15	Joshua Smith	unknown (zip= Independence)	3 CSR 10-7.440: Migratory Game Birds and Waterfowl: Seasons, Limits	Support	Everything seems to be good except the shooting hours. I feel the shooting hours should be extended to half hour after sunset just like any other season. It seems majority of the birds I've watched don't start flying off evening fields till sunset. Which does not give hunters a chance on evening hunts unless the shooting hours are extended.	Daily hunting hours for migratory birds are set by the US Fish and Wildlife Service. Given that hunting hours are federally regulated, the Department of Conservation has no control over when a hunter begins or ends their hunting day.

**Periodic Review Comments
July 1 - August 31, 2015**

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
8/28/15	Wes Johnston	Springfield	3 CSR 10-7.455: Turkeys: Seasons, Methods, Limits	Support	I do agree with the seasons, methods and limits. I understand why there is a limit of one bearded turkey in the first week of the spring season. What I would like to see is a way to let a hunter harvest two birds the same day on the 2nd and 3rd week. Maybe have a bonus a hunter could pay extra for at time of purchase or a drawing for the option to harvest two birds. thanks	Turkey hunters are allowed to harvest only one (1) bird daily during the second and third weeks of the spring turkey season in order to spread out the harvest and reduce hunter interference and competition for those hunters who have been unsuccessful earlier in the day, and thus, improves the quality of the hunt for all hunters.

**Periodic Review Comments
July 1 - August 31, 2015**

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
8/30/15	Kurt Brashear	unknown (incomplete zip code)	3 CSR 10- 6.510: Channel Catfish, Blue Catfish, Flathead Catfish	Oppose	I oppose the Blue Catfish slot rules based upon the following: 1. The sample methods were not typical of normal cat fishing methods. 2. No one person from the department went with or sought the advice of a catfishing guide on what size fish they were catching. Fish biologist are not FISHING experts but are fish experts. 3. If the idea is to remove the smaller fish to allow the bigger fish to get bigger, why not allow anglers to keep crappie below 9 inches, this would allow crappie to get bigger. 4. Other states have a SLOT limit but allow anglers to keep 2 blue catfish above a certain size. I took my grand kids fishing today and although we caught fish, we had to release all 9 keepers because they were in the slot size 26 to 34 inches. We did catch 2 small ones about 18 inches that were to small to keep, no meat.5. Why not allow anglers to keep 2 fish over 26 inches? at least we could have brought a few fish home today. Grandchildren would have enjoyed that, other states do it why not Missouri? I encourage you to go blue cat fishing or contact guides on Truman lake to get their input. Would you change the highway system because engineers said it was a good idea without consulting Truckers?	For a number of years, Department of Conservation staff had been concerned about potential overharvest of blue catfish in Truman Reservoir and Lake of the Ozarks, especially larger blue catfish. Anglers had also expressed concern about the decline in the numbers of large blue catfish. Due to high fishing pressure and angler harvest, the numbers of larger blue catfish in Truman and Lake of the Ozarks had steadily declined since the mid-1990s. These conditions were preventing blue catfish from reaching their full growth potential. In the Department's 2002 Statewide Catfish Angler Survey, nearly thirty-five percent (35%) of respondents indicated the quality of catfishing at Truman Reservoir had declined over the last ten (10) years, while about twelve percent (12%) indicated catfishing had improved. Department staff had also documented very high harvest and slow growth of blue catfish at Truman Reservoir during our Reservoir Catfish Evaluation Project from 2004 to 2008. Research showed a blue catfish harvest rate two-to-three (2-3)-times higher than reported in similar studies nationwide. Research shows that it takes a blue catfish in Truman and Lake of the Ozarks about fifteen (15) years to reach thirty-one inches (31") in length and a weight of about twelve (12) pounds. A fifteen (15) year old blue catfish that is thirty-one inches (31") today can easily live another ten to fifteen (10-15) years and reach sixty (60) or eighty (80) pounds. For that to happen, however, we have to make sure that anglers don't harvest them all. Data indicated that anglers were harvesting too many blue catfish before they reached their growth potential. As a top level predator, blue catfish can and do feed on a wide variety of aquatic organisms from zebra mussels to smaller blue catfish. As a rule, like any predatory game fish, blue catfish will feed on the prey that are the most abundant and easily caught. In Truman Reservoir and Lake of the Ozarks, that is gizzard shad. In May 2010, the Department held stakeholder meetings to discuss potential regulation changes. Those in attendance included recreational and tournament anglers, catfishing guides, organized catfish angler groups, bait shop and marina owners, media representatives, judges and prosecuting attorneys, local chambers of commerce, state representatives and other government and non-government groups such as the Department of Natural Resources, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and Ameren UE. The majority of attendees were in favor of potential regulations. The regulation changes provide harvest protection for medium-size blue catfish, which will allow more blue catfish to reach larger sizes. Doubling the daily limit from five (5) to ten (10) also encouraged the harvest of smaller blue catfish. The numbers of smaller blue catfish in both reservoirs are adequate to allow for additional harvest. Encouraging more harvest of smaller blue catfish has the potential to reduce competition among blue catfish, which may actually improve growth. Encouraging the harvest of smaller blue catfish will still allow anglers to take fish home for the table. Because of the slow growth exhibited by blue catfish, it will take at least seven (7) or eight (8) years before the population will start to show any significant response to the regulation and a long-term evaluation will be conducted at that time. Missouri is nationally known for our fishery resources. We have no evidence that the local economy would be negatively impacted by this regulations change. In fact, it is our opinion that the local economy would improve as a result of this regulation drawing more anglers to the area as the fishery improves. The Department's history of regulations on reservoirs and streams have documented improved fishing. Examples include: The Lake Taneycomo twenty inch (20") minimum trout regulations on the upper three (3) miles of the lake, minimum length limits for crappie on Truman and other major reservoirs, banning commercial harvest of catfish on the Missouri River, and the striped bass fishery at Bull Shoals, just to name a few. All of these regulations have created "destination fisheries" for the state and local economies.

**Periodic Review Comments
July 1 - August 31, 2015**

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
8/31/15	Philip Kneibert	KS	3 CSR 10-5.551: Nonresident Firearms Any-Deer Hunting Permit	Oppose	I feel there should be an exception or a reduced price for non resident hunters who pay taxes and/or own property in Missouri. Why do we pay the same amount as those who have no connection to the state?	The Department of Conservation routinely hears from many Missouri residents who believe that nonresident permit prices are too low. Following a comprehensive review of permit pricing, nonresident permit fees were increased across the board in 2009 and reduced-cost nonresident landowner permits were eliminated. The logic for elimination of those permits was that nonresident landowners do not contribute to conservation on a daily basis the way resident landowners do. Since that time, the Department has been contacted by several nonresident landowners requesting that the reduced-cost permits be re-established. As a result, the Regulations Committee considered the topic in July 2015. Following discussion, they agreed that additional research and evaluation is necessary prior to formal consideration of reimplementation of those permit options.

**Periodic Review Comments
July 1 - August 31, 2015**

Date	Name	City	Rule	Support/ Oppose	Comment	MO Department of Conservation Response
8/31/15	Johnny "Dr. Duck" Everhart	Blairstown	3 CSR 10-6.510: Channel Catfish, Blue Catfish, Flathead Catfish	Oppose	<p>The blue cat study was a JOKE! The Slot Limit on Truman is a JOKE! The mdc's conclusion was a BIG JOKE! The Slot Sized Blue Cat Catfish is the most abundant and the most desired fish for table fair. MDC based much of this decision from a 2001 study and questionnaire. In this research MDC stated most anglers said quality of cat fishing had declined? In their own report showed that 35% said declined and 39% polled said it was as good or better? MDC wanting BC fish to reach 18 to 20 years old before you can keep them past the slot. The MDC messed up on this one! While MDC wants us to catch and release Blue Catfish other states like Maryland has learned their lesson and the blue catfish is on the INVASIVE list to keep or throw on the bank. This species will clean a lake out of other game fish. The whole thing was based on Junk Science and not enough opinion from the guides and anglers. MDC Biologists who ran this project may of been book smart but were not experience anglers. They decided before the public input meeting that they had a "phone and a pen" and they were going to dump this on us no matter what we thought. If you want to hear what I really think? call me Johnny Everhart at 660.885.5049</p>	<p>For a number of years, Department of Conservation staff had been concerned about potential overharvest of blue catfish in Truman Reservoir and Lake of the Ozarks, especially larger blue catfish. Anglers had also expressed concern about the decline in the numbers of large blue catfish. Due to high fishing pressure and angler harvest, the numbers of larger blue catfish in Truman and Lake of the Ozarks had steadily declined since the mid-1990s. These conditions were preventing blue catfish from reaching their full growth potential. In the Department's 2002 Statewide Catfish Angler Survey, nearly thirty-five percent (35%) of respondents indicated the quality of catfishing at Truman Reservoir had declined over the last ten (10) years, while about twelve percent (12%) indicated catfishing had improved. Department staff had also documented very high harvest and slow growth of blue catfish at Truman Reservoir during our Reservoir Catfish Evaluation Project from 2004 to 2008. Research showed a blue catfish harvest rate two-to-three (2-3)-times higher than reported in similar studies nationwide. Research shows that it takes a blue catfish in Truman and Lake of the Ozarks about fifteen (15) years to reach thirty-one inches (31") in length and a weight of about twelve (12) pounds. A fifteen (15) year old blue catfish that is thirty-one inches (31") today can easily live another ten to fifteen (10-15) years and reach sixty (60) or eighty (80) pounds. For that to happen, however, we have to make sure that anglers don't harvest them all. Data indicated that anglers were harvesting too many blue catfish before they reached their growth potential. As a top level predator, blue catfish can and do feed on a wide variety of aquatic organisms from zebra mussels to smaller blue catfish. As a rule, like any predatory game fish, blue catfish will feed on the prey that are the most abundant and easily caught. In Truman Reservoir and Lake of the Ozarks, that is gizzard shad. In May 2010, the Department held stakeholder meetings to discuss potential regulation changes. Those in attendance included recreational and tournament anglers, catfishing guides, organized catfish angler groups, bait shop and marina owners, media representatives, judges and prosecuting attorneys, local chambers of commerce, state representatives and other government and non-government groups such as the Department of Natural Resources, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and Ameren UE. The majority of attendees were in favor of potential regulations. The regulation changes provide harvest protection for medium-size blue catfish, which will allow more blue catfish to reach larger sizes. Doubling the daily limit from five (5) to ten (10) also encouraged the harvest of smaller blue catfish. The numbers of smaller blue catfish in both reservoirs are adequate to allow for additional harvest. Encouraging more harvest of smaller blue catfish has the potential to reduce competition among blue catfish, which may actually improve growth. Encouraging the harvest of smaller blue catfish will still allow anglers to take fish home for the table. Because of the slow growth exhibited by blue catfish, it will take at least seven (7) or eight (8) years before the population will start to show any significant response to the regulation and a long-term evaluation will be conducted at that time. Missouri is nationally known for our fishery resources. We have no evidence that the local economy would be negatively impacted by this regulations change. In fact, it is our opinion that the local economy would improve as a result of this regulation drawing more anglers to the area as the fishery improves. The Department's history of regulations on reservoirs and streams have documented improved fishing. Examples include: The Lake Taneycomo twenty inch (20") minimum trout regulations on the upper three (3) miles of the lake, minimum length limits for crappie on Truman and other major reservoirs, banning commercial harvest of catfish on the Missouri River, and the striped bass fishery at Bull Shoals, just to name a few. All of these regulations have created "destination fisheries" for the state and local economies.</p>