

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: NR Waterfowl

From: TJ Johnson [drtjohnson@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2015 1:38 PM
To: Spies, Jim
Subject: NR Waterfowl

Good afternoon Jim,

I am writing you this letter on the nonresident waterfall bill coming up on June 4. I live south of Groton and work as a chiropractor in Aberdeen. I am a very avid waterfall hunter and over the past couple of years there's been a significant increase in pressure on getting permission to hunt a farmer's field and having multiple hunting groups in the field at the same time. Both this and last year I had permission for multiple fields and when I got to the fields there were non-resident hunters already in the field who did not have permission. We did kick them out of the field, however it is never a fun experience to have to do that. Never once have I had that experience with another in state hunter. I encourage you to decrease the number of nonresident licenses by 10%. I request removal of the 500 3-day licenses and northeast South Dakota and have them returned to the Missouri River area or eliminated entirely. I do not mind some nonresident youth licenses for the same time frame as the resident youth season and we need these rules to stay in effect for at least three years so we do not have to have this conversation every year.

I appreciate your time in reading this email and consideration on the content.

Thank you Jim,

Dr. TJ Johnson
Groton, SD
[605-380-1599](tel:605-380-1599)

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: NR Waterfowl

From: TJ Johnson [drtjohnson@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2015 1:38 PM
To: Spies, Jim
Subject: NR Waterfowl

Good afternoon Jim,

I am writing you this letter on the nonresident waterfall bill coming up on June 4. I live south of Groton and work as a chiropractor in Aberdeen. I am a very avid waterfall hunter and over the past couple of years there's been a significant increase in pressure on getting permission to hunt a farmer's field and having multiple hunting groups in the field at the same time. Both this and last year I had permission for multiple fields and when I got to the fields there were non-resident hunters already in the field who did not have permission. We did kick them out of the field, however it is never a fun experience to have to do that. Never once have I had that experience with another in state hunter. I encourage you to decrease the number of nonresident licenses by 10%. I request removal of the 500 3-day licenses and northeast South Dakota and have them returned to the Missouri River area or eliminated entirely. I do not mind some nonresident youth licenses for the same time frame as the resident youth season and we need these rules to stay in effect for at least three years so we do not have to have this conversation every year.

I appreciate your time in reading this email and consideration on the content.

Thank you Jim,

Dr. TJ Johnson
Groton, SD
[605-380-1599](tel:605-380-1599)

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Public comment on non-resident waterfowl for June commission meeting

From: Allen, Justin

Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2015 2:49 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Cc: 'jlcoop11@aol.com'; Peterson, Cathy; 'hpd@nvc.net'; 'barryj@gwtc.net'; Jensen, Gary; Phillips, W. Scott; Sather, Duane; Spies, Jim; Allen, Justin

Subject: Public comment on non-resident waterfowl for June commission meeting

Dear GFP Commissioners,

As a resident waterfowl hunter I do not support the proposed changes in non-resident waterfowl licenses. I do not support the following proposals:

1. Add Spink County to current nine-county northeast SD license unit.
2. Retain the allocation of 500 three-day licenses for the NE SD license unit.
3. Allocate 2,000 10-day licenses for the NE SD license unit.
4. Allocate 1,750 10-day licenses for the unit comprised of that part of the state not included in the NE SD and SE SD license units.
5. Remove Potter County from the central SD three-day license unit.
6. Create a new nonresident license unit in northcentral SD to include Campbell, Walworth, Potter, Faulk, Edmunds and McPherson Counties.
7. Allocate 250 three-day licenses to this new unit in north central SD that would be transferred from the central SD hunting unit.
8. Reduce the license allocation for the central SD hunting unit to 1200 licenses.
9. Transfer 50 three-day licenses from the central SD unit to the existing 5-county unit in southeastern SD along the Missouri River.
11. Remove the restriction in SE SD on nonresidents hunting during the September Canada goose hunting season.
12. Create 100 nonresident youth waterfowl licenses (25 season-long licenses in the SE SD unit and 75 10-day licenses valid in the rest of the state).

3-day licenses were created for the Pierre area years ago during legislation and were a compromise between waterfowl hunters and commercial interests. They were not created to be moved around the state in order to sell more licenses or what some think better used. I would actually like to see some of the current NE SD 500 3-days license moved make to the Pierre area. Having lived and still waterfowl hunting in the NE and SE portions of the state I feel the proposed unit changes does nothing to spread out hunting pressure but will actually increase competition for quality hunting areas in all units proposed. Increased competition leads to leasing of land and less opportunity for many. I would support 10-day

licenses not being valid in the central region of the state (Pierre area to Chamberlain), you have not seen pressure until you spend a week in the Pierre Area in Dec. or Jan. Bottom line, Increasing NR licenses in any sector of hunting in SD leads to more commercial hunting operations and the majority loose out when that occurs.

I have watched the process of this entire NR waterfowl licenses closely and have read all public comments during the work group process as I hope you have as well. I have also listened to public comments at the two previous commission meeting regarding NR waterfowl. Everyone is saying the same thing so I'm not going to go into a lengthy discussion about current hunting pressure, guides/outfitters, leasing of land, quality hunting, hunting access on private and public ground because if you have listened to the hunters you are well aware of each. However, It is very clear to anyone that the vast majority of the folks that are most impacted by the proposed changes do not want additional licenses, period. If anything they want a decrease. Even about 50% of the NRs that wrote in do not want an increase. They are aware what increased pressure would do to SD waterfowl hunting. Plus they are happy with statistically drawing a license 2 out of 3 years. I know NRs that have drawn 8 years in a row, many 4 years plus in a row. Not that you should weigh your decision on NR opinions but none of the NR I hunt with each year want an increase. I think it is pretty clear the decision that needs to be made.

Outdoor and hunting activities are a huge draw for our residents to stay here and live their lives but yet we continue to put the wishes of a few non-resident hunters and commercial hunting interests first. Why is that? The current proposals have no positive impact on resident hunters, period. It does nothing but hurt the quality of the hunting for residents and non-residents alike. Raising license numbers or moving them to areas in which they were not created for is not supported by the hunters that truly care about the quality of the resource. I do not support any actions that would increase non-resident licenses sold.

Thank you for your time,

Justin Allen

Pierre, SD

-On a side note I'm neutral on Bennett Co. being moved into unit 2. I have hunted down there many times during the tag season and 9 day January season. Paid pheasant and deer hunting is very common within a few miles of the refuge and honestly 3 landowners own a good chunk of the farm ground the geese and ducks use throughout the winter. I would be concerned 1. These landowners will either lease hunting rights on that ground or do paid waterfowl hunts. 2. The straight crop ground GFP has leased into walk-in will be taken out because the landowner could make more money leasing in privately. Just something to think about

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: GFP Waterfowl License Ciscussion

From: "Lloyd Hodgkin" <lloydhodgin@nvc.net>

Date: May 6, 2015 at 10:10:21 AM CDT

To: <jlcoop11@aol.com>, <cathy.peterson@state.sd.us>, <hpd@nvc.net>, <barryj@gwtc.net>, <gary.jensen@state.sd.us>, <wscott.phillips@state.sd.us>, <duane.sather@state.sd.us>, <jim.spies@state.sd.us>

Cc: "Chuck Dieter" <charles.dieter@gmail.com>

Subject: GFP Waterfowl License Ciscussion

Good day,

My name is Lloyd Hodgkin and I am a resident of Aberdeen and a lifelong resident of South Dakota. I grew up in Custer so I have seen all of what our state has to offer with respect to recreation for the sports man and woman. Although I live and recreate extensively in the NE, I am west river at heart. I'd like to take a moment to comment about the commission's consideration with respect to its recommendations regarding out of state waterfowl hunting licenses.

I am opposed to any change to our current system. I find that here in North East South Dakota, the pressure of out of state hunters is apparent. I primarily rely on public lands for my opportunities. I spend a great deal of time scouting and locating my best hunting. For those of you that waterfowl, you know the number of hours necessary to locate the birds, find the cover, discover their pattern and set up early one morning for a successful hunt. Clearly, one of my favorite activities and one that I have successfully transplanted into my son.

As you consider the recommendation, please keep in mind first and foremost the in-state hunter. Too often, this discussion seems to be driven by the idea that more out of state licenses will provide substantial economic activity to our area and bolster local economies. I don't deny that hunters that come to our communities have their modest impact. But that impact is tiny compared to the economic impact of the local and in state hunter/sportsman. Each and every day of the year I occupy my home, run my business, but my clothes and groceries, go to my local restaurants, purchase my gas and ammunition and bait. I travel this corner of the state extensively in pursuit of waterfowl and fish. My contribution and the contribution of my fellow in-state sportsmen and women far exceeds any small addition that an out of state hunter will produce.

I don't need to point out the impact that additional hunters in a relatively small area can have to the quality of waterfowl hunting. Others more schooled than I have already pointed this out to you. It's important that you know that I concur with their thoughts on this matter and can relate personal stories that make their point.

I know that there has been a significant push to increase these licenses over the years. Many of those promoting this either do so out of self-interest as they are already involved in the guide services they hope to expand or they are local economic development people that have great intentions, but they don't understand the nature of waterfowl hunting. They see this in the same vein a pheasant hunting. We all know this is considerably different than pheasant hunting.

Apples and Oranges. I know these people in Aberdeen and they are just wrong about what they believe this would do for our economy. We know that opportunities to hunt private land will be diminished as out-of-staters lease up the land. We also know that after a few days, the birds will redirect their activities and that will take those out-of-state hunters off the private land and place them into direct competition with those of us that rely on public lands for our hunting.

I have one modest suggestion. If you feel you must increase licenses to placate the economic development argument and the guided service providers, add a new class of license that only applies to private lands. Much like a refuge. They can hunt the land offered by the guides, but not public grounds.

Thanks for your time. Again, please keep in mind the impact that your choice will have on the in-state hunters as your primary concern as you move forward. We need our representation in your group as well. We deserve protection of our heritage and we are relying on you. I welcome any response you may have to my comments.

Regards,

Lloyd Hodgin
Aberdeen SD.

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Non-resident waterfowl licensing

From: Dick Werner <dickwerner_5@hotmail.com>

Date: May 6, 2015 at 11:31:32 AM CDT

To: "[Jlcoop11@aol.com](mailto:jlcoop11@aol.com)" <jlcoop11@aol.com>, "cathy.peterson@state.sd.us" <cathy.peterson@state.sd.us>, "hpd@nvc.net" <hpd@nvc.net>, "barryj@gwtc.net" <barryj@gwtc.net>, "gary.jensen@state.sd.us" <gary.jensen@state.sd.us>, "wscott.phillips@state.sd.us" <wscott.phillips@state.sd.us>, "duane.sather@state.sd.us" <duane.sather@state.sd.us>, "jim.spies@state.sd.us" <jim.spies@state.sd.us>, "Hepler, Kelly" <kelly.hepler@state.sd.us>, Tony Leif <tony.leif@state.sd.us>

Subject: Non-resident waterfowl licensing

SD GF&P Commissioners and GF&P staff,

I am Rep. Dick Werner the Prime Sponsor of HB 1185. I have worked on this non-resident waterfowl licensing legislation for three years. The final decision is now in your hands, where it should be. I hope you will take into consideration the work groups findings in your upcoming decision. Understand most of the work groups discussion was not unanimous, but we went into it knowing that would never be possible.

Personally I want to make several things very clear:

- 1.) I am not out to increase non-resident waterfowl licenses.
- 2.) I am totally sensitive to those parts of the state that currently have pressure on their waterfowl hunting.

I think about this issue a lot and am apologize for sending this last minute email on this subject prior to your meeting tomorrow. Here are my final thoughts for your consideration.

Ten-Day License

The 10-day licenses are one that I have given the most thought about. At a minimum, I feel the Commission should eliminate the unit NRW-11A (Bennett County) and roll that allotment of 25 licenses into the current NRW-OOB allotment of 3725, for a total of 3750 NRA-OOB licenses offered for the 2015 season.

In regards to the work groups discussion to establish a Unit B with 2000 license and a Unit C with the 1750 licenses. This very likely may provide some relief on the pressure in the northeastern part of the state, but the hunters buying these licenses may very likely follow a migration over that 10 days and it would limit their ability to move about the state. I would be fine with approval of this proposal but it may very likely bring the most heat to the department as its a significant change.

Three-Day License:

This one I have the most passion about as the waterfowl migration has changed in our state over the years and we have increased waterfowl numbers, those coupled with unused licenses that could be used in other parts of the state where there is minimal pressure. In particular, the north central part of the state where there is minimal

pressure and a significant distance from the state's population base. The work groups discussion of moving 250 licenses from the current NRW-OOX (Missouri River) to a new 6 county area that would include Potter County into this new unit is one that I feel is necessary. This move may actually help the current NRW-OOX area as there will be some added pressure to move the waterfowl south. These 250 licenses need to be both private and public.

In regards to moving an additional 50 licenses to the south eastern part of the state I feel that was a good compromise and the Commission needs to take action to approve that proposal. However, one consideration could be to move those 50 licenses from the current 500 allotment NRW-OOY (Northeast) that was moved there years ago from the Missouri River NRW-OOX. If that was done than 1250 licenses would stay in NRW-OOX and NRW-OOY would reduce from 500 to 450. It would give some help to address the pressure in the northeast. Regardless, these 50 licenses need to be moved to the southeast unit.

Nonresident Geese

All I am going to say is we have geese everywhere and more then we have ever had and they are creating increased depredation issues.

I hope the Commission takes favorable consideration to make some of these minor but necessary changes to our non-resident waterfowl management of licenses for the 2015 season. I know you get tons of emails and letters from certain groups in the state, believe me I've been there. The legislature has given full confidence to the Commission to take reasonable action on this issue. I'm hopeful that can happen starting in 2015 and can continue for decades to follow.

Rep. Dick Werner
1505 McDonald Drive
Huron, SD 57350
605-350-1371

April 17, 2015
Mr. John Cooper
108 Iris Court
Pierre, SD 57501

Dear John:

I hope you remember me. I lived and worked in Pierre 20 plus years ago and made your acquaintance many times. I was chairman of Pierre DU for 3 years and we hunting ducks together once by Gettysburg were my brother was a long-time game warden. Regardless, I certainly remember you and have followed your service as a Federal Warden, SD GF&P Director and Commissioner. I hold the highest respect for you as a leader and protector of our wildlife and SD hunting heritage. Thank you for your service. I write today to voice my thoughts and concerns regarding the NR waterfowl license issue to be finalized by the Commission in June.

Of particular interest to me is the situation on the Mo. River near Springfield. Before I go into that, I do wish to clarify I have followed developments of the NR Waterfowl Workgroup and filed my personal input at that level. Pursuant to my calculations of the filed comments, 85% received from SD residents want no changes or a reduction in current NR licenses and 46% of non-residence want no change to current allotment. Thus overwhelming majority of respondents do not want more NR licenses. But, the Workgroup majority is NOT LISTENING. One example being the concept that NR licenses allotted to Pierre are to be considered transferrable to the NE or anywhere else. As you know, those additional licenses were a part of the deal cut by Mike Rounds specific to Pierre area commercial goose operations & have no correlation to other parts of the state. Its inaccurate and unfair to think otherwise.

As to the SE or lower Missouri Unit, primarily Springfield; I can say John, without any contention that I am a qualified authority on the history of events in this area. I first hunted what is referred to locally as the Springfield Bottom, for near 50 years beginning in 1965. I have hunted there each year since. I grew up in Springfield, went to high school there and, excluding college and my 13 year absence while in Pierre, have lived my entire life within a few miles of this area. I have witnessed how hunting pressure has increased and quality opportunity has decreased overtime in spite of the fact that more marsh exists due to sedimentation. It's my opinion that this area is drastically overcrowded for much of the season and in direct proportion to increase of SD NR hunters. Unless one has actually been out on that marsh, especially a couple days after the prairies freeze up and the mallards arrive, it would be impossible to imagine. Have you ever seen 5 miles of marsh light up like a city with spot lights 2 hours before shooting time, men shouting and shooting guns off in the dark in attempt to "protect" their spots acquired 3 hours before shooting time? Come to Springfield, I'd be happy to show you. The marsh is not that large when 250 SEASON-LONG NR + Nebraskans pour into it. I hope somebody on the Commission understand that a significant portion of the marsh, the original Springfield Bottoms following closer of the dam, is closed to NE? Although not well enforced, cannot we at least try to protect that portion for SD residents? That was deal in the beginning, when once productive SD farm land was seized by the Feds under eminent domain, (most not voluntarily) and flooded. The deal was only SD hunters were

allowed. There was no such thing as NR SD hunters at the time. There is no longer can be a sustained build-up of birds. When a migration occurs, over hunting/over crowding quickly pushes them out. This never happened prior to NR. Because this area is the only place in SD where season-long NR licenses are issued, this area tends to attract many NR professional or semi-professional hunters and guides that hunt most all the time. Ducks have no refuge and get pounded relentlessly. If one goes to any of the 3 area boat ramps, almost any day of the season, the majority of pickups will be NR. We don't need more NR pressure. Situation is very sad, frustrating and most guys from the immediate SD area I know, have already given up.

The current NR controversy appears to have started when Bon Homme Co Senator VanGerpen was persuaded, by a few area businessman, to introduce legislation last year for reason of economic stimulus. As you know, VanGerpen's bill died but lead to other legislation and now GF&P is the responsible authority instead of the State Legislature. I think a good move as long as the Commission really hears and reacts appropriately to the majority opinion. Some say increasing NR licenses is a done deal and the Workforce was nothing more then a "Dog & Pony" show. I can't agree with that attitude for it is a poor reflection upon you and the Commission. I believe you truly are seeking public input, believe it to be valuable and that the final Commission decision will appropriately respond to the testimony.

In conclusion, I have faith in your leadership and request your strong influence upon this issue. I advocate, as does the majority, that there be no increase in NR waterfowl licenses and in fact my recommendation is a reduction, particularly in the SE Unit, were over time, the season-long allotment has grown from 150 to 250 . Thank you John for your consideration. I hope our paths cross again some day.

Respectfully Yours,



Jim Kirk

Springfield, SD

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: nonresident waterfowl

From: Matt Owens, MD [<mailto:matt.owens@redfieldcmh.org>]

Sent: Friday, May 15, 2015 11:10 AM

To: GFP Wild Info

Cc: 'pgillette@gillettelaw.net'; Ron Wren; 'Dave Lyon'; 'Jean Liudahl'

Subject: nonresident waterfowl

I am against additional allocation of nonresident waterfowl permits by gfp. It is obvious this is being driven by budgetary concerns, not good game management that supports local sportspersons ability "to be in the field". Perhaps cutting the budget would be more appropriate. Matthew Owens, Redfield SD. landowner

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Non Resident Licenses

From: Tim Brown [fowlhunter3@hotmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 3:41 PM

To: Spies, Jim

Subject: Non Resident Licenses

Jim,

Hi, my name is Tim Brown and am from Watertown as well. I am writing you to encourage you to please lower or keep the same amount of non resident licenses as there currently are. We also need return the 500 3 day licenses back to the river zone instead of NE South Dakota. And that the decisions made at the meetings in June have a 5 year time frame until changes can be made to the proposals to figure out if it is working or not. The final meeting is coming up soon on this matter and I wanted to make my concerns and the concerns of my fellow resident hunters voiced. Right now the current number of non resident licenses sold leads to stiff competition for a quality place to hunt. Increasing the number of these licenses will only make it tougher and lead to more non residents leasing up the hunting rights to key areas squeezing out the resident hunter. I beg you to please not let that happen. I have plenty of friends who are from out of state that think our regulations for non residents is perfect and allows for quality hunting to be had here. Which is why they send in. They feel that we are doing it right here in South Dakota where so many other states have done it wrong by allowing so many out of state hunters licenses that the hunting is not near as good. They already get drawn every year or every other at worst. And they are fine with that in order to keep the hunting good. However, I do feel that increasing the number of non res youth licenses is a good thing as long as those licenses are valid during the youth season only. It is important to encourage our youth to pick up the sport. I really look forward to hunting with my kids as my father did with me. And having good places to do it that aren't over pressured or leased up by out of staters. So please don't take that away from us residents by increasing the number of licenses sold to non residents.

Thanks for your time,
Tim Brown

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident Waterfowl Licenses

From: Curt Tesch [curtaps@venturecomm.net]
Sent: Wednesday, May 20, 2015 7:58 AM
To: Spies, Jim
Subject: Nonresident Waterfowl Licenses

Dear Jim Spies,

I have emailed on this topic before and I testified at the Brookings meeting. A lot of other people also emailed and testified. Most of this testimony had issues with the current proposals, but seems to have no effect.

I live in the northeast in Roberts county. I will be affected more than most by these proposals. By your own data you can see Roberts county is inundated by more nonresident duck hunters than any other county in the state by more than double. Let's remember we don't owe nonresidents anything. Let's have a little consideration for the resident hunter that lives here, works here, pays taxes here and in many cases as with myself, moved here for the resident hunting privileges.

I agree with creating specific zones for these nonresident licenses. Let's, however, use these zones to redistribute the hunting pressure. Right now you are proposing I believe 2,000 ten day licenses and 500 three day licenses for the northeast. Really? The 2,000 licenses in the northeast is more than what is allocated for the bulk of the rest of the state. Let's also remember the three day licenses were never intended to be distributed throughout the state, but that ship seems to have sailed. I would propose reducing the ten day licenses down to at maximum of 1,500 and move the three days licenses further west where I hear quite a bit of testimony that they might actually want them. Most of the nonresident licenses used in this area are used by what I call "day hunters". They come across the border in the morning, hunt all day, and are back in Minnesota by nightfall. Money seems to be the only reason for these licenses anyway. You are not making "tourist" money from these licenses used here. This type of hunting puts excessive pressure on the birds and they simply leave.

We have already sold out our pheasant hunting for the sake of the "almighty tourist dollar". Let's not sell out our heritage of waterfowl hunting for the sake of money. Please consider the above suggestions.

Curt Tesch
Associated Production Services
10527 469TH AV
Rosholt, SD 57260

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident Waterfowl Licenses

From: Lynn Lander <lynn.lander@aberdeen.sd.us>

Date: May 19, 2015 at 2:22:54 PM CDT

To: "jlcoop11@aol.com" <jlcoop11@aol.com>

Subject: Nonresident Waterfowl Licenses

I'm well aware of the fact the Tourism Visitors Bureaus and Motel Groups were the driving force behind expanding non-resident licenses. A large portion of these individuals that live in my area are non-hunters, thus not caring about the sport other than the extra dollars possibility derived from motel bookings from the extra licenses. I thought when the duty of determining non-resident was transferred to the Game, Fish and Parks Commission, South Dakota hunters would be a bigger priority over out-of-state hunters. It is my understanding the 9 board proposal doesn't increase the number of total licenses. However, it appears but I might be wrong with the creation of the new NR license unit in northcentral central the new unit increases the NR licenses to a concentrate area vs. the entire eastern half. I respectfully ask if you are going concentrate licenses to some of the best hunting within the state that you increase NR license fees substantially so new funds are available to buy or lease additional habitat. It seems to be a very sad fact that ducking hunting is going the same route as the commercialization of pheasant hunting within South Dakota. The Commission's decision on this major issue could ultimately set the tone for future conservation support by local hunters for many years.

Lynn Lander
505 East Palmer Circle
Aberdeen, SD 57401

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: NRW Licenses

On May 19, 2015, at 3:44 PM, Conrad Ferrara <seaeff13@comcast.net> wrote:

Dear Commissioner:

I have hunted in South Dakota for 27 of the past 30 years---largely in the Brown/McPherson County area. I have enjoyed the game, the openness, the uncrowded, unhurried ambiance of my hunting experience.

The crush to increase NR licenses is without a doubt a threat to the South Dakota hunting experience. The commercial lobby seems to be "having its way" ----in spite of heavy opposition from locals and out-of staters.

I regret that this email is even necessary. SDGFP should have quashed the movement from the get go. Someone needs to take responsibility for the quality of the hunting in South Dakota. More is NOT going to be better for the hunter or the game. Consider decreasing the available NRW licenses. South Dakota hunting should be a priviledge, not a purchase.

Sincerely,

Conrad P. Ferrara
Lawrenceville, GA

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Non-resident waterfowl licenses

From: Chuck Dieter <charles.dieter@gmail.com>

Date: May 6, 2015 at 8:57:33 PM CDT

To: John Cooper <jlcoop11@aol.com>, cathy.peterson@state.sd.us, hpd@nvc.net, barry jensen <barryj@gwtc.net>, duane.sather@state.sd.us, gary.jensen@state.sd.us, jim.spies@state.sd.us, wscott.phillips@state.sd.us

Subject: Non-resident waterfowl licenses

Dear commission members,

I will not be able to attend the meeting in Custer tomorrow because of work. As President of the SD Waterfowl Association, I want to remind you of the overwhelming testimony that occurred in Brookings on April 1. The vast majority of people spoke against any increase in non-resident licenses and most wanted a reduction in the number of hunters in order to maintain hunting quality. The SDWA has several suggestions that we would like you to consider for our group.

1. We would like to see a 5-10% *decrease* in all non-resident licenses.
2. We would like to see the 500 3-day licenses in NE SD returned to the Missouri River area where they belong.
3. We would like to see some NR youth licenses allotted for the same time frame as the resident youth season.
4. We also request that the new rules stay in effect for at least 3-5 years so we don't have this consternation every year.

Thank you for your consideration. Chuck Dieter, President of SDWA

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Support for Study Group Report

From: "Norb Barrie" <norbarrie@nvc.net>

Date: May 7, 2015 at 11:42:17 AM CDT

To: "Cathy Peterson, Vice Chair" <cathy.peterson@state.sd.us>, "Jim Spies" <jim.spies@state.sd.us>, "John Cooper" <jlcoop11@aol.com>, "Paul Dennert" <hpd@nvc.net>, "Duane Sather" <duane.sather@state.sd.us>, "Scott Phillips" <wscott.phillips@state.sd.us>, "Gary Jensen" <gary.jensen@state.sd.us>, "Barry Jensen" <barryj@gwtc.net>

Cc: "Tony Leif" <Tony.Leif@state.sd.us>

Subject: Support for Study Group Report



Aiming to hunt

SOUTH DAKOTA OPPORTUNITY GROUP

A South Dakota non profit corporation
Dedicated to growing South Dakota's tourism economy
for the benefit of all South Dakotans

May 7, 2015

Dear Commissioners

I am writing this morning to ask your support of the NR Waterfowl Study Group Report that is before you today. The report represents the best efforts of the members of the group who were bringing diverse views and interests to a single issue.

South Dakota Opportunity Group and our members believe the report also serves the common interests of all South Dakotans. The nonresident hunter brings jobs to our communities, small businesses and their employees. They also bring licensing revenue to the Game Fish and Parks, and sales and tourism tax revenue into the state coffers.

On a personal note, I want to thank you for the opportunity to serve on the Study Group. I also want to say how well Tony Leif managed this group and how well he and his staff met my needs.

Cordially

Norbe Barrie, President

cc Tony Leif

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

-----Original Message-----

From: Dan Milo [<mailto:decoydan44060@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2015 10:30 PM

To: Ascher, Debra

Subject: Re: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

Mentor, Ohio

Sent from my iPhone

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Dan Milo [<mailto:decoydan44060@yahoo.com>]

> Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 11:05 AM

> To: GFP Wild Info

> Subject: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

>

> Thank you for considering my opinion as an out of state hunter. Not knowing the state very well having only hunted there last year I really have no informed opinion on the changes of zones or allocations. I do much approve the possibility of the youth license reduction in fee.

>

> As to the allocation of out of state permits, since I'm not a constituent I say this with all do respect. I really can't understand on why the allocations are so small for out of state hunters in relation to the overall amount of area to hunt. We hunted in McPherson county and saw our heard only one other group of waterfowlers the entire week we hunted.

>

> We hunted the week of the pheasant opener. I could see making weeks that residents would like less pressure having reduced allocation to non resident duck hunters.

>

> I was dumbfounded to how easy it was to gain permission to hunt potholes littered with ducks as the locals cared very little about the ducks. I do realize I hunted only one county. We had good success, however we could have used a little more pressure to keep birds moving.

>

> Unfortunately, I will not be able to attend the meeting. Please keep me in the loop for future comment.

>

> Regards, Daniel W. Milo

> Sent from my iPhone

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

From: clint hay [mailto:clint_hay@live.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2015 7:28 PM

To: Ascher, Debra

Subject: Re: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

Brookings, SD

From: clint hay [mailto:clint_hay@live.com]

Sent: Wednesday, May 20, 2015 7:34 AM

To: Leif, Tony

Subject: Re: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

Tony,

Thanks for the message. I will try to make it to the Pierre meeting.

I attended the recent meeting in Brookings, and did speak I'm front of the work group.

At the end of the day, I really believe the resident hunters might not be taken seriously. We know what's going on in our state when it comes to hunting because we see it weekly. Myself and many many fellow hunters have noticed the dramatic increases in hunting pressure and how terribly difficult it is to gain permission to hunt. I was denied access over 30 times last year. The struggle is truly real.

If it's a money thing, possibly consider having a \$20 habitat stamp every year? I know hunters will have no problem spending an extra \$20. My home state of Nebraska has that in place. Resident hunters spend plenty of money in South Dakota at local business in small towns. Between hotels, bars, restaurants, gas stations we spend plenty!!

A couple proposals I would like to see are these:

The increase of NR Licenses...the current lottery in place has worked flawlessly in past years! If it's not broke, don't fix it. I think the majority of fellow NR hunters would agree.

Look at the NR college students...why are they different than regular NR's? Why don't they have to go through the lottery process? Having NR college students "God Fathered" in has definitely increased the pressure, they have no respect for landowners!! They might be one of the reasons why it's so tough to gain permission. Also, back to finances, do college students really have the money and means to travel, and spend money for hotels, bars, restaurants? It's not helping our state when it comes to hunting.

Thanks for your time Tony, I hope yourself and the commission takes a moment to listen to us resident waterfowl hunters. We are truly the future of the outdoors in this great state.

Please don't hesitate to contact me. 695-251-7482

Thanks, Clint Hay
Sent from my iPhone

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

From: Hansen, Steven T. [<mailto:SHansen@RobinsKaplan.com>]

Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2015 9:18 AM

To: Leif, Tony

Subject: RE: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

Tony,

Why the change in license allocation? I've been hunting South Dakota for a long time and things are changing. Northeast South Dakota has become highly pressured with incoming guide services locking up large chunks of lands. Outfits like Flatland Flyways are hurting the regular hunter who does not have the financial means to pay for hunting. I view these changes as government serving special interest (flatland flyway) while doing what is not best for the majority. I truly hope you reconsider. The system that was in place worked very well, why the need to change?

Regards,

Steve Hansen
13941 Woodridge Path
Savage, MN 55378

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Bennet Co.

From: Notebooms [<mailto:notebooms@siouxvalley.net>]

Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2015 5:34 PM

To: Ascher, Debra

Subject: Re: Bennet Co.

Corsica, SD 57328

From: Notebooms [<mailto:notebooms@siouxvalley.net>]

Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 9:08 AM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Bennet Co.

I oppose changing the Bennett Co. Canada Goose tag system to Unit 2.

Larry Noteboom

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Non-resident waterfowl public comment for June commission meeting

From: Allen, Renee

Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 1:16 PM

To: jlcoop11@aol.com; Peterson, Cathy; hpd@nvc.net; barryj@gwtc.net; Jensen, Gary; Phillips, W. Scott; Sather, Duane; Spies, Jim; GFP Wild Info

Subject: Non-resident waterfowl public comment for June commission meeting

Dear GFP Commissioners,

I'm writing in regards to nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota. I am against any increase in licenses sold or any structure change to the current system and would like to see a 5-10% decrease in NR fall licenses available/sold in NE SD, central SD and eastern SD spring snows. I do not support NR youth licenses during the regular waterfowl season and believe all 3-day licenses should be moved back to central SD on private land only where they were originally created for.

My 3 children, husband and I enjoy our great waterfowl hunting in SD. I was born and raised on a rural South Dakota farm and despite the prospects of greener pastures across our borders I have chosen to raise my family in SD largely because of our hunting and fishing opportunities. It has been unfortunate to slowly watch the opportunities residents once had fade away in the name of paid hunting and non-resident tourism revenue. Every year it becomes increasingly harder to access to quality private land, this is especially true gaining waterfowl access in the last 5 years. It seems to me our state's hunting is becoming more commercialized every year. I see increasing nonresident licenses no different than another attempt by a small group of people wanting to make money and commercialize waterfowl hunting just so it can be like pheasant hunting. I firmly believe that if GFP commission increases nonresident waterfowl licenses it will increase paid hunting across waterfowl areas. Increased paid hunting; just like in other states, increases waterfowl guides and outfitters which lease huge amounts of land and closes the door to anyone that ever had hunted that ground. At the same time it increases competition for the remaining areas. As a resident hunter of SD I fail to see how my family should sacrifice our quality hunting opportunities so an outfitter or guide can run paid nonresident hunters or watch a nonresident take hunting opportunities away from my kids today or in their future! Let's preserve this state's hunting heritage for the residents that reside here year around.

Thanks

Renee Allen

Pierre, SD

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: SD waterfowl regulations

From: Pearson, Dave [<mailto:DPearson@winthrop.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 8:31 AM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: SD waterfowl regulations

I grew up in SD, own property there and have been hunting ducks for some 30 years as a nonresident. I am very concerned about any proposal to reduce out of state licenses, which are already at a premium. We out of state hunters bring revenue into SD, are there for a limited time and aid in conservation through the purchase of our licenses. I urge you to expand, not contract, the number of out of state license, especially in northeast SD, the Day, Marshall county area. Thank you. (do you wonder if the federal government will take action if SD too narrowly constricts out of state licenses?)



David P. Pearson
Winthrop & Weinstine, P.A.
Shareholder
(612) 604-6692
dpearson@winthrop.com
[vCard](#) | [Bio](#)

Capella Tower | Suite 3500 | 225 S 6th Street | Minneapolis, MN 55402

Notice: Important disclaimers & limitations apply to this email.
[Please click here for our disclaimers and limitations.](#)

Ascher, Debra

Subject:

FW:

From: Edward Vanderbeck [<mailto:evanderbeck62@gmail.com>]

Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 8:32 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject:

My biggest concern that SD will go the way of my home state KS. They have totally taken the wildlife management out and went for the all mighty dollar you have such a treasure in your state the potholes as a concerned conservationist I would be sickened if the waterfowl we all work so hard to preserve are sold out for a few dollars more.

Ed Vanderbeck Columbus Ks feel free to contact me 620 704 4471

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

From: mike.olmstead@comcast.net [<mailto:mike.olmstead@comcast.net>]

Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 6:29 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

I'm against any change to the NRW zone structure or license allocations.

For the last 25 years water levels in NE & Central SD have been at historic highs. Now as water levels decline the new proposal will crowd hunters and increase pressure on ducks. As farmers and ranchers get their land back from receding water, there is no doubt they will put in tile and other flood preventative measures thereby reducing habit and places to hunt.

In the past I have chosen the NRW-00B 10 day license, under which I could hunt Brown county and McPherson county. The new proposal would end that and I would not be happy about it. From year to year, the duck migration and habit vary, sometimes you need to put on miles to find the ducks and have a good hunt. I feel the new zone structure is too limiting.

Under the current structure you get drawn for a license every other year – that's more than fair.

Don't ruin a good thing,

Mike Olmstead
7273 Jensen Ave S
Cottage Grove, MN 55016
(651) 459-7652

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: nonresident waterfowl

From: Dave Lyon [<mailto:dlyon@alliancecom.net>]

Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 6:57 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: RE: nonresident waterfowl

I am against additional allocation of nonresident waterfowl permits by GFP. It is obvious this is being driven by budgetary concerns and profits for a few preserve owners, not good game management that supports local sportspersons ability "to be in the field". Perhaps cutting the budget would be more appropriate.

This is my second time expressing my opposition to the proposed changes. From what I've read, you are receiving strong opposition from most people except those on the working group who own hunting operations.

Please do not make enact the proposed changes to the nonresident waterfowl licenses for the benefit of the few at the expense of the resident waterfowl hunters and good game management.

David Lyon
29690 482nd Ave
Hudson, SD
605/310-4143

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Non Resident Waterfowl

From: Elmo Ziebach [<mailto:ziebach@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 10:40 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Non Resident Waterfowl

I wrote earlier when you asked for comments and you responded by sending me your proposed changes to the SD Non Resident waterfowl licenses. I have been pheasant hunting in SD over twenty five years and many of those years drew a waterfowl license, Had a few goods hunts and didn't even load my gun several years. I generally bring ten to twelve Alabama boys to pheasant hunt too. Only three of us try to duck hunt.

I have read over the changes and other than moving licenses around I do not see any improvement. The change to 2000 licenses to Unit 00y-86 from state wide B-86 is questionable. These licenses were already valid for Unit Y-86 so I assume you just want to take pressure off rest of state not included in other limited Units, which in my experience in Miner, Jerauld, and Sandborn, is pretty light. This will move hunt pressure to NE Counties. Maybe go with 1000 first year to see how it works.

I still believe ten day licenses for many of your license holders is a waste. Do a survey to see how many days most hunters actually hunt ducks each year. I will be surprised if half of them not living in adjacent states, are even in South Dakota for more than five days. More licenses for shorter periods as I have previously suggested would bring in more revenue to State and give more hunters opportunity to hunt. Same number of possible hunt days, more money in Fish and Game Department, and more happy hunters.

Thanks, Elmo Ziebach
Monroeville, Alabama

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Allocate 2,000 10,-,day licenses for the NE SD license unit.

-----Original Message-----

From: Joel K [<mailto:joelk@nawfi.com>]
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 1:32 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Allocate 2,000 10,-,day licenses for the NE SD license unit.

To Whom It May Concern,

Adding 2,000 10 day licenses to the current 500 3 day licenses for the NE unit will effectively end "free" hunting for SD waterfowl hunters. Non-Resident hunters from the Twin Cities metro area will entice the local farmers to lease their land. Capitalizing on another natural resource the way of the pheasants.

And there is wonder why the decline in hunters in this state???

Joel R. Knopf
Sioux Falls, SD

From: Joel K [<mailto:joelk@nawfi.com>]
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 1:39 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Waterfowl hunting license revenue

If it is added revenue you are looking for look to the resident waterfowl hunters. Increase the price of the South Dakota Migratory Bird Certification and DO NOT increase the number of non-resident licenses. A very large percentage of local waterfowl hunters would rather pay more for a SD stamp than compete with a non-resident in our own state.

Joel R Knopf
South Dakota Migratory Bird Certification
South Dakota Migratory Bird Certification
South Dakota Migratory Bird Certification

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: NR Waterfowl Licenses

From: Tanner Johnson [<mailto:tanner.johnson@heftyseed.com>]

Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 1:45 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: NR Waterfowl Licenses

Dear Committee,

As a born and raised South Dakotan and an avid waterfowl hunter this issue is very concerning to me. The number of nonresident waterfowl licenses needs to be decreased, not increased. The only people I've heard pushing for more NR licenses are the guide services and hunting outfitters. Why should resident waterfowl hunters have to be pushed aside and, more than likely, be forced to hunt public land because all of the guiding services are using their extra dollars, from NR hunters, to pay farmers to hunt their private land? Along with disappointing many South Dakota resident waterfowl hunters, this proposal seems to be nothing but a silly waste of time and government money. Sure, if you increase the number of NR licenses your out-of-state dollars might go up, but on the other hand you will definitely lose some residents hunters which will bring your in-state dollars down. What would happen if all the residents waterfowl hunters just quit and gave up their sport? More than likely these men and women would take their families, time, and MONEY and go on a vacation or do something else in a different state. So then where does that dollar end up? Not in South Dakota.

I appreciate you guys from taking the time to read our thoughts and comments on the subject. I hope you make the right decision for us resident waterfowl hunters as well as the great state of South Dakota.

Thank You!

Sincerely,

Tanner Johnson

Agronomist

Hefty Seed Company

Aberdeen, SD

(W): 605-226-2492

(C): 605-252-0941

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: waterfowl nonresident license allocation

From: Jim Gruber [<mailto:jgruber148@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 1:49 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: waterfowl nonresident license allocation

While reading over the current proposals one has to wonder, just who is going to be out there trying to untangle the mess this is creating? Boundaries, licenses, youth, right unit, right dates, all falls on the game and fish officer who already is over loaded with area coverage..

Sometimes things are better off left as is, a system that has worked.

Yes, S.D. has some of the greatest waterfowl hunting in the nation. And yes pressure by out of staters continues to grow.. But, there is a reason we live here. We could sacrifice and move for higher wages, and better economic opportunity, but we remain. I grew up in Mn. and saw western mn. transform from a waterfowl heaven to one that only has federal and state land left for hunting, and to realize that if you wanted to hunt in mn. you had better have your spot secured by 4 a.m. or you were out of luck.. Do we really want that here?

By increasing the number of licenses, and supposedly spreading them out over a larger area is not going to work... Waterfowl hunters, like all others, go when and where the waterfowl is located..and there in lies the problem.. the ducks and geese are not going to change their flight patterns over night.. and our hunters will be faced with the ever increasing demand by out of state hunters to be here when the ducks are.. our wetlands are not going to be crowded on the second week of the season, but at the height of the migration.. an example.. look at our lakes in the winter.. loaded with out of state houses, and with social networking it does not take long to figure out where one should locate.. and the same for waterfowl./

I believe revenue is the main driving force in this action, and perhaps we really need to look at the true outcome of this action.... thank you.... jim gruber 148 sunset park dr. estelline s.d. 57234 605 873 2017

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Non Resident Duck Hunting Licences

From: Marty Ahrendt [<mailto:mahrendt@finkbinerequipment.com>]

Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 1:51 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Cc: Mike.Ahrendt@aryzta.com

Subject: Non Resident Duck Hunting Licences

10 consecutive days even with a better possession limit is "silly". So selling 3 day licenses would be sensible (interesting to see the price tag). (2) 5 day tags is the next best thing. My brothers and I now try the Group scenario so we can come "home" to hunt w/ our DAD.....also silly but I understand that the Outfitters in state carry some clout(\$\$). In the last 5-7 years we have been denied the privilege of coming home (SD) to hunt w/ our father a couple of times as one or both of his sons don't make the drawing.....all sad but so goes life in today's political climate.

Marty Ahrendt - President
Finkbiner Equipment Co., Inc. [Burr Ridge, IL](#)
Phone 630-654-3700 Fax 630-654-3792
mahrendt@finkbinerequipment.com

The information contained in this e-mail message may be privileged, confidential and protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution, copying, printing or other use is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail message in error, please contact the sender immediately and delete the material from all computers.

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: lottery regulation for waterfowl

From: Stark, Murrel [<mailto:Murrel.Stark@jbssa.com>]

Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 1:58 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: lottery regulation for waterfowl

This lottery is nonsense. I am a former resident of SD and never did understand the limited access of NR hunters for waterfowl, when the doors are wide open for pheasants. I don't know of any other state that limits NR access to hunt waterfowl. I know a lot of people from SD that go to other states to hunt waterfowl. Why would they be against letting someone come and play in their backyard, one word, SELFISH!!!! You folks are losing out on a lot of income for your state by restricting access. I have heard all of the strawman arguments opposing opening the border for NR waterfowl hunters. I call it BS. This regulation needs to go away to allow more opportunity for people to enjoy your fine state. Some people hunt on a spur of the moment and just go. With this current system, if someone buys the license, and cannot go for unforeseen circumstances, they are just out the money. If you could buy the license over the counter, it would eliminate this. I could go on for days, but I won't. Please get this regulation removed.



MAKING YOUR
WORLD STRONGER

Murrel Stark
Distribution Center Superintendent

JBS Plainwell DC
Murrel.stark@jbssa.com

O: 269-204-3426
C: 920-636-5949
www.jbssa.com
33 11th street
Plainwell, MI 49080

Our foundation & our strength is in our values



Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: non-res water fowl

From: Beatis [<mailto:beatis@aol.com>]

Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 2:08 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: non-res water fowl

I support no changes to the non-resident water fowl license in SD. I do not support the 12 items listed in the proposal from the working group. I do however support a creation of 100 non-resident waterfowl tags during the youth waterfowl season only. The capital journal summed it up well today about this task force. They put nothing forward in the form of helping with the resource and the access issue in South Dakota. You can not come to the commission and ask for more but offer nothing in return for the local sportsmen.

Jeff Olson
Rapid City

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Proposed Non-Resident Waterfowl License Changes

From: Carlson, Joel W [<mailto:JCARLSON@amfam.com>]
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 2:27 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Proposed Non-Resident Waterfowl License Changes

Dear SDGFPs,

I appreciate the email I received today from Tony Leif, regarding the proposed changes to the NR waterfowl licenses. While I do not have a comment for each of the 12 proposed changes, I do approve of the overall changes and direction the committee is taking. As a non-resident waterfowl hunter, it is important to me that South Dakota continues to limit the number of non-resident waterfowl licenses. In doing so, I believe we are protecting the quality of hunting in your great state for years to come.

Thank you,

Joel Carlson
Omaha, NE

American Family Insurance Company | American Family Life Insurance Company | American Family Mutual Insurance Company | American Family Securities Insurance Company of Ohio | American Family Life Insurance Company of Wisconsin | Mutual American Insurance Company | 10000 Old Orchard Road, Suite 1000, Omaha, NE 68114

If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender.

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: NR Waterfowl

From: Chris Daniels [<mailto:ChrisD@huffconstructioninc.com>]

Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 2:32 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: NR Waterfowl

To whom it may concern,

I would like to see things stay the way they are, personally with the waterfowl seasons and licensing. I grew up in Iowa and have family there that put in for the draw every year. When my dad isn't drawn it stinks but at the same time I understand the reasoning and we are still able to enjoy pheasant hunting and fishing in the fall. The issue I have with adding licenses is that in the NE portion of the state we are already flooded with hunters to a point that it is deterring many locals to continue hunting. I grew up hunting in the zoo that is Iowa marshes so I will hunt as long as I can get into the field but, I am expecting the quality of hunting to be hindered from here on out as we deal with what seems to be "death by a thousand paper cuts". Add 500 here, add 2000 there and before long it is such a high number that the draw is nothing more than unrequired overhead that will be replaced by over the counter sales. SD has something special with its waterfowl hunting and a big reason we do is because of how it was set up by GFP many years ago with the draw. If we lose the draw we will be the same as everyone else with birds moving through faster than ever because of overcrowding. I can tell you one thing, Nebraska and Iowa won't be complaining.... One thing I would ask is that in the future if we keep adding more licenses I would like to see additional state/federal refuges in high pressure areas, maybe even managed pay to hunt public areas like MO has with flooded corn/etc – just a thought. Also putting a cap on waterfowl guide services as well as requiring guides to register in spring and fall would be a great addition as well!

Chris Daniels

Huff Construction – Project Manager

11 N Dakota St

Aberdeen, SD 57401

Office: 605-226-0052 X 15

Cell: 605-216-5606

Chrisd@huffconstructioninc.com



Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Comments on the proposed changes for NR wildlife licenses

From: Joe Williams [<mailto:joe@jwdevelopmentinc.com>]

Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 3:27 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Cc: Luke Laborde (Luke.Laborde@gmail.com); Jones Samuel (samcjones@bellsouth.net); Dave Dybdahl

Subject: Comments on the proposed changes for NR wildlife licenses

Hey guys, appreciate the work you did and I read over the proposed changes. Unfortunately, if I am reading them correctly, it means that South Dakota will continue to use a lottery system for obtaining a non-resident hunting license, which was the point of my comments initially being a system where planning waterfowl hunts is almost impossible. Being that every time I have visited your state (22 times in last 25 years) to hunt pheasant, McPherson County was overrun by ducks most years. I could count on one hand each time we saw local guys even hunting them. The duck population was not the issue that I could tell.

I don't get it, I really don't. I can hunt ducks all over the USA by just showing up and buying a NR license (1 to 5 day timeframes) to do just that all along the Mississippi River basin and points west and east of it easily. This makes it very easy to plan a trip in those states because we know we can hunt legally once we get there. These states have a thriving and healthy guide business which in turn has a huge economic impact on those small rural communities and gives the local farmers off season income as well.

But that's precisely my point, you have to plan out of state hunts months in advance, so how do you plan a duck hunt into a state that cannot guarantee you a license. The answer is you can't. So they go to other states.

And the real shame is that South Dakota is made for combination pheasant/duck hunt packages! There aren't many states that can offer that but you can. But with the lottery system locked in place, those are not going to happen. I've travelled there long enough to say flat out those local communities would see far better economics with out-of-state hunters flooding their community. I wonder what they'd say about these changes.

Best of luck, I hope this helps and I care, that's why I'm taking time to write.

Joe Williams

JW Development

7801 North Capital of Texas, Ste 390

Austin, TX 78731

joe@jwdevelopmentinc.com

Office: 512/901-9800

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

From: Scenic City Fishing [<mailto:Richard@ScenicCityFishing.com>]
Sent: Sunday, May 24, 2015 12:55 PM
To: Ascher, Debra
Subject: Re: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

Richard Simms
7104 Dalefield Lane
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37421

Thank you.

--
Richard Simms
www.ScenicCityFishing.com
[Scenic City Fishing on Trip Advisor](#)
[NewsChannel 9 Outdoors](#)
[RheaReview.com Outdoors](#)
[423-509-4655](tel:423-509-4655) (cell)

From: Richard Simms [<mailto:richard@sceniccityfishing.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 10:27 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Cc: Leif, Tony; Lynn Lake Lodge
Subject: Re: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

To whom it may concern:

Thank you for sharing this information. I had already read the news release regarding the proposed changes for non-resident SD waterfowl licenses.

I was disappointed when I read the recommendations. As a non-resident, it was my hope that any forthcoming changes would make the non-resident waterfowl license application process less complicated and more user-friendly. While I admit I haven't "studied" all of the 12 changes closely... I must say that my first impression was that instead of making the process less complicated, it is going to become even more complicated.

I have visited SD to duck hunt the past five years and always write about my experiences for my various media outlets. This initiates a lot of feedback from friends and readers who ask how they can do the same, and particularly seek advice on the waterfowl license application process. I cannot give them simple answers. My only answer is that, "You have to go on the South Dakota website and do some 'serious' homework... completely reading and studying the process." I tell them they must plan to spend lots of quality time learning. And if they can't understand everything, call SD and ask. I will say that I have always been EXTREMELY impressed by the staff's efficiency and ability to help callers such as me.

Still, most people I interact with either won't "do the work," or they find the SD procedure too overwhelming, and if they go anywhere, they simply head for another state where the process is easier.

With the absolutely tremendous public hunting opportunities and abundant natural resources available for waterfowlers in South Dakota ... I find it baffling as to why the state makes it so complicated for non-residents to take advantage of those opportunities and resources. This is especially true in that most SD residents could really care less about duck hunting. Invariably when I seek permission to hunt private land, landowners ask with a quizzical look, "Well, sure you can duck hunt... but why would you want to?"

I understand that pheasant is King, for good reason. But I personally believe that South Dakota is missing out on an incredible opportunity to also become a "destination state" for waterfowlers. Of course, I suppose in some respects I should be glad about that (he said selfishly). :-)

Thank you for the chance to share my feedback.

Richard Simms

www.ScenicCityFishing.com

[Scenic City Fishing on Trip Advisor](#)

[NewsChannel 9 Outdoors](#)

[RheaReview.com Outdoors](#)

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident Waterfowl Licenses

From: wendl26t@yahoo.com [<mailto:wendl26t@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Sunday, May 24, 2015 12:54 PM

To: Ascher, Debra

Subject: Re: Nonresident Waterfowl Licenses

Ryan Wendling

609 sw 13th st Beresford SD 57004

Thank you

-----Original Message-----

From: Ryan Wendling [<mailto:wendl26t@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 5:51 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Nonresident Waterfowl Licenses

To whom it may concern

I am an avid waterfowl hunter here in South Dakota. I have watched the sport turn in to a mess here in South Dakota the last 20 years. I Hunt nearly every weekend and travel miles upon miles to hunt the ducks and geese and spend countless hours scouting and learning the birds and the pattern they are taking. Not to mention the thousands of dollars I spend doing this. For me the biggest problem I have seen is that the out of state residents are making it impossible for local residents to hunt because they have guides from out of state that come in and buy up all the ground and they also get paid to take the out of staters hunting. It has also been getting harder to find land because the farmers keep telling me the out of state hunter don't care and tear up fields and leave trash all over so they just shut it down to everybody. The out of state college kids don't help the matter. Just because they take classes in SD they become a resident and they don't pay the taxes like the residents do. If anything they need to reduce the number of out of state waterfowl licenses and also look at the sections they are adding to. those areas already have enough pressure the way it is. I understand the a lot of the legislative committee could give two shits about how many emails we send or really not give a shit what we say but I guess it's worth a try.

Thanks for maybe reading this

Ryan Wendling

605-929-3929

wendl26t@yahoo.com

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

From: Stan Lucas [<mailto:stanlucas@imagemill.com>]
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 2:16 PM
To: Leif, Tony
Subject: RE: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

Tony,

I don't know if this will get to you but I must try...

Thank you so much for the courtesy of registering my comments and offering the considerate reply below. I read most SD Fish & Game posts that arrive to my email inbox. Your professionalism, thoughtfulness and considerate reply are simply fantastic...proof that good government can and does work and works hard for the citizens. Keep up the great work...I'm on your side...and tell your boss that one hunter from The Great NW thinks you deserve a raise. ;b)

I read the document you linked me to. Most of the items don't pertain to myself and friends who come out once per year at the start of deer season. We hunt deer in the early hours and at the end of the day and in the day time in between we like to either hunt pheasant and/or waterfowl. We hunt in Bennett County near the town of Martin.

For myself, the cost of a non-resident deer tag, pheasant and waterfowl is simply too great to do all 3 so most years I usually do deer and pheasant as do the other guys with whom I hunt. Were there a "package deal" I would certainly consider it.

Again, thank you for your thoughtful and professional reply and consideration of the above,

Stan Lucas
Washington State
The Great Northwest

May, 18, 2015

Thomas Skinner
801 Joann Road
Pierre, SD 57501

To whom it may concern:

I like to express my feelings and opinions concerning the proposed changes to the South Dakota GF&P nonresident waterfowl regulations.

Being a former long time nonresident and thankfully now a resident of South Dakota I feel able to speak about both sides of this issue.

Having spent many years as a conservationist as well as a water fowler it is my strong belief South Dakota enjoys the world class hunting opportunities in part of the regulations currently set forth.

To open up areas to out of state outfitters, guides & flux of nonresident hunting will be the road to ruin for the resident hunter.

I have witnessed this occurrence in other states, and Canadian provinces over the years. Rather than increase the nonresident licenses I strongly propose a decrease in them, 10% or perhaps a bit more, no lower.

Changing the 500 3- day private access land licenses from the Missouri River zone to NE SD zone should be cancelled and left as is in the Missouri River zone.

If hunting is to progress with our youth we should consider more nonresident youth licenses, with consideration to mentoring and guiding hunts for all interested young people both resident and nonresident alike.

I request our regulations stay in effect for a period of 5 years with only emergency changes considered.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Yours in sport,
Thomas Skinner
goldensundk@live.com

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Residents Against Nonresident Waterfowl Proposal

From: HESBY, MARTIN P [mh920u@att.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 17, 2015 7:44 PM
To: Peterson, Cathy
Subject: Residents Against Nonresident Waterfowl Proposal

Cathy,

Please SUPPORT SD RESIDENTS and DO NOT approve the nonresident waterfowl proposal in June- This is simply a proposal that goes against everything you are hearing from the residents of SD (April and May public comments overwhelming against this proposal). No action is really necessary, just table this ugly proposal as it is anti-resident.

Residents feel that this is our last plead to save our waterfowling heritage as we know it here in South Dakota-

I am writing to you to humbly ask, that you take no action (it is not necessary and residents actually want a 5 to 10% decrease) or amend the non-resident waterfowl proposal, and to stand by the views of the majority of the residents here in SD. No transfer of licenses from Pierre to the NE (that is in turn creating more pressure and creating new licenses despite what Tony Leif is saying. Residents want an overall decrease in nonresident licenses as the resource is already over-crowded. Brookings, Kingsbury and all the counties north have way too many nonresident waterfowl hunters already.

Please support the residents of your state, and take no action on this proposal. It is not a recommendation from the workgroup, as the workgroup was skewed in favor of those who want an increase, including Tony Leif and GFP. The South Dakota Wildlife Federation and the South Dakota Waterfowl Association have thousands of members, all who did not support the workgroup's recommendation.

You have a great opportunity, to stand by what is right, and what the resident waterfowl hunters here in your great state of SD, have to say- That is simple, no increase, shift from Pierre to the NE or any other zone. The youth licenses were a concession to the workgroup, but they should only be valid during the existing youth season, not general licenses as that is simply an increase of 100 nonresident hunters (because youth already apply and take out of the existing pool, now we will have a separate allocation freeing up 100 more adults).

It is my understanding from attending the last meeting in May that the commissioners voted to approve the workgroup (couldn't even get a 2nd on approving it) to hear public comments for 30 days, and to either decide to table the proposal in full and take no action, amend the existing proposal, or approve it.

PLEASE DO NOT APPROVE THIS PROPOSAL- Approving this is going AGAINST THE RESIDENTS OF SOUTH DAKOTA-

Respectfully,

Martin Hesby
1408 Sheridan Circle
Brookings SD 57006

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Public Comment on Non-resident Waterfowl for June Commission Meeting

From: Robert Naylor [<mailto:Robert@trianglecf.org>]

Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 9:33 AM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Public Comment on Non-resident Waterfowl for June Commission Meeting

To the honorable Members of the GFP Commission:

I live in North Carolina, and I am a frequent out of state visitor to the great state of South Dakota. I look forward to visiting every year, and each year I eagerly await the results of the out-of-state lottery for non-resident waterfowl licenses. Last year was the first time in 7 years that my friends and I (group application) did not get drawn for an out of state waterfowl license, which is fine with me. I believe the state of South Dakota should not change the number of non-resident licenses issued each year. The migratory waterfowl congregate in specific areas of South Dakota at very specific times during the year, and it would be easy to put too much pressure on the migratory waterfowl in these short windows of time by increasing the number of non-resident waterfowl licenses. Increasing the number of non-resident waterfowl licenses would harm the waterfowl by putting too much stress on them each day while they are staging for the next leg of their journey south, and it may potentially alter their migratory patterns if they are constantly pressured by an increased number of hunters. But most importantly, it would harm the outdoor experience that resident and non-resident hunters enjoy today. The waterfowl are very concentrated in certain parts of your state during the migration, and there are already issues with crowding being experienced by resident and non-resident hunters vying for access to land and water being used by those migrating waterfowl. Much of the waterfowl hunting is done on private lands, and more licenses would add to the frustrations that the generous landowners are experiencing, as they are generally ok with allowing access to their land as long as there are not too many people interrupting their busy lives with requests for permission to hunt.

Lastly, there is no truth in rumors that guided waterfowl hunts would be good for the state and therefore there is a need for more licenses. Waterfowl guides are motivated to bring in high dollar clients, who pay the guides to lease private land and/or crowd out the public land, and the result is frustration and a bad outdoor experience for all those involved. There is no economic benefit generated by increasing non-resident waterfowl licenses (pheasants are the golden egg for South Dakota, not waterfowl), but South Dakota can certainly ruin a good thing for all those involved by caving in to the demands of a few self-serving individuals that are happy to ruin the resources that are rightfully owned by the residents of the state of South Dakota.

I'm honored to be allowed to hunt in South Dakota, and I am honored to be able to weigh in on this very important issue. It's a slippery slope, and giving an inch now can result in giving a mile next year, and sooner than later there will be irreparably negative consequences. Just look at current habitat loss, tiling, erosion issues, flooding, windrows of trees being ripped down, and wetland destruction going on in South Dakota right now. If you are not careful, it will be too late before anyone realizes it, and once it's gone, it's gone.

Sincerely,

Robert Naylor
1108 Willow Drive
Chapel Hill, NC 27517
robert@trianglecf.org

Ascher, Debra

Subject:

FW: Non-Resident Waterfowl Proposal

Dear Commissioners,

I am asking you to vote NO on the Non-Resident Waterfowl proposal which will consider at the upcoming June meeting in Pierre.

The recommendations that the SDWF and the SDWA offered in the Working Group are not part of the "proposal" you are considering, and in fact were not given any serious consideration by the commercial interests on the Working Group. It appears the final recommendation to increase the number of non/resident waterfowl hunters was a forgone conclusion intended to assist those who want to profit from a public resource.

The majority of waterfowl hunters (both resident and non-resident waterfowl hunters) do not want an increase in non-resident licenses. From the hundreds of comments received by the Workgroup, over 90% of resident waterfowl hunters as well as 40% of non-resident hunters wanted a reduction or at least no increase in the number of hunters. Moving licenses from one area to another area IS an increase and will negatively affect the waterfowl hunting experience for resident hunters.

We have a good thing going here in South Dakota and that's why non-residents want to come here to hunt. However, waterfowl hunting isn't like pheasant hunting. Increased pressure will force those migrating ducks to head South sooner. If non-residents think they are getting a raw deal, then let them move to South Dakota and take up residence.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mark Widman
2315 N. Devon Ave.
Tea, SD 57064
605-213-3996
mwidman294@gmail.com

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Additional Nonresident Waterfowl Licensing

From: Paul J. Gillette [<mailto:pgillette@gillettelaw.net>]

Sent: Friday, May 15, 2015 3:54 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Additional Nonresident Waterfowl Licensing

Dear Sir\Madam:

I am writing this letter to object to the issuance of additional nonresident waterfowl hunting licenses in Northeastern South Dakota.

The issuance of additional licenses is not consistent with good wildlife management.

Issuing additional licenses will result in less access for local and existing nonresident hunters alike.

The current system of licensing is excellent and satisfies the needs of wildlife management as well as protecting the public interest for hunters and waterfowl enthusiasts.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Gillette

PO Box 60

Redfield, SD 57469

(605) 472-1210

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident waterfowl permits

From: Jean Liudahl [<mailto:jeanliudahl@gmail.com>]

Sent: Saturday, May 16, 2015 11:53 AM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Nonresident waterfowl permits

Comment for Game Commission Meeting June 4 in Pierre

Commissioners:

I am adamantly opposed to additional allocation of nonresident SD waterfowl permits by the Game, Fish, and Parks commission. It is obvious to me that this is being driven by special interest groups that profit from out of state hunters. The SD waterfowl hunter (ie: the majority) is not being considered with this proposal!! I can tell you from personal experience that hunting opportunities will be reduced for the SD sportsman if additional licenses are allocated. Isn't the SD sportsman the person the Game, Fish & Parks Commission should be most concerned about?

I urge you to decrease the number of nonresident waterfowl licenses rather than increase them.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeffrey J. Liudahl, M.D.

Pierre, SD/ Pickerel Lake, SD

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Waterfowl Licenses

From: Dan Raderschadt [dan@lewsfireworks.com]
Sent: Friday, May 01, 2015 4:01 PM
To: Spies, Jim
Subject: Waterfowl Licenses

Jim,

Not sure your stance on this, but I like the fact that our waterfowl resource in South Dakota is not over-licensed. Many of us hunt for the peacefulness and opportunity to just watch the annual migration. Not everything in life has to be utilized to the maximum all in the name of monetary profits.

Just my thoughts.

Sincerely,

DAN RADERSCHADT



45788 US Hwy 212
Watertown, SD 57201
(605)882-1744
www.lewsfireworks.com

"But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name;" -John 1:12 KJV



Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Non Resident Waterfowl Changes

From: Bezdicek, Paul [<mailto:paul.bezdicek@ircó.com>]

Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2015 2:47 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Non Resident Waterfowl Changes

Work Group,

There is not a more meaningful or dangerous threat to the future of waterfowl hunting in the state of SD than the potential floodgate that you are opening with the increase of the non resident waterfowl additional licenses. I have lived out of state in both MN and NE for a number of years and while living in both those states I have come back to enjoy the hunting in SD. This is truly one of the last places in the country where knocking on doors and gaining permission with a hand shake is still possible. We have seen the massive destruction that increasing non resident license has created just one state to the north of us. We want to protect the ability for the average hunter to enjoy a world class hunt without having to lease land or pay guides to hunt. This freelance style of hunting is great for both resident and non resident alike. A majority of the people that hunt ducks both resident and non resident alike do not want to see increases to the license.

We have a great system that works extremely well. Under the current configuration a no resident gets a license every other year at an absolute max. I feel that if they want a guarantee of a license they should do as I have done, move back to this great state and take a pay decrease to enjoy the benefits of being a resident. Last time I checked we have plenty of jobs for anyone that wants to come here and work and enjoy the great benefits of being a resident.

In closing, we have an opportunity here to preserve a great system that has worked extremely well for the past 40-50 years. 90%+ Residents and 60%+ Non residents do not want changes to the current system. Let's not screw up the system for the people that enjoy hunting for a few people to make a few more bucks.

Paul Bezdicek
Senior Sales Engineer
Ingersoll Rand Industrial Technologies
Sioux Falls, SD

Office +1.402.330.5831
Mobile +1.605-809-6299
Fax +1.402.330.1271
Email: paul.bezdicek@ircó.com
Website: www.ingersollrand.com



The information contained in this message is privileged and intended only for the recipients named. If the reader is not a representative of the intended recipient, any review, dissemination or copying of this message or the information it contains is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender, and delete the original message and attachments.

Ascher, Debra

Subject:

FW:

From: Russ Hanson [<mailto:hansonstaxidermy@mncomm.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2015 9:59 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject:

I am in favor of the transfer of 500 unsold lic, why these are not state birds, they are(migreatory birds) and will always be there for the hunting public , wheather that hunter is from instate or out of state they have just as much right to hunt them as we do, some of the people do not have the great hunting as we do , let them enjoy SD PS why didn't they think of adding them to Pheasant lic, that way they are not going to lease up land, they are here to hunt pheasants with waterfowl as a bonus, thank u Rusty Hanson Pierre, SD

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident waterfowl

From: Engbrecht, Jason
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2015 9:06 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Cc: Axlund, Cody; Vandel, Andy; Brown, Benjamin
Subject: Nonresident waterfowl

To whom it may concern,

Just got done reading the proposed changes in the nonresident waterfowl hunting season. I was completely shocked with the committee's recommendations. Why would we want more nonresidents here hunting our waterfowl in South Dakota. For many of us it's the only hunting we have left that isn't completely run by commercial hunting. I was very disappointed to read that they are thinking of adding even more opportunities for nonresidents. What is wrong with this committee? They aren't representing us as sportsmen. NOBODY wants this and yet it seems like us as sportsman are being ignored. Adding hundreds of nonresident hunters is 100% against what us as sportsman want. Again it looks like the rich get their way again.

Waterfowl hunters are some of the most conservation minded people around. We are always thinking of habitat, water conditions and how to better the environment for the waterfowl. Most of us don't over hunt the same waterways and sloughs to give the waterfowl a refuge area. In fact we support, both financially and philosophy wise, the implementation of refuges and areas of rest and safety for our beloved waterfowl. Having hundreds of more people here is a huge detriment to that.

You can bet we will be there in force come June 4th and hopefully we will actually be listened to. We are getting sick of being bullied by a few politicians and aspiring waterfowl commercial operators.

Jason E Engbrecht
Pierre, SD
280-2840

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Increasing Waterfowl licenses in NE South Dakota

From: avera.org, jerry.soholt

Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2015 2:14 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Increasing Waterfowl licenses in NE South Dakota

Good Afternoon:

What was the allocation of Nonresident licenses for NE SD last year? What groups have created the requests for more licenses?

My concern with this is that a few of the guides in NE SD will lease the private ponds eliminating the hunting for residents of SD.

Why are we deliberately ending hunting opportunity for residents. I've hunted NE South Dakota for about 15 years and have seen a few of the "Lodges" leasing up some of the areas only waiting to get more licenses to really shut off the locals who still enjoy the sport.

I am a bit disappointed to see the commission tipping in favor of the pay to hunt Lodges in NE SD..

I understand hunting is no longer what it was perhaps I was just hoping SD would hold onto the opportunity for locals to chase ducks.

Open the doors on this but shut the door on a few divers who want to attempt to shoot fish.

I know this message is not politically correct perhaps I am growing tired of the rhetoric.

Jerry Soholt, Sioux Falls, SD

261-9104

Ascher, Debra

From: Miller, LouAnn
Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2015 8:15 AM
To: Kiel, Emily
Subject: FW: Non-Resident Waterfowl Permits

From: Robert Brumbaugh [<mailto:robertbrumbaugh@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2015 8:12 AM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Non-Resident Waterfowl Permits

Gentlemen:

As you make decisions regarding the number of non-resident waterfowl permits to issue this year, please keep in mind that non-residents provide jobs for locals, help the area economy, and let us enjoy your great state.

Last season my son and I were drawn for non-resident licenses. We had a great time while staying in a wonderful camp. We have plans to return this fall....assuming we can get drawn again. We spent close to \$4000 in SD on our 2014 trip. Multiply that times however many non-residents come to SD for pheasant and waterfowl hunts....the total is probably a major contributor to some SD citizens income.

Since the draw numbers will likely drop if your new considerations take affect we have decided to hedge our bets and have booked a hunt in ND. If we are successful with this year's draw, we will spend a few more days and hunt SD as well. Getting a non-resident permit is the key decision maker for us to visit your state this fall. In particular, we are interested in a north eastern area draw in the area around Clark, SD.

Thanks for giving consideration to keeping the non-resident draw numbers at a level that gives us a chance to enjoy a hunt in your state.

Bob

Robert Brumbaugh MBA, MCMEA, SBA
Master Certified Machinery and Equipment Appraiser
8601 Six Forks Road
Suite 400
Raleigh, NC 27615
(Office) 919.870.8258
(Fax) 919.861.0064
www.brumbaughappraisals.com

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident Waterfowl License Allocation Proposal

From: Linda Vaa [<mailto:lindavaa@brookings.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 20, 2015 1:09 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Nonresident Waterfowl License Allocation Proposal

Dear SD GFP Commission,

I'm a long time waterfowl hunter spanning from the late 1950's to the present time. I've hunted in many states as well as all three prairie provinces in Canada plus Alaska, almost all freelancing it with a hunting buddy or two. One thing I've learned is that the amount of hunting pressure often determines the quality of the hunting experience. That's why I oppose the current proposal to increase the number of NR waterfowl licenses by transferring licenses from one unit to other units and creating a new unit in Northcentral SD. NR waterfowl hunters currently enjoy excellent draw odds so they can come to SD at least every other year, and when they get here they will likely enjoy a bountiful hunt. I think you should drop this proposal and go back to what it was last year and then leave it alone for at least 3-5 years. I do support allowing up to 100 NR youth licenses during the same time period (2 days) as the resident youth season. SD does not need more commercialization of our waterfowl hunting heritage at the expense of us resident hunters.

Sincerely,
Spencer Vaa
1819 Olwien Street
Brookings, SD 57006

Ascher, Debra

From: Miller, LouAnn
Sent: Friday, May 22, 2015 8:23 AM
To: Kiel, Emily
Subject: FW: Non-Resident Waterfowl License Comment

From: Robert Foote [<mailto:bobofoote@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, May 22, 2015 12:55 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Non-Resident Waterfowl License Comment

First, I am in support of the idea to create 100 non-resident youth waterfowl licenses. I think this is super for those young folks that wish to join in the waterfowl hunting sport. They now have an opportunity in a category of their own and for only \$10. Great news~

I am a non-resident hunter and I have many relatives & my own place in NE SoDak. I always attempt to get a 10 day hunting license in the balance of the state and have been successful most of the time. I am certainly not opposed to the creation of the new NE unit and making 2000 ten day licenses available. My concern is: How do you know if the allocation of 2000 licenses is the correct number? I have no idea how many hunters hunt waterfowl in the NE corner and am wondering how you were able to make this judgment and know it is a fair/reasonable number of licenses?

Thank you for allowing for comments and doing a super job of managing the SoDak wildlife! Please know your efforts and commitment are appreciated.

Robert Foote, Whittier CA

Ascher, Debra

From: Miller, LouAnn
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2015 8:21 AM
To: Kiel, Emily
Subject: FW: Non-resident waterfowl licenses...

From: Maynard Isaacson [<mailto:isaacson@sio.midco.net>]
Sent: Saturday, May 23, 2015 10:09 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Non-resident waterfowl licenses...

Members of the South Dakota State Game Commission and SD GF & P staff:

When twin brother Don passed away 2 years 9 months ago (and counting), I lost my best waterfowl partner but also, one of the better waterfowl hunters I've ever known. We had more great waterfowl hunts on the Missouri River than anyone could image! I'm going to be 76 in September so, because of the passing of Don, my waterfowl hunting has been limited. There are still a large number of young water fowler's in our great state that need to experience this opportunity. We have a wonderful waterfowl hunting legacy in South Dakota and we need to keep that intact!

Here are my suggestions:

1. Request a 5-10% decrease in all non-resident licenses.
2. Request removal of the 500 3-day licenses in NE SD and return them to the Missouri River area.
3. It would be nice to see these rules stay in effect for 3-5 years so we don't have to address them on an annual basis.

Thank you for your consideration.

Maynard Isaacson
3405 S. Pennant Pl.
Sioux Falls, SD 57110

Cell phone: 605.759.8837

Ascher, Debra

From: Miller, LouAnn
Sent: Friday, May 22, 2015 2:09 PM
To: Kiel, Emily
Subject: FW: non-resident waterfowl licensing

From: Koupal, Pete J [<mailto:PKOUPAL@amfam.com>]
Sent: Friday, May 22, 2015 1:55 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: non-resident waterfowl licensing

I have read the entire proposal regarding non-resident waterfowl licensing. My concern on this issue still is the number of *opportunities* we currently have in SD. Whether you are a resident or non-resident hunter, the hunting experience comes down to the quality of your hunting opportunity, and my belief is that those hunting opportunities for waterfowl in SD are currently not adequate for the number of waterfowl hunters that we already have now.

A few years ago, the Lower Oahe Waterfowl Hunting Area was established by the state. What a fantastic *opportunity* was provided by establishing this area.....well done! We need to develop more of these type programs before we consider more licenses.

Pete Koupal
Rapid City, SD

American Family Insurance Company | American Family Life Insurance Company | American Family Mutual Insurance Company | American Standard Insurance Company of Ohio | American Standard Insurance Company of Wisconsin | Home Office: 5000 American Parkway | Madison, WI 53725

*If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete this e-mail and any attachments from all devices.

Ascher, Debra

From: Miller, LouAnn
Sent: Friday, May 22, 2015 2:09 PM
To: Kiel, Emily
Subject: FW: south dakota waterfowl work group recommendations

From: John Nolen [<mailto:jnolen@wfschools.org>]
Sent: Friday, May 22, 2015 12:48 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: south dakota waterfowl work group recommendations

To whom it may concern,

My name is John Nolen i'm from West Frankfort, Illinois and don't support the recommendations that have been set by the work group. If the proposed recommendations go through it will only further hurt a great system that is in place now that provides quality waterfowling opportunities to the people who are drawn. Without having a long drawn out email, if you feel you need further information from me on why this is a bad idea feel free to call.

Thanks

John Nolen
618-513-0579

Ascher, Debra

From: Miller, LouAnn
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2015 8:08 AM
To: Kiel, Emily
Subject: FW: Waterfowl

From: David Feiner [<mailto:feinerdave@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, May 23, 2015 7:44 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Waterfowl

Not in favor of letting more non residents hunt in sd. I find very few spots to hunt now and bringing in more non residents would certainly make it even more difficult. The only folks u'll find in favor of it will be those who envision their wallets getting bigger. They'll try to offer other rationale but the only one that matters to them is their wallet.

Dave Feiner, Mitchell, SD

Ascher, Debra

From: alan thomas <ans661@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 24, 2015 11:09 AM
To: John Cooper; Peterson, Cathy; hpd@nve.net; barryj@gwtc.net; Jensen, Gary; Phillips, W. Scott; Sather, Duane; Spies, Jim; GFP Wild Info
Subject: Non Resident Waterfowl Licenses

To The South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks Commission and the Associated Staff of the Department and the Division of Wildlife

The subject of waterfowl licenses for non residents has long been a topic of concern for the resident waterfowl hunters of South Dakota. As we all know, the Central Flyway has long been a popular flyway for hunting, waterfowl propagation, wetland retention and management and general viewing and education. As many, I was born in South Dakota and gained my basic love for the outdoors here. My father worked for the Bureau of Reclamation and we moved back to Huron in 1947. Since then there have been a multitude of changes: the dams on the Missouri River; farming practices; crop differentiation and the large acreages managed by families and corporations. My career started as a Conservation Officer in 1970 in Plankinton and ventured to Alaska, Wyoming, Nebraska and the great state of South Dakota.

The competition for the "dollar" has never been greater and folks seem to have more to spend now than ever before. And that has become a challenge for the general hunter in South Dakota. Therefore, I am asking you to provide the necessary assistance in controlling the number of non-resident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota through the following:

1. Remove the 500 three day non-resident licenses in NE South Dakota and have them returned to the Missouri River area;
2. Request that rules stay in effect for three to five years to minimize or eliminate the associated problems with annual rule changes.
3. Request a five to ten percent decrease in all non-resident waterfowl licenses.
4. Provide some non-resident waterfowl youth licenses for the same timeframe as the resident waterfowl youth season.

I have always been a strong proponent of the work and responsibilities of the Game, Fish and Parks Commission and look foreword to your continued work for he wildlife, outdoor enthusiasts and my grandchildren and great grandchildren of South Dakota.

Sincerely,

Alan D. Thomas
Huron, South Dakota

Ascher, Debra

From: The Knechts <knecht4@pie.midco.net>
Sent: Monday, May 25, 2015 10:03 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Non-resident waterfowl licenses

Members of the Game Fish and Parks Commission:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the proposed changes to non-resident waterfowl licenses. My concern is specifically related to the transfer of the three-day licenses from the Central South Dakota Unit (Missouri River) to the six-county area in north central South Dakota. As a person who was raised in that area and also regularly hunts waterfowl in that area I have to express my concern.

My first concern is that by transferring these licenses, which have never been used, and creating a new area in which they can be used the state is effectively increasing the number of non-resident waterfowl licenses. I am opposed to increasing non-resident waterfowl licenses as are the vast majority of South Dakotan's who are following this issue.

My second concern is that this change would put increased hunting pressure on an area that has a limited amount of public waterfowl hunting opportunities. Please take a look at the limited amount of lakes and sloughs that actually hold ducks and geese and are also accessible to the public. There are very few. Unless the non-residents that acquire these licenses are going to pay for access to waterfowl habitat, they will increase the amount of hunting pressure on the limited public places in these counties. Those lakes and sloughs that are public have limited points on them by which waterfowl hunters can access them. Those limited access point have no improvements on them to allow hunters to launch duck boats. Today a handful of small boats are launched on the muddy shores of the lakes in this region. While not ideal, it works because there are only a few folks using those limited access points.

With increased licenses in north central South Dakota one can anticipate the frustration of both resident and non-resident hunters as we compete to access those muddy launching areas in the dark, pre-dawn hours.

To increase the number of hunters that will use a small number of lakes without improving, or increasing, the access points to those lakes seems irresponsible. Please do not move licenses to the north central counties of our state.

Sincerely,

Paul Knecht

815 N Monroe Ave
Pierre, SD 57501

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

From: Bruce Basom [<mailto:bbasom@co.montcalm.mi.us>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 11:26 AM
To: Kiel, Emily
Cc: Bruce Basom
Subject: RE: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

Ms. Kiel:

I was able to open the attachment containing the information that I was interested in reading. I wish to thank both you and Director Leif for your assistance and prompt attention to my request. In terms of comments, I support the modifications recommended by the Department. This plan seems to be both reasonable and fairly easy to understand and administer by both potential nonresident hunters and the Department.

Hope to make another trip out to South Dakota again this year. I began making hunting trips in 1980 and have missed only a few years. One year we made a second trip during Christmas break with our two sons when they were still in college. Some years the hunting is better than others, but we always have a great time. The friendships that we have established are probably our biggest joy. The people of South Dakota have been just wonderful to us from public employees like you and Director Leif, to motel owners, to restaurant owners to farmers and ranchers. In South Dakota people care about each other. In more heavily populated states like Michigan, a person tends to be just another face in the crowd, where people basically just ignore each other.

I apologize for causing extra work for you. I am older and not real good with a computer, though our younger IT people at work and our young adult children basically resolve most of my problems.

Thank you again.

Sincerely,

Bruce Basom
P.O. Box 131
Stanton, Michigan 48888

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: waterfowl licenses

From: Mark Heck [<mailto:alsengraving@mit.midco.net>]

Sent: Saturday, May 23, 2015 7:27 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: waterfowl licenses

Dear Work Group

After reading the proposal it looks to me like you are just moving license allotments around so there are more available for the nonresident in NE South Dakota.

Who really benefits from this??

Does it make for better hunting for the resident duck hunter, No. It just benefits the guides. If the guides can make more money then they will lease up more land.

If the non resident hunts without a guide it will just make more competition for the limited amount of quality land, sloughs and public hunting areas.

The resident hunter will lose.

Lets face it, the duck hunting isn't what it use to be. The migration is later. When the ducks do get here the resident has a small window of opportunity.

When you have nonresidents hunters pounding the same area or slough for 10 days it won't take long for the ducks to move out. Then the nonresident goes home and the resident hunter has nothing left.

Please don't change the license allotment.

Don't make our duck hunting into what has become of the pheasant hunting. Leave something for the resident duck hunter.

Mark Heck
915 W. Elm
Mitchell, SD 57301
605 996 8834

Ascher, Debra

From: Thompson, Derek L [CIRAS] <thompson@iastate.edu>
Sent: Sunday, May 24, 2015 8:53 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: SD Nonresident waterfowl regulations

I have hunted waterfowl in South Dakota as a nonresident, for a number of years. It is my opinion that the seasons, zones, and number of nonresident licenses available is just right. I have not been drawn every year and that is ok.

Please leave the regulations and guidelines as they are.

Sincerely
D. Thompson
1617 140th St
Boone, Iowa 50036

Ascher, Debra

From: Anne Orton <rlorton73@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 9:57 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Non-Resident Waterfowl Plan

Re: Non- Resident Waterfowl Plan

Game Fish & Parks Commission:

I am writing in hopes that the commission will adopt a non-resident waterfowl plan that is favorable to the residents of our great state while still allowing a reasonable number of non-resident licenses. At its heart the commission should protect and utilize our resources in the best interest of South Dakotans.

The recommendations made by the workgroup seems to benefit the few and not the majority of South Dakotans. Those recommendations are for the benefit of commercial hunting operations and not for the rank file waterfowl hunters of South Dakota. They were made so a few could profit from one of the state's resources.

Here is what I believe needs to be done:

First, we need to reduce the number of non-resident waterfowl licenses issued. Let's start with 10% and see what the impact is. The quality of hunting in our state will improve for everyone.

Second, return the 500 3 day licenses to the Missouri river from NE South Dakota. The quality of hunting in this area (where I hunt waterfowl) has been drastically reduced by the extra hunting pressure. The holders of these licenses do not care if the birds are moved out of the area as their license is only good for 3 days. To heck with the resident hunters who used to enjoy a full season of quality hunting.

Third, if we want to provide some opportunities for youth, allow non-resident youth hunters at the same time as the resident youth season. There is limited pressure at this time.

Fourth, let's come up with a good plan for South Dakotans and leave it in place for 3 to 5 years so this battle does not have to be waged each year.

This is a decision that be made for the benefit of the majority of South Dakotans and not for the profits of a few.

Thanks for consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Orton
2000 S Bradford Ct
Sioux Falls, SD 57106

Ascher, Debra

From: Casey Rorvick <rorvick@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 8:23 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: nonresident waterfowl work group recommendations

For matter of public record, I would like it to be known that I oppose all 12 of the recommendations put forth by the committee, for all the reasons stated in my previous email. I know the root of this issue is commercially driven at the star and private (guides) level. I oppose ALL recommendations.

Casey Rorvick
Sioux Falls South Dakota

Sent from my iPhone

Ascher, Debra

From: William J. O'Brien <wjo@dewittmcm.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 6:07 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Cc: 'Sam Assam'
Subject: proposed waterfowl license changes

Would still like to see the waterfowl season start later and go later in the SE region along the Missouri River.

Excellent response to the youth license fees and adding more of them for nonresident youth. We need to get and keep our youth interested in the sport and it has to be affordable for parents to carry the load at an affordable price.

With school, school activities and time to travel to SD, the youth will not thin out the flock as may be the worry of some residents or commissioners. Just need them to get interested while they are young.

Thanks for the opportunity to be heard.

William J. O'Brien
Attorney
Ph: 612-305-1462
F: 612-305-1414
wjo@dewittmcm.com
1400 AT&T Tower
901 Marquette Ave.
Minneapolis, MN 55402

DeWitt
Mackall Crouse & Moore
www.dewittmcm.com

This message is a PRIVATE communication. This message and all attachments are a private communication sent by a law firm and may be confidential or protected by privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the information contained in or attached to this message is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender of the delivery error by replying to this message, and then delete it from your system. Thank you.

Ascher, Debra

From: Whiteing, Tom <tom.whiteing@rfconline.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 5:54 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: public comment on non-resident waterfowl for June Commission Meeting

I want to express my opinion regarding nonresident waterfowl hunting and the proposed changes to nonresident licensing. I am NOT in support of any measure to increase the number of non-resident licenses. South Dakota is one of the few places in the US that I enjoy travelling to for the purpose of hunting waterfowl, and I have been lucky enough to draw a license in 5 of the last 7 years. In my opinion, that is a very high (and acceptable) success rate, and feel that any increase in the non-resident licenses would be detrimental both to the resources and the experience.

Thank you for considering my opinion.

Tom

Thomas G. Whiteing

Shareholder

Director, Advisor Development

Financial Advisor, Securian Financial Services, Inc.

Renaissance Financial Corporation

15858 W Dodge RD, STE 200

Omaha, NE 68118

(402)682-3903

(402) 682-3905 FAX

tom.whiteing@rfconline.com



Securities and Investment Advisory Services offered through Securian Financial Services, Inc., Member FINRA/SIPC
Renaissance Financial is independently owned and operated.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email is intended only for its addressee and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure. If you have received this email message in error, please immediately delete this email transmission and notify us by telephone of this error.

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Non Resident Waterfowl Changes

From: dave nowak [<mailto:davenowak@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2015 7:26 PM
To: Ascher, Debra
Subject: Re: Non Resident Waterfowl Changes

David Nowak Milwaukee WI 53219

From: dave nowak [<mailto:davenowak@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2015 9:09 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Non Resident Waterfowl Changes

Hi, my name is David Nowak a non resident waterfowl hunter from Wisconsin. I just want to say that the license are fine the way they are and can tell you over the last few years it has been getting more and more crowded with resident hunters. To add more people in the NE is not only going to hurt the quality of hunting(and that is why my dad and I come to SD) it is also going to be harder to get permission on private land. We spend 10 days there, renting a house from a local farmer, buying fuel and food in the small town where we hunt and put money back into SD. If the reason the state wants to add more permits is for outfitters and or guides is wrong. They are not going to put money back to SD only to the outfit they pay to take them hunting and meals come included. Also here is an example, I called my farmer friend and he was very upset with what is going on with the leasing of land for hunting rights and stated he is not going to let any one on his 15-16 quarter sections to hunt anymore and not even going to start the leasing out land for hunting mess. I can go on and on about farmers that lost farming rights due to the outfitters leasing it for hunting. If this is what the state of SD wants to bring to the table it is going to be a complete mess to come for the future of hunters resident or non resident. Also, we never once had to pay to hunt any land in SD and a lot of farmers welcome non residents to there land and that is going to change. As for the changes to the license please do what is right for the resource and the state of SD hunters, leave the waterfowl permits the same. Thanks for your time David Nowak

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: FW: Comments on Waterfowl proposals

From: jim&sue blankenheim [<mailto:oysterdogs@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2015 7:27 PM
To: Ascher, Debra
Subject: Re: FW: Comments on Waterfowl proposals

I have no idea how to include it in the original message. My city and state are Tomahawk, WI

From: jim&sue blankenheim [<mailto:oysterdogs@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 20, 2015 11:35 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Comments on Waterfowl proposals

Thanks Tony, for the opportunity to again comment. My interest is strictly relates to the NE SD unit. I've been fortunate to hunt there for the last 4 years. We always do a 4 day hunt beginning opening day. We have never had any crowding issues and the hunts were extremely enjoyable.

I travel about 10 hours to get to the Hecla/Britton area and 3 days just isn't enough. So I have no interest in the 3 day license. And 10 days is just not realistic, in my opinion. Hunting is usually quite good so in order to hunt an extended period like 10 days, we'd have to eat ducks 3 times a day, give away most of what we shoot or violate. All are unacceptable, especially the latter as I'm a retired warden. "Thou shalt not over-bag". I'm pretty sure that is commandment #11. I know one does not have to hunt all ten days but once you get over 4-5 days, you are looking at those 3 options above. So that begs the question, why have a 10 days license? Is it for those who come out pheasant hunting and don't really concentrate mainly on ducks? Or maybe those who live just across the border into a neighboring state and can go home after a few days and then return. Or maybe the duck hunting gets a lot harder as the season progresses?

I guess what I'm maybe getting at is a 5 or 7 day license instead of the 10 day. It seems more realistic to me, especially if it would increase the number of licenses available.

As for the actual numbers of 10 and 3 day licenses proposed for NE SD, since I don't have the original numbers to compare to the proposal, it is hard to comment on that aspect. I just hope to be able to draw again this year as it is truly the highlight of my fall.

Thanks again, Jim Blankenheim

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident waterfowl

-----Original Message-----

From: Mick Hanan [<mailto:mickhanan@hotmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2015 7:32 PM

To: Ascher, Debra

Subject: Re: Nonresident waterfowl

I live in Lake Andes, SD.

Thanks,

Mick

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Mick Hanan [<mailto:mickhanan@hotmail.com>]

> Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 4:08 PM

> To: GFP Wild Info

> Subject: Nonresident waterfowl

>

> To whom it may concern,

> I have read and thought deeply about the current nonresident waterfowl proposal (current as of 5/18/2015). As an avid waterfowler and resident of the state of South Dakota I respectfully think that the current proposal is taking the wrong approach. Many people already have a hard enough time understanding the many regulations and hunting zone boundaries for various hunting activities. Adding zones and moving around allocated licenses only increases the difficulty of understanding all the boundaries.

> Under the current proposal there will be more zones and more restrictions. This means the state is going to sell approximately the same amount of licenses but make it tougher for people to draw a license and understand where they can and can't hunt if they do get drawn. This makes no sense. This has been one of my fears of changing the nonresident waterfowl allocations. In my comments earlier in this process I suggested that the zones be removed and the days be relaxed somehow and yet now things are going in the opposite direction. Don't get me wrong, I don't want to see an increase in hunting pressure so I would rather not see more total licenses. I don't understand what the current proposal is trying to accomplish.

> I currently happen to live in the southern zone but I've lived in other parts of eastern South Dakota and travel all over the state to waterfowl hunt. I understand that the southern zone for nonresidents is in place to reduce pressure on the river. However, Nebraska sells an unlimited number of licenses to nonresidents and they can hunt the entire river along the border so that essentially does nothing except create a political boundary for no reason.

> We should be exploring opportunities to increase economic revenue to the state that allows for more hunter opportunity while not increasing hunter pressure. I suggest that the total number of hunting licenses available remain at the same number (~4,500 I believe). I think if the number of licenses increased there is a risk of opening up waterfowl hunting to more commercialization (guiding, leases, and out of state people buying up land). This would be bad for the sport. I also suggest that we allow for two 5 day blocks, three 4 day blocks, or 10 total hunting days no matter how they are divided up. Another option might be to allocate a percentage of licenses to a full season license and the rest to one of the options I mentioned previously. The zones should be dissolved and all licenses should be all state licenses to reduce confusion and spread out hunters.

> A combination of these suggestions would maintain, if not increase, current license sales. It would also reduce the hunting pressure in my mind. With the 10 day license most hunters try to use their license during prime migration because they have one shot, one 10 straight day period. Therefore, most nonresidents end up in the state at the same time and it creates an abundance of hunters for a brief period of time. Also by allowing hunters to break up their days it increases the number of trips made by some hunters. This means more gas, more hotel nights, more money spent at

restaurants, and more food and drinks. By opening up the zones it should spread hunters out a little. I understand that there will be some clustering due to the nature of bird concentrations but it will likely be dispersed enough that it won't affect hunting quality.

> I sincerely hope that this proposal is reconsidered before moving forward and putting it into practice. Those involved in the decision making need to carefully evaluate the pros and cons of all options. A process needs to be identified to assess if the chosen alternative is achieving the desired objectives. A good Structured Decision Making process should be used to clearly identify all the desired objectives of license allocations and explore all viable alternatives. A facilitator familiar with this process could greatly help identify the best approach. This could be accomplished in a 3-5 day workshop if the correct people (those that make the decisions and those that can inform) are at the table. I apologize for getting technical and critical of the process but it appears to me that there is a lack of clear understanding what is trying to be accomplished by the restructuring of license allocations.

> Thank you very much for your time and considerations.

> Mick Hanan

> 605-695-1025

> mickhanan@hotmail.com

>

> Sent from my iPhone

Ascher, Debra

Subject:

FW: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota Proposed Changes.

From: Tom Fell [<mailto:twfell@comcast.net>]

Sent: Monday, May 25, 2015 7:41 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota Proposed Changes.

Thank you for sending the proposed changes to the SD NR Waterfowl licenses. My question would be what is the Game, Fish and Parks Commission trying to accomplish?

I have been pheasant hunting in the area around Letcher SD for almost 30 years. It is only in the last couple of years that I have applied for a NR Waterfowl License because the opportunities in the area where I pheasant hunt are very limited. I have never seen or heard anyone other than the few people I hunt with waterfowl hunting in this area.

After reading over the proposed changes I don't see anything in the changes that would make a difference in the NR waterfowl hunting for the area where I typically hunt except moving the 2000 license from the statewide B-86 to a limited draw area will decrease the number of licenses available in the area where I try to draw.

Of all the people that I know that hunt waterfowl in SD they do so in conjunction with a pheasant hunting trip. These trips typically last 5 days of hunting because of the way the NR pheasant license is constructed. You could increase the number of license in the northeast but why not leave the number of licenses in the low waterfowl hunting pressure areas the same but make them 5 day licenses. Make it work out to be the same number of potential hunt days. I think a 5 day NR waterfowl license at a reduced fee for the low pressure waterfowl hunting areas would possibility increase the revenue to the Commission (if this is one of the goals) as more licenses would be sold while not changing the hunting pressure in the area very much.

Try it for a year or two and if it doesn't work it can always be changed back and the SDWA and the SDWF can say they were right. ☺

Thank you,
Tom Fell
Mobile, AL

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Non resident waterfowl licensing

From: Art Russo [<mailto:arusso@rhodesanderson.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2015 6:27 PM

To: Ascher, Debra

Subject: Re: Non resident waterfowl licensing

I live in Aberdeen South Dakota

From: Art Russo [<mailto:arusso@rhodesanderson.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, May 20, 2015 8:51 AM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Non resident waterfowl licensing

I would like to take this opportunity to address the Game, Fish and Parks Commissioners. My son Alex and I both testified at the open forum in Brookings and expressed our concerns on changing any of the non resident licensing. From what we could tell at that open forum everyone pretty much expressed the opinion of no changes. We would ask that you would leave it the way its been for many years. It works well as it stands.

Your addition of some youth non residents being added is an excellent idea. I think its great to encourage our youth to hunt. This is a great idea. I have been a resident hunter for 43 years and have not noticed that I don't have a place to hunt. The opportunites are endless. Getting permission is very easy to obtain.

Instead of rambling on and on Please consider leaving things the way they are. Thank you for your time.

Arthur Russo

Ascher, Debra

Subject:

FW: Bennett Co.

From: Tom Gerlach [<mailto:mwcheese@siouxvalley.net>]

Sent: Sunday, May 24, 2015 1:45 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Bennett Co.

I oppose changing the Bennett Co. Goose tag system to Unit 2.

Tom Gerlach
Midwest Cheese
125 North Dakota Avenue
Corsica SD 57328
1-605-946-5857

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: FW: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

From: Wayne & Cindy Steinhauer [<mailto:cwsteinhauer@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2015 1:55 PM
To: Ascher, Debra
Subject: Re: FW: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

Thanks we live in Hartford SD.

Best Regards

From: Wayne & Cindy Steinhauer [<mailto:cwsteinhauer@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 4:35 PM
To: Leif, Tony
Subject: Re: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

Thanks for the opportunity to review the recommended changes. I continue to hope for some special consideration to be giving to former South Dakota residents.

Best regards

Wayne & Cindy Steinhauer

26581 East Shore Place

Hartford SD 57033

[605-526-4269](tel:605-526-4269)

May 25, 2015

Mr. John Cooper, Chairman
Game, Fish and Parks Commission
108 Iris Court
Pierre, SD 57501

Mr. Chairman:

By this time you have undoubtedly heard all the arguments, all the facts, for and against the liberalization and/or commercialization of nonresident waterfowling in South Dakota. You may very well be weary of the strident, angry, self-serving and surely contradictory facts and antidotes, so I will not burden you with any more. I will just tell you what I want and leave you with your conscience.

I want everything to stay the same, although that is not what is happening. I want the same opportunity that I have had most of my life, to hunt waterfowl in the solitude and simplicity that is the prairie pothole region of South Dakota. I want the wholesale drainage of wetlands to stop. I want the unprecedented disappearance of upland habitat to stop. I want the commercial exploitation of our natural resources to stop. I want extreme hunting to stop; the most, the biggest and the fastest has gone beyond ridiculous. You cannot measure a hunt.

I like my hunting the way it has always been. I do not want it to change. I do not want to compromise anymore because every time I do, I lose something. And I am tired of losing, giving away. Yes, that is selfish, but selfish in the face of massive assaults on our natural resources.

So I am going to say no. No to increases in nonresident waterfowl licenses. No to wetland drainage. No to upland habitat destruction. No to the commercialization of common, public resources.

I want the wetlands back. I want the grasslands back. I want the solitude, the soul and spirit of South Dakota back.

Mr. Chairman, what do you want for South Dakota?

Respectfully,

Tim Bjork
112 West Oak St.
Pierre, SD 57501

cc: Ms. Cathy Peterson, Vice Chairman
Mr. Paul Dennert
Mr. Barry Jensen
Mr. Gary Jensen
Mr. Scott Phillip
Mr. Duane Sather
Mr. Jim Spies

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Bennett County Goose season Proposal

From: mark rumble [markarumble@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2015 2:29 PM
To: Jensen, Gary
Subject: Bennett County Goose season Proposal

Mr. Gary Jensen
South Dakota Game Fish and Parks Commission

Dear Mr. Jensen,

I am writing to ask you to vote no on both proposals to alter the goose season in Bennett County. These proposals are as follows:

Absorb the current Bennett County 10-day license into the unit comprised of that part of the state not included in the NE and SE units.

In addition, the Commission proposed to repeal the special Canada goose hunting season for Bennett County and place into Unit 2 of the regular goose hunting season.

There have been multiple attempts by the staff in Pierre to change the Bennett county goose season dating back nearly a decade. Yet for some reason, the staff continues to put forward recommendations to change this season to the detriment of South Dakota residents. It appears to me that the GFP staff is doing everything possible to circumvent the desires of the public that have been expressed over the years by including these recommendations in the nonresident waterfowl proposal. This appears to be another attempt to circumvent the public's expressed wishes over the years by hiding this proposal to a portion of the season proposal that most South Dakota residents overlook.

I am uncertain as to why this recommendation keeps coming from the GFP staff in Pierre. There is little support for these changes locally. The public meetings in Martin were poorly attended (I believe 6 total) with equal support for and against (3 for and 3 against) the recommended changes. Citizens of South Dakota should not have to be constantly vigilant to proposals that have been demonstrated in the past to be unpopular and not supported by previous commission actions. Perhaps this can be laid to rest for the future.

This hunting season has been (and hopefully will continue to be) a quality opportunity for the residents of South Dakota. These opportunities are what make South Dakota such a great place to live and work. If these proposed changes are made, there is no doubt that South Dakota citizens will lose hunting opportunities. Access to quality hunting through the Walk-in Program will be leased for private hunting by non-residents.

Sincerely,



Mark A. Rumble, 1115 Columbus, Rapid City, SD 57701

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

From: scot hamilton [<mailto:scothami007@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2015 12:37 PM
To: Ascher, Debra
Subject: Re: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

scot Hamilton
246 orchard st
gray tn 37615

most any other state you can buy a non resident license over the counter , that doesn't mean that you will kill ducks , however it does mean if you have the chance you can legally take them , in the state of south Dakota , in my opinion , would sell and take in much more money , with the sale of otc non resident waterfowl license ,
thank you for your time ,, , , , , , , scot Hamilton

From: scot hamilton [<mailto:scothami007@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 6:12 PM
To: Leif, Tony
Subject: Re: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

thank you for the reply , still I think you would sell a lot more permits over the counter for non-residents and very few more ducks would be killed , I don't understand the system in place ,, thanks
,, scot

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

From: doug allen [mailto:ddwirehair@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2015 10:49 AM
To: Ascher, Debra
Subject: Re: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

Here is my response to the proposed regulations that I'd like included in the public comments. I currently live in Willmar, Minnesota.

As a third generation South Dakotan (my grandfather was one of the first veterinarians in the state in the late 1800's) now living in Minnesota, I've been hunting ever since it was legal for me to do so. Hunting is more than a sport for me, it's part of my heritage. If I'm reading this correctly, just for the NE area where my family and friends have traditionally hunted, it looks like a proposed reduction of 1725 10 day licenses while keeping the same number of 3 day licenses as have existed in the past (500). This is a significant reduction if it's true that most of the current recipients of 10 day licenses prefer to hunt in the NE.

As you might guess, I'm disappointed in the proposed regulations. I've been gathering with friends and family for an annual duck hunt, usually for a long weekend (5 days), since I can remember. I fear this will virtually end that tradition with family and friends since it's unlikely we'll all be successful in drawing licenses. Not everyone is a non-resident, but several of us are and we've already experienced the disappointment of not drawing a license. I live close and still have my father living in SD, so I've made the trip when I didn't have a license, just to gather with friends and get my dog some work, but for some of my friends who live in other states, it's not worth the time and expense to come and not hunt. I'm deeply saddened by the possibility that our tradition will die and am disheartened that powerful special interest groups such as those represented by Dieter and Hesla carry such weight when there appears to be a significant trend in declining waterfowl hunting among residents and no scientific evidence that reducing the number of NR duck hunters will change either the number of resident waterfowl hunters or make any difference in duck numbers. I have no doubt, based on their opposition to every proposed change, that they'll continue to lobby until non-resident waterfowl hunting will no longer exist in South Dakota since it's obvious that's their goal.

In my mind these recommendations are another step toward making hunting a sport for the rich and privileged. At a time when hunting is under attack from many (I'd argue from people out of touch with the natural world and man's place in it), this move seems short-sighted at best. Please consider other options--I've suggested in the past that the ten day license be eliminated and a five day license be instituted instead. At least that move would allow NR a chance at drawing a license. Thank you for considering my input. I'll be anxious to hear how the regulations end up.

Dr. Douglas W. Allen

From: doug allen [<mailto:ddwirehair@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 4:08 PM
To: Leif, Tony
Subject: Re: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

Mr. Leif:

Thank you so much for your quick response--if I'm reading this correctly, just for the NE area where my family and friends have traditionally hunted, it looks like a proposed reduction of 1725 10 day licenses while keeping the same number of 3 day licenses as have existed in the past (500). I have one more question that I'm hoping you can clarify for me. I'm not sure that I read last year's regulations correctly or not, but it appeared to me that one could buy an unlimited number of preference points. Essentially if I had the money, I could buy 10 or 20 or 50 preference points. Is that correct?

As you might guess, I'm disappointed in the proposed regulations. I'll write a more thorough response and submit that formally as requested, but I fear this will virtually end a tradition with family and friends that has existed since I started hunting as a boy. I'm deeply saddened by that prospect and disheartened that powerful special interest groups such as those represented by Dieter and Hesla carry such weight. I have no doubt, based on their opposition to every proposed change, that they'll continue to lobby until non-resident waterfowl hunting will no longer exist in South Dakota since it's obvious that's their goal. I'd be curious whether either man has any financial interest in game farms or other enterprises that offer the non-resident options that side-step the public access process.

Regardless of that, in my mind this represents another step toward making hunting a sport for the rich and privileged. At a time when hunting and gun ownership is under attack from people out of touch with the natural world and man's place in it, this move seems short-sighted at best.

Again, thanks for your patience with my questions and for your quick responses. I look forward to your clarification on this last question.

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

From: Tom Parker [<mailto:tparker@thoroughbredfinancial.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2015 10:56 AM

To: Ascher, Debra

Subject: Re: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

Nashville Tennessee

Thomas J. Parker

From: Tom Parker [<mailto:tparker@thoroughbredfinancial.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 9:37 AM

To: Leif, Tony

Subject: Re: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

Tony

We are in support of the new legislation. It is our understanding that more waterfowl licenses will be available in the Pollock South Dakota area as a result of these changes. We have friends in Pollock and visit almost every year and sometimes twice. While in Pollock, we do a little hunting of different types (upland, waterfowl if drawn and bow hunting). In recent years, we have had a hard time getting drawn for waterfowl. Hopefully, these new changes will increase our chances of being drawn.

I really have never understood why you South Dakota is so restrictive on waterfowl licenses as these are migratory birds. I have waterfowl hunted in many states and never have I not been able to get a non resident licenses. I can see how maybe you would want to limit the number of waterfowl hunters opening weekend of pheasant hunting but not at any other time. I am confident that this cost the state significant revenue as some people (including part of our group) will not visit if they are not drawn.

Thanks again for your consideration

Tom

Thomas J. Parker

President

Thoroughbred Financial Services, LLC

P: 615.371.0001

D: 615.932.8110

F: 615.371.0184

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: FW: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

-----Original Message-----

From: Acs [<mailto:acs@venturecomm.net>]

Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2015 10:29 AM

To: Ascher, Debra

Subject: Re: FW: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

Britton SD

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Acs [<mailto:acs@venturecomm.net>]

> Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 2:52 PM

> To: Leif, Tony

> Subject: Re: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

>

> Hi, I see the proposed numbers for NE SD and those numbers seem very

> very high, considering that we (people that live and have land in NE

> SD) find it harder and harder to find land to hunt waterfowl in the

> fall that isn't leased up from outfitters. Did I read this correctly,

> currently 500 licenses for NE SD and the workgroup wants it to go to

> 2k!

> With the number of ducks on the decline according to DU and SD GFP's

> web site this make ZERO since on a waterfowl management side, that's

> what GFP's does right? Plus with the increase number of outfitters

> breaking waterfowl laws already (taking more than the limit and taking

> people out duck hunting without license, it happens way way more than

> they are catching, people brag about it on Facebook) Plus I was

> curious

> can duck boats (or any boats) be launched and run on CREP water or

> walk

> in waters (I understand they can launch from a R O W ditch or state

> owned land, but most don't)? We have seen a HUGE number of boats on

> crep/walk in the last 4 years and do nothing but hurt and scare off the

> local ducks plus ruin our hunting when we are already setup before

> they get there. I understand you can drive or have a boat on the land

> with landowner permission, but I highly don't think boats from out of

> state even know the landowners names. I haven't got an answer on this

> issue from any CO's. Thank you for your time, and hopefully we will

> have NE landowners out in Pierre against the idea of commercial

> hunting in NE SD. aka more non resident waterfowl hunters. I realize

> you're really not the person to talk about this, but obviously our voices

> wasn't heard from the group,

>

> Thank you

> Ryan roehr

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: waterfowl licenses

From: curt koepp [<mailto:ckoepp@abe.midco.net>]
Sent: Sunday, May 24, 2015 3:36 PM
To: Ascher, Debra
Subject: OOS waterfowl licenses

here is my name and address ckoepp 109 e lakeshore dr waubay s.d. 57273. How do I know this will be included???

From: curt koepp [<mailto:ckoepp@abe.midco.net>]
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 4:42 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: waterfowl licenses

I read all the comments that were submitted and it is a fact that they were biased to the out of staters. When did the gf&p become so blatently in favor to the out of staters and could care less about the residents of this state. All you have done here is sell more of S.D. to the out of staters. If I were you and the commission I would hang my head in shame as to what you are doing and have done in the past. Change your name to The out of staters game fish and parks, you are a disgrace. My farm land will be locked out because of your ways.

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: NE SD waterfowl hunting changes

From: Greg Borchard [<mailto:gborchard@avastonetech.com>]
Sent: Sunday, May 24, 2015 7:39 PM
To: Ascher, Debra
Subject: RE: NE SD waterfowl hunting changes

Greg Borchard
W384S5050 Cty Road ZC
Dousman, WI 53118

From: Greg Borchard [<mailto:gborchard@avastonetech.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 7:10 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: NE SD waterfowl hunting changes

Our group of 5 like he proposed changes for NE South Dakota to make it easier for our whole group to get an out of state waterfowl lic.
I grew up in the Redfield area and like to come back home for a few days before the pheasant opener to hunt ducks with my college buddy
It's no fun when 3 of us get a lic. And 2 don't....
Thanks.

Greg Borchard
Director of Business Development
Avastone Technologies

C - 262-391-4734
O - 262-650-6500 ext 1222
gborchard@avastonetech.com
www.avastonetech.com

Heartland can recycle your old equipment for free – Ask me how

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

From: Lynn Lake Lodge [<mailto:lynnlake@itctel.com>]
Sent: Sunday, May 24, 2015 3:00 PM
Subject: Re: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

Paul and Karen Johnson, Webster, SD

From: Lynn Lake Lodge [<mailto:lynnlake@itctel.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 10:41 AM
To: Richard Simms; GFP Wild Info
Subject: Re: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

Well said, young man! You have no idea how many would-be hunters agree with your statements.

From: [Richard Simms](#)
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 10:26 AM
Subject: Re: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

To whom it may concern:

Thank you for sharing this information. I had already read the news release regarding the proposed changes for non-resident SD waterfowl licenses.

I was disappointed when I read the recommendations. As a non-resident, it was my hope that any forthcoming changes would make the non-resident waterfowl license application process less complicated and more user-friendly. While I admit I haven't "studied" all of the 12 changes closely... I must say that my first impression was that instead of making the process less complicated, it is going to become even more complicated.

I have visited SD to duck hunt the past five years and always write about my experiences for my various media outlets. This initiates a lot of feedback from friends and readers who ask how they can do the same, and particularly seek advice on the waterfowl license application process. I cannot give them simple answers. My only answer is that, "You have to go on the South Dakota website and do some 'serious' homework... completely reading and studying the process." I tell them they must plan to spend lots of quality time learning. And if they can't understand everything, call SD and ask. I will say that I have always been EXTREMELY impressed by the staff's efficiency and ability to help callers such as me.

Still, most people I interact with either won't "do the work," or they find the SD procedure too overwhelming, and if they go anywhere, they simply head for another state where the process is easier.

With the absolutely tremendous public hunting opportunities and abundant natural resources available for waterfowlers in South Dakota ... I find it baffling as to why the state makes it so complicated for non-residents to take advantage of those opportunities and resources. This is especially true in that most SD residents could really care less about duck hunting. Invariably when I seek permission to hunt private land, landowners ask with a quizzical look, "Well, sure you can duck hunt... but why would you want to?"

I understand that pheasant is King, for good reason. But I personally believe that South Dakota is missing out on an incredible opportunity to also become a "destination state" for waterfowlers. Of course, I suppose in some respects I should be glad about that (he said selfishly). :-)

Thank you for the chance to share my feedback.

Richard Simms

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

From: Hutchko, Charles [<mailto:chutchko@nalco.com>]
Sent: Sunday, May 24, 2015 9:09 PM
To: Ascher, Debra
Subject: Re: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

Debra,

I live in Sewickley, PA but have a farm in Roscoe that is in CRP.

Did not want to make trouble but felt compelled to state my concern.

Mick

Sent from my Verizon 4G LTE Smartphone

From: Hutchko, Charles [<mailto:chutchko@nalco.com>]
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 8:06 PM
To: Leif, Tony
Cc: Undlin, David A (GE Power & Water)
Subject: RE: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

Tony,

Thanks for the reply, didn't really expect to see anything!!!

I did look at the proposals and didn't see anything that addressed my concerns. Seems like the people in Pierre are quite protective of their waterfowl hunting. Interestingly I have not met one local person near the Roscoe area that hunts waterfowl in over 20 years of hunting there. Seems like a waste a valuable NATURAL resources and a substantial loss of state revenue, but it is what it is.

Thanks again for taking the time to update me!!!

Mick

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Non resident waterfowl rule changes

From: Jeanne Ward [<mailto:tjeward@outlook.com>]

Sent: Monday, May 25, 2015 10:28 AM

To: Ascher, Debra

Subject: Re: Non resident waterfowl rule changes

Milbank,SD

Sent from my iPhone

From: Jeanne Ward [<mailto:tjeward@outlook.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 12:38 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Non resident waterfowl rule changes

Please consider these requests concerning the new proposals for non resident waterfowl rules.

1. Please require a 5-10% *decrease* in all non-resident licenses.
2. I Request removal of the 500 3-day licenses in NE SD and have them returned to the Missouri River area.
3. Allow some NR youth licenses for the same time frame as the resident youth season.
4. I request that rules stay in effect for 3-5 years so we don't have this consternation every year.

Thank you for your consideration. Tim Ward

Sent from my iPhone.

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Bennett Co.

From: L. Menning, O.D. [<mailto:lmanning@midstatesd.net>]

Sent: Monday, May 25, 2015 7:06 PM

To: Ascher, Debra

Subject: Re: Bennett Co.

Larry Menning
Chamberlain, SD

From: Larry and Pam Menning [<mailto:lmanning@midstatesd.net>]

Sent: Sunday, May 17, 2015 9:49 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Bennett Co.

I oppose changing the Bennett Co. Canada Goose tag system to Unit 2.

Larry Menning

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Non-resident waterfowl work group

From: Brett Andrews [<mailto:Brett@huffconstructioninc.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2015 7:20 AM

To: Ascher, Debra

Subject: Re: Non-resident waterfowl work group

Aberdeen South Dakota

From: Brett Andrews [<mailto:Brett@huffconstructioninc.com>]

Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 2:09 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Non-resident waterfowl work group

I am writing to speak my opinions on the proposed changes to the non-resident waterfowl licensing.

I honestly do not support any of the 12 items on the proposal not even the youth one and I am an active member in our Delta Waterfowl Aberdeen Chapter. As I read through the proposal all I can see is the addition of over 4,000 non-resident licenses. I have talked to a lot of SD resident waterfowl hunters and other types of game hunters (upland or big game) and not one person wants or agrees with this proposal. So in my opinion if the residents do not want these changes why are they even being considered? I know many North Dakota resident waterfowl hunters that hate the rules that North Dakota has for the non-resident hunters up there. It is depressing to think that the way we have hunted here in SD for over 30 years is very close to changing for the worse. The way we have our hunting now Resident hunters are OK with it, even though some things we are not happy about but we can live with them and we do not want them to change and have the hunting get worse. If the proposed changes do get accepted and finalized it will disappoint and upset every Resident waterfowl hunter.

Think about the kids or future generations of resident hunters. The people specifically who do not own land which is the majority. They don't have the luxury of owning land have to ask permission to hunt private land or have to hunt public land. As the hunting was in years past these people have a chance to hunt or at least get their kids out and hunt because of the low hunting pressure. If you throw 4000+ non-resident hunters into that scenario this coming year, that father that wants to try to get his kids out from in front of the video game screen and into nature will have a slim chance to have a fun and successful hunt with his kids because they have to try and compete with the increased pressure from non-resident hunters. I want in the future be able to take my son or daughter hunting and share my passion with them. If SD keeps allowing more and more non-resident hunters every year (because it seems like that's how often this topic comes up) I am afraid I will not have the opportunity to share that experience with them. And for what, so the state can make a little bit more money?

If it is about more money for the state, then why not charge the resident hunters more? I would gladly pay higher license fees if it meant there would be less non-residents and I know for a fact I am not the only resident who feels this way. SD has a good thing going right now for waterfowl hunting...please don't ruin it by flooding the state with non-resident hunters.

Thank You
Brett Andrews

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: FW: GFP comment

From: Aubrei Borah [<mailto:aubreillin.borah@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2015 8:25 PM
To: Ascher, Debra
Subject: Re: FW: GFP comment

Chamberlain, South Dakota

Aubrei-Llin S. Borah
B/A Government/World Affairs
Concentration: Law and Government
Minor: Criminology

From: Aubrei Borah [<mailto:aubreillin.borah@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2015 3:08 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject:

I oppose changing the Bennett county Canada goose tag system to Unit 2.

Aubrei-Llin S. Borah
B/A Government/World Affairs
Concentration: Law and Government
Minor: Criminology

Ascher, Debra

From: GFP Admin Rules
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2015 4:51 PM
To: GFP Admin Rules
Subject: Comment on : 2015 GFP May Proposals - June Finals

Name: Bob Marquardt

Address: 915 1st St NW

City: Watertown

State: sd

Zip: 57201

Email: bmarquardt@iw.net

Phone: 605-886-2107

Comment: Commission members, I would like to go on record in opposition of the expanded out of state duck license proposal that is on the agenda for your June 4th meeting. I believe this change does not reflect the opinions, and interest of the sportsman and women of South Dakota, nor the public in general. It is sad that the commission in general would put the Tourism industry, interest before the hunting population of South Dakota residents. I also believe that members of the commission who have business dealings with the tourism industry should excuse themselves from this vote due to conflict of interest, in particular Mr Spies. Thank you Bob Marquardt

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Waterfowl proposal

From: Joel Will [mailto:igwill64@gmail.com]

Sent: Sunday, May 24, 2015 11:27 AM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Waterfowl proposal

I believe the great state of South Dakota has answered and addressed some of the issues that non resident waterfowl hunters have. I love splitting the ne zone. I hunt in Watertown so it will impact me personally, but will spread out the non residents so we do not over burden the locals and the resource. I personally don't understand the 3 day license. If someone wants to hunt they can 1 thru 10 days; a very small percentage stay all 10 days. Why not change all licenses to 7 days? I believe there would be a bigger impact on the local economy. You would not lose money from the 10 day license, but you would gain money from non residents on the 3 day license. The only question is if it would have a negative impact on the local waterfowl. I also agree in not increasing the number of licenses. North Dakota and Nebraska are basically unlimited. The birds use sd as a resting area. I have actually heard people say that. I would have to agree. There really is little pressure on the birds and the roosting areas are usually left undisturbed. I wish to say thank you for your hospitality and wish you all good fortune.

I'm from Waseca, Minnesota.

5/23/15

SD G&P Commission + staff,

RECEIVED

MAY 28 2015

Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks
Pierre, SD 57501

I am a 80 year old waterfowl hunter who is opposed to increasing the number of non-resident WF licenses.

I hunted with my father in the Watertown area in the mid 1940's, before the NR WF ban. Did any of you?

This was before the repeal of the Open trespass law (1973). One of the main problems with the NR hunters was the leasing of Duck pass areas. The same thing commercial hunting does. The other thing was the NR's hunting hard Monday thru Friday and by the weekend, ^{ducks} were pretty much blown out of the area. Not much left for the working resident hunters on the weekend.

An example of commercialism...

Our resident pheasant hunter numbers has dropped to near 50% of what it used to be, while N.R. have nearly tripled!

As for the S county, along the river,
3 day licenses, they were primarily
for goose hunting. They were a trade off
for resident access, which I personally
feel has not been too successful.
The Commission should not feel
these licenses should be transferable
to other areas.

Because of "freeze-up" most of SD
has a very short duck season. We
should not have to over share our
opportunities. We raise far more
ducks than we harvest. Most of
the ducks are shot to the south
and east of us where they winter.
They can wait their turn!

Sincerely,

Roger Jones
812 N. Monroe
Pierre SD 57501

605-224-5360

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: nonresident waterfowl hunters

From: Larry Minter [<mailto:lminter@mvsteel.com>]
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2015 6:40 AM
To: Ascher, Debra
Subject: RE: nonresident waterfowl hunters

It's Jefferson, SD. I included it below.
Thank you

From: Larry Minter [<mailto:lminter@mvsteel.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2015 6:41 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: nonresident waterfowl hunters

Please vote against the proposal to increase nonresident waterfowl hunting permits. Especially the Low Plains South zone and I'm sure there are other parts of the state where public hunting for the average guy is very limited. My partner and I have been hunting the same area on the Missouri River for the last 14 years and last year we had 2 groups (from Iowa) set up within 150 yards of us for the entire season. Were too old to go to war with them but the thought was there.

Anyway, please support keeping the amount of nonresident permits the same or less in some zones.

Larry Minter
Jefferson, SD 57038

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Non Resident Licenses

From: steve dubiak [<mailto:recker222000@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2015 11:15 AM

To: Ascher, Debra

Subject: Re: Non Resident Licenses

St Louis Park, Minnesota

From: steve dubiak [<mailto:recker222000@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Friday, May 22, 2015 1:14 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Non Resident Licenses

I have been coming to South Dakota for 30 years and things are just fine the way they are. You should not let these pushy for profit guide services tell you what to do. Look at Devils Lake in ND which used to be all free roam. It is all now locked up by guides and the average guy cannot get on land to save his life. Guides like the flatland flyway are only interested in profit and will lock up all the land if possible effectively ending hunting for the average guy. Please keep things the way they are and do not get bullied by these guiding outfits.

Dan Koch
2525 S. Main Ave.
Sioux Falls, SD 57105

5/23/15

Dan Koch

RECEIVED

MAY 28 2015

Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks
Pierre, SD 57501

GF & P

I have hunted waterfowl in
South Dakota since 1956.
I enjoy being able to hunt
Ducks without all the cost of
state competition. Please don't
open up our great hunting to people that don't
live here. Dan Koch

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: FW: waterfowl

-----Original Message-----

From: dolneya@venturecomm.net [mailto:dolneya@venturecomm.net]

Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2015 12:50 PM

To: Ascher, Debra

Subject: Re: FW: waterfowl

I am from grenville sd

> -----Original Message-----

> From: dolneya@venturecomm.net [mailto:dolneya@venturecomm.net]

> Sent: Wednesday, May 20, 2015 8:42 AM

> To: GFP Wild Info

> Subject: waterfowl

>

> the proposed changes are a start but just a start instead of all the
> confusion just make things simple mean while the geese are growing

> in

> numbers and the people that can help control the numbers are being

> held

> up, just sell so many permits but make it simple not to set traps

> for

> nonresident people I agree that youth should have some permits set

> a

> side for them but lets get the hunters here, also these hunters

> support a lot of south Dakota business owners that pay the taxes

> more

> permits for nonresident for a year or two then see how it works,

> the gfp spent a lot of time and money trying to do what can happen

> with

> nonresident hunters. Andrew dolney business owner