

Public Hearing Minutes of the Game, Fish, and Parks Commission  
June 4, 2015

Chairman John Cooper began the Public Hearing at 2:02 p.m. with Commissioners Cooper, Peterson, Barry Jensen, Gary Jensen, Duane Sather, H. Paul Dennert, and W. Scott Phillips present. Cooper indicated Commissioner Peterson will lead the public hearing on the waterfowl issue and anyone wishing to speak on the waterfowl issue were asked to sign in at the table just outside the meeting room. The sign in list would be posted on the back wall and testimony would follow the order on the sign in sheets. Oral testimony would be limited to three minutes per person.

Public Hearing Officer Scott Simpson indicated written comments were provided to the Commission for consideration and would be included in the public hearing minutes. Simpson then invited the public to come forward with oral testimony. Written testimony will follow the oral testimony. Written comments on the 9-day extended season comments are included in the East and West River Deer Hunting Season unless unspecified and these are included in the East River Deer Season comments.

### **East River Deer Hunting Season**

No oral testimony was received.

Gary G. Colbath of Rapid City, SD, emailed, "...Please follow through with recommendation to eliminate the 9-day antlerless season statewide..."

Paul Bezdicek of Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, "...write you about the proposed elimination of the 9-day antlerless deer season in December. I would like to let you know that I am against the proposed changes to the season for many reasons...the extended season is a great way for the state of SD to manage the deer herd in Sully County..."

Dean Scheele of Glencoe, MN, emailed, "I am personally opposed to ending the late antlerless season..."

Chip O'Malley of Wentworth, SD, emailed, "I think the changes to East and West River deer are great. I thought the 9-day antlerless season should never existed to begin with."

Chad Feistner of Mankato, MN, emailed, "I hope you will not remove the 9-day deer extended season..."

John Morris of Pierre, SD, emailed, "...this additional season has allowed me time to take a first time adult deer hunter out to fill an antlerless tag the past 2 years because there is more access to private land that isn't accessible during the normal season...this additional season I have allowed hunters to hunt our private land that normally wouldn't have access to land during the normal season...allows hunters who are looking to only fill an antlerless tag...allows so many people who are just trying to put meat in their freezer an opportunity to do so...I will support a decision made either way..."

Mike Lees of Pierre, SD, emailed, "In regard to the Commission's proposal to remove the nine day antlerless season for both East and West River deer hunting seasons. I oppose this change...I'd prefer to have fewer antlerless tags available than to remove the 9-day antlerless extension season."

Jon D. Heck of Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, "I am writing to oppose the elimination of the 9-day antlerless seasons for east and west river...I would urge the commission to keep this extended season in place."

Dean Eimers of Madison, SD, emailed, "I am in full favor of eliminating the 9-day antlerless deer season."

Gregg J. Simon of Mobridge, SD, emailed, "I would ask the commission to please consider continuing the after Christmas antlerless season..."

David Meyer of Monroe, SD, emailed, "If this helps increase the deer numbers. I'm all for limiting this season."

Kevin J. Hansen of Zell, SD, emailed, "I think it is a great idea to do away with the 9-day antlerless deer seasons in both the East and West River units. Please proceed with these plans to do so."

Rick Boettcher of Parkston, SD, emailed, "I approve both of these new changes. Especially the removal of the antlerless 9-days. The deer have already been stressed and pressured enough. It also removes the possibility of bucks being taken illegally."

Scott Madsen of Aberdeen, SD, emailed, "...While I understand that there may be legitimate reason(s) for eliminating the late doe season, I would ask you to consider the aforementioned reasons for keeping it..."

Steve Rausch of Harrisburg, SD, emailed, "Removal of the 9-day antlerless season: I do not support this move...Please consider not removing these dates..."

Todd Brandt of Bowdle, SD, emailed, "I wanted to share my thoughts on the second short antlerless deer seasons. I would not be in favor of removing the 9-day season starting the Saturday after Christmas..."

Jeff Braulick of New Ulm, MN, emailed, "I really hope you reconsider closing down that 3<sup>rd</sup> season, hunting in southern Minnesota is not enjoyable at all for me..."

Anthony Arneson of Yankton, SD, emailed, "...I enjoy the antlerless season very much and would like to see it remain in place..."

Dylan Deuter of Ree Heights, SD, emailed, "I am in support of ending the January deer seasons..."

Gary Sejnoha of Yankton, SD, emailed, "...I do however question the reason for eliminating the extra 9-day "antlerless only" season at the end of the year...I strongly disagree with the elimination of that season and would ask that it be further reviewed."

Cory Hansen of Brandon, SD, emailed, "...I propose to shorten the season in November to a 9-day season, which would cover two weekends and one week. Then leave the 9-day doe only season, as it is, in late December/early January..."

Larry W. Martian of Howard, SD, emailed, "I think that eliminating the extra season for antler deer is a bad idea..."

Mark Swenson of Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, "I've observed a distinct drop off in deer numbers and fully support dropping the 9-day antlerless season..."

Mike Meyer of Springfield, SD, emailed, "I ask that you keep this 9-day season at the 1<sup>st</sup> of the year...Please do not take away this 9-day season, please."

Cheryl Braun of Rosholt, SD, emailed, "Yes, remove the 9-day antlerless deer season for all types of hunting beginning after Christmas!"

Harvey Freeman of Garretson, SD, emailed, "I agree with closing of the antlerless rifle season after Christmas. It's about time it was closed. I have never liked it..."

Charles Boulais of Mina, SD, emailed, "Please consider reducing the 9-day antlerless season to only the last six days of December..."

Mirranda Blumhardt of Aberdeen, SD, emailed, "I believe that you should not get rid of the 9-day antlerless season...Please consider in keeping this 9-day season!"

Kevin Bruzelius of Pierre, SD, emailed, "I would like to comment on the additional 9-day doe hunting: I would be in favor of continuing this excellent/beneficial additional hunting season..."

Troy Gilman of Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, "I am writing about the proposal of cutting the nine days off after Christmas...as a concerned hunter, those days are the only days I am able to do deer hunting...because I work at the post office here in Sioux Falls...Thank you for considering not cutting the days."

Richard Pearson of Webster, SD, emailed, "I'm a landowner in Day County and support stopping the late season."

William Menne of Doland, SD, emailed, "I do not understand why you would remove the antlerless season?..."

Travis Halsey of Huron, SD, emailed, "I do not see any benefit in eliminating the 9-day antlerless portion of the East River Deer Season. I also feel that with the slight increase in tags given that also it should go back to any unfilled "any deer" tags being converted into "any antlerless" tags for the 9-day antlerless season..."

Charles Brewer of Wessington, SD, emailed, "Please consider keeping the antlerless season open for counties with abundant deer populations. I feel Hand County has a very good deer population, at least in our area, and would like to see the season still available."

Rick Bohn of Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, "I wish to object to the removal of the 9-day antlerless hunting the Saturday following Christmas...I would like it to remain as it has!..."

Rick Albrecht of Albuquerque, NM, emailed, "...I object to this proposal to remove the antlerless season...please do not decline us our ability to hunt these antlerless deer..."

Matt Thompson of Mitchell, SD, emailed, "...Please do not get rid of the 9-day deer season in January."

Mark Meyer of Menomonee Falls, WI, emailed, "What are the main reasons for closing the 9-day late season antlerless season is it simply a down population issue or land owners tired of the long hunting season in general? Reason I ask is I live out of state and have participated in the late season hunt many times as much easier to get on land as the residents have filled their doe tags by that time so nice when we drive that far and get on quality land..."

Eric Ristau of St. Paul, MN, emailed, "The East River Antlerless deer season extension over the Christmas holiday has been a great opportunity for my daughters to get into deer hunting. I urge you to continue this wonderful tradition for younger hunters who are unable to participate during the regular season (and who may not be all that welcome to join the "regular" season hunters who predominantly are buck hunting during the November-early Dec regular season."

Dick Stotz of Tolstoy, SD, emailed, "In Potter Co. we need the 9-day antlerless season because of the over population of whitetail deer."

Jim Gruber of Estelline, SD, emailed, "...many a day bow hunting I will see the same vehicles sometimes once an hour all day long, and if one [deer] spotted it quickly, due to social media, becomes a full blown circus of trucks and the chase begins. End all the seasons on December 31<sup>st</sup>. No need for a longer season...a month is long enough."

Jay Klusmann of Hurley, SD, emailed, "Received email re: proposed changes deer hunting. I support them and am encouraged that you are being mindful of the low deer numbers I have seen the past several seasons, by cutting the doe seasons."

Ron Waterfall of Milbank, SD, emailed, "I am in favor of the proposed changes..."

Janet Hanson of Minnetrista, MN, emailed, "I own 80 acres in Marshall County...For the past three years, I have been unable to deer hunt on my land. The deer population has been down. No non-residents have been allowed to purchase a deer hunting license..."

Jason West of Onida, SD, emailed, "Our mule deer numbers are still declining. Cut down the tags and regulate your archery hunting on public lands better. A special unit needs to be made in west sully co from Peoria flats to potter co line using 1804 as it's east boundary. Make this a special archery unit and start controlling the public better. More antlered tag restrictions and lessen the doe harvest."

Lowell Somsen of Pierre, SD, emailed, "How about at least a few any doe tags in Hughes County instead of whitetail doe only? Hunted 20 miles east of Pierre and saw 100 mule deer doe, but no white tail doe. Got areas that have too many mule deer doe."

Paul Assmus of White Lake, SD, emailed, "I don't know why u would want to even think of cutting the antlerless season from the east river deer season dates...I don't think the extra 9-days is going to hurt anything..."

Ray Pearce of Spearfish, SD, emailed, "If you remove the separate antlerless season, will you extending the regular season to 2 weeks long?"

Matt Bones of Parker, SD, emailed, "Absolutely!! Get rid of the extra antlerless season..."

John Simpson of Pierre, SD, emailed, "...I'm not convinced the special antlerless season after Christmas need to be eliminated statewide..."

### **West River Deer Hunting Season**

No oral testimony was received.

Marty Roghair of Okaton, SD, emailed, "You need to keep the after Christmas antlerless season especially for whitetail deer...Please consider keeping this season open."

Frank L. Wilson of Litchfield Park, AZ, emailed, "This year I have drawn a west river special buck tag and have already made travel arrangements and gotten the vacation time approved...The proposed changes to the 2015 Gregory County season will make my trip this year impossible...I don't see the need for the any change..."

Brittney Dahler of Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, "...Filling those tags is what we use for our meat for our family of 4 for the year. We are not trophy hunters, we hunt for the sport and to feed our family. We only hunt public land and are limited on weekends to come out and hunt. Some of those weekends the public land is over crowded with other hunters so we rely on being able to fill our tags during the 9-day antlerless season. It is also more fun to hunt during that season as the deer have had a break from being chased around and are not as easily spooked..."

Mick Trask of Wasta, SD, emailed, "I completely support ending the doe season in January, and or end it on mule deer does anytime...Please end the doe seasons until the population gets higher..."

Joe Wolfe of Dyerburg, TN, emailed, "I strongly oppose the possible deletion of the antler less seasons, particularly in the West River areas..."

Michael Gebes of Philip, SD, emailed, "I am sorry to hear that you are considering removing the 9-day antlerless season...This is a season that we enjoy to hunt for meat and do not have to compete with out of state buck hunters."

Steve Halverson of Pierre, SD, emailed, "I am opposed to eliminating the 9-day antlerless season west river...I urge you to continue this important deer management season."

Randy Routier of Buffalo, SD, emailed, "I would strongly suggest you end the antlerless deer season in January..."

Glenn Saeger of Wi Rapids, WI, emailed, "Can you delay the date change till next year. We are from out of state and have to put in for vacation in January, by you moving the date from what it has been in the past messes up our vacation. Don't change hunting dates midyear. Set them up for next year..."

Shane Simon of Nemo, SD, emailed, "I am writing to express that I do not want to see the 9-days of antlerless hunting for der after Christmas to be closed...In short, please do not close the season for antlerless deer!"

Ken Hehr of Spearfish, SD, emailed, "Leave the antlerless season the way it is. Make it earlier if you must change it."

Michael Krug of Rapid City, SD, emailed, "I would please like you to consider leaving the 9-day antlerless deer hunt for West River as is..."

Kevin L. Stoterau of Tea, SD, emailed, "I find this date change very irrational. State hunter having both east and west river deer season at the same time is going to cut down on our harvests. I live east river, and hunt both east and west..."

Cody Hanten of Groton, SD, emailed, "I have been hunting in Corson County for around seven years and really like the early season, it gives me and my brother-in-laws that do some flexibility as to when we can all get together for a weekend and go. The proposed start put it only 1 weekend before East River season, which does not allow much flexibility. I would really like to see the seasons dates for Corson, Dewey, and Ziebach Counties to stay the same."

Ross Swedeen of Rapid City, SD, emailed, "I would please like you to consider leaving the 9-day antlerless deer hunt for West River as is..."

Brent Wiederholt of Mobridge, SD, emailed, "I think these are good changes. I do hunt Corson County..."

Mark A. Miler of Black Hawk, SD, emailed, "I feel if our deer numbers are down everywhere, that non-resident should not take president over resident hunters. If the doe number are so bad why are you still issuing doe tags to be used in December? It is very frustrating as a resident of South Dakota who hunts to provide meat for my family to be turned down 3 times last year..."

Kelly Koistinen of Spearfish, SD, emailed, "...why is it that the Commission thinks that they should increase the number of Black Hills Deer tags this year? The population is still trying to rebound from everything that has been going on the last four years. WE shouldn't increase the number of tags yet!..."

Brent Roth of Bison, SD, emailed, "I would like to see the deer season dates in west river be left alone unless the reservation is going to change and start enforcing. If West River starts Nov. 14 the native Americans will have been hunting for 2-3 weeks already."

Jarrett Perry of Rapid City, SD, emailed, "Changing the season dates to the same as all the other counties in the state is unfair for the people that hunt in Ziebach, Dewey, and Corson. All of the other counties don't have a tribal season in there counties. We should have the same opportunity as the tribal season to harvest a good buck."

Austin Falkingham of Tea, SD, emailed, "I would like to comment on the proposed change of the 2015 deer season dates for Corson County... Moving the Corson dates back by two weeks will put us state hunters at a disadvantage, as the deer will have already been hunted for over a month by the time we are allowed to start hunting..."

Fred Eland Septka of Spearfish, SD, emailed, "I do not think the season should be changed...When January comes around and it is cold, there are not many hunters out there. That is when I get my deer...If you take away the 9-days in January, I will not get my deer..."

Luther Perry of Rapid City, SD, emailed, "First, I want to thank you about thinking about get rid of the late deer season for does it is not smart to shoot does that late when they possibly could be pregnant. Changing the dates for Ziebach, Corson, and Dewey Counties is not a smart decision. If these dates were changed then we could have to hunt 14 days after the tribal season. That is not fair for the people that have to hunt deeded land. We should have the same chance to harvest a good buck as the tribal members."

Rich Coykendall of Honor, MI, emailed, "I have been hunting West River for several years. I think changing dates and shortening the season is not a good idea, my son and I hunt Corson County and also hunt Standing Rock for about 12 years. I think it could be devastating to the economy; it is already hard enough finding a place to stay and now it would take a whole week away from your small motels and restaurants. As a small business owner of sporting goods store, I know how bad that could be. For us, we would have to cancel our reservations because we might not be able to hunt Corson County this year with the change proposal..."

Thomas Hoffman of Hot Spring, SD, emailed, "...If the antlerless season after Christmas was eliminated, I doubt that it would reduce the harvest, since many hunters like myself would make every effort to fill his/her two-deer tag during the general season...I cannot support this proposal without seeing more date..."

Richard Beuttell of Vero Beach, FL, emailed, "I agree with the decision to restrict antlerless harvest..."

Steven Anderson of Rapid City, SD, emailed, "I don't agree that reducing tags in all of West River is a good idea...My suggestion is to maintain or increase the number slightly."

Joshua De La Rosa, of Dupree, SD, emailed, "I am a concerned hunter for Ziebach County. This is because if you change this date, the tribe will still stay the same and the deer may be scattered by the time state licenses are valid. This would cause me not to be a participant of West River deer season..."

David Craig Burnett of Pierre, SD, emailed, "...I love the early openings in said counties [Corson, Dewey, Ziebach] and have had tags in all of them save Gregory Co. I see these early opening counties as a bonus for those serious deer hunters who are willing to do their research and spend their time and money to try new areas that don't conflict with their close or convenient counties. I hunted Ziebach for the first time this last season...Mellette is an option, but good for only three huntable days before regular West River season open...I see this proposal as a move that removes money from SD and gives it to other states."

Jay Price of New Underwood, SD, emailed, "I am a rancher and the deer population in southern Meade County need a big rest the Oct. blizzard and the common flu the herd [I] had was not good."

Tony Russell of Isabel, SD, emailed, "about time the deer might be in rut when season opens instead of at the end of the season."

Tadd Hattery of Brookings, SD, emailed, "I'm writing this email in regards to the proposed season date changes for Corson County this upcoming 2015 deer season. I've been deer hunting on the same ranch in Corson County for approximately the last 6-7 year...the lodging need to be booked nearly a year in advance...In other words I will not be able to hunt there this year..."

Justin Allen -Kyle of Murdo, SD, emailed, "It has been brought to my attention that GFP has proposed to eliminate the extended rifle antlerless season that opens after Christmas. I like the season...and believe it should continue to be used by GFP..."

William Rice of Sisseton, SD, emailed, "I would like to see Corson dates left as they were in the past. We have had many years of trips to Corson during the holiday week in November and it has worked great. Not sure why it would need to be changed."

Dan Williams of Webster, SD, emailed, "I would like to see if you could change Bennett counties season date to align with the Pine Ridge season..."

Shawn Olsen of Dupree, SD, emailed, "I just read the proposed change to the West River deer season. To say the least I would be disappointed if this was to take effect..."

Terry Finzen of Deephaven, MN, emailed, "...If I read the information correctly, it looks like the West River Deer season would run from November 14-29, and for Gregory and Mellette Counties the proposed dates would be November 7-10 and November 23-29...I believe the November 7-10 dates will conflict with the Minnesota deer season. This would mean we would not be able to apply for a South Dakota license for first season and may not make a second pheasant trip, since the 2<sup>nd</sup> proposed season conflicts with Thanksgiving..."

James Waterson of Wright, WY, emailed, "...In order for the deer herd to recover from disease devastation I believe it would be a good idea to cancel the 9-day antlerless hunt after the regular season is over..."

Micheal Scott Brickman of Black Hawk, SD, emailed, "and [I] am opposed to the proposed changes in the upcoming deer season. The reason for this is I hunt in Mellette County and have had much better luck with the late season than any other time..."

Pat Nogelmeier of Florence, SD, emailed, "I am opposed to the proposal which will start Dewey County West [River] deer season the same dates as all other West River units..."

Kenneth Bombalski of Farwell, MI, emailed, "...If there is a genuine need to move the date in Gregory County, would it be possible to allow the small number of West River Special Buck Out of State Hunter to hunt from Nov. 14, 2015, like last year. This would preserve my lifelong dream of back to back out of state hunts for a potential Trophy Whitetail. There will be little to no affect on residents of South Dakota (except possibly for our guides' family)..."

### **Black Hills Deer Hunting Season**

No oral testimony was received.

Michael Rudebush of Watertown, SD, emailed, "Any whitetail license should be increased by 500. I have seen them rebounded in number the last few years."

Grant Jones of Deadwood, SD, emailed, "I think more resident firearm licenses should be made available in the Black Hills region..."

### **Refuge Deer Hunting Season**

No oral testimony was received.

### **Archery Deer hunting season**

No oral testimony was received.

Mike Mattson of Davis, SD, emailed, "I am just concerned with the proposals that would increase tags for firearm hunters when archery tags remain without additional tag options..."

### **Archery Deer in Newton Hills**

No oral testimony was received.

### **Crossbow requirements**

No oral testimony was received.

Ron Geerdes of Dent, MN, emailed, "Crossbows should be allowed for all seniors res or non-res if they are 60 yrs old!!! Can also be allowed for disabilities!"

Kevin Hansen of Zell, SD, emailed, "I would like to object to the proposed changes that would allow Cross Bow Permittees to use scopes on their crossbows during the archery seasons..."

Paul Anderson of Custer, SD, emailed, "...I for one, am opposed to this weapon in the archery season except for those folks with legitimate disabilities...but I have noticed over the years that the "new" equipment seems to have promoted longer and longer shooting which flies in the face of what archery and bowhunting is all about."

Grant Jones of Deadwood, SD, emailed, "Crossbow: I think you should be able to archery hunt deer with a crossbow, just like a compound bow. Many other states have already made this adjustment and with good results. I don't think a special handicap permit should be required..."

### **Boat lighting requirements**

No oral or written testimony was received.

### **Special Canada goose and non-resident waterfowl licenses**

Oral testimony:

Sean Weaver of Hecla, SD, the Flatland Flyways commercial operator, stated he believes nothing should be changed, it is a good system, it has been working, and don't change anything.

Martin Hesby of Brookings, SD, stated his passion about waterfowl and does not support anything in the proposal other than the youth changes. He indicated this is about a quality of life and the resource. He is not in favor of the changes and urges the Commission to stand with the residents of South Dakota. The meeting in Brookings had overwhelming testimony against this and the same testimony extended to the Custer meeting and that in the end the Commission had to approve the proposals as presented; and this meeting, modifications can be made. He asks the Commission to do nothing, kill it all; if need to do one thing the nonresident youth would be okay.

Norbe Barrie of Turton, SD, thanked the Commission for the opportunity to serve on the work group and for the good information provided by Tony and staff. He represents the South Dakota Opportunity Group they believes quality of life is for everyone and should not be for just certain groups, all South Dakotans are to have a good quality of life. HB1185 was hog housed and hunters should be able to hunt farmers land with or without permission. Where is the risk reward for the farmer and the risk liability of this. He named the persons that provided support for HB1185 including Senator Krebs and then were opponents the next day.

Spencer Vaa of Brookings, SD, representing himself self and the 110 members of the Brookings Wildlife Federation, believes excessive hunting pressure leads to mediocre duck hunting. He opposes these proposed changes and that they will result in more non-resident hunters. He stated to leave it as it is, it is working as is, and non-residents drawing every other year are good odds. Hunters like the good hunt. He suggested making changes to last 3-5 years so this don't have come up for consideration for changes so often. He supports the non-resident youth season as that will fit in nicely with the resident youth season. The Public Hearing and comments are great and thanked the Commission for their work.

Dean Hyde of Pierre, SD, stated that we have to remember that all wildlife belongs to the citizens of South Dakota not Minnesota and other states. Wildlife does not belong to the State, the Game, Fish, and Parks, or the Commission but the public. If more non-residents come into the state, the birds will go further and further away from the roads and ditches.

Pat Gross of Springfield, SD, read a statement providing his history as a waterfowl hunter and his involvement in many issues over time. He moved to Springfield for the quality of life and stated his concerns of the proposed changes. Reject the proposal before you.

Rich Widman of Brookings, SD, President of the South Dakota Wildlife Federation (SDWF) representing 150,000 sportsmen and women in South Dakota and could have filled this room. Thank you for serving and hopefully this issue will be easy as due to the comments received from South Dakota citizens. He stated that the South Dakota Wildlife Federation was founded on the waterfowl hunting in South Dakota for veterans and feel we [South Dakota] should not go backwards. Widman stated was disappointed with the makeup of the work group. He recommended to keep the non-resident license as is and we have a paradise of waterfowl hunting in South Dakota and he does not want to ruin it.

Chuck Dieter of Brookings, SD, stated the South Dakota Waterfowl Association represents the 500 waterfowl hunters that purchase the South Dakota Migratory Bird Certificate and the want to preserve the waterfowl hunting in South Dakota. He participated in the working group and tried remain open minded and felt the working group was unbalanced and as he and Helsa represented thousands of members and only had two seats on the group while the commercial operators each had a say. The workgroup was not balanced and that a consensus was not made for the recommendations. He stated that between January and April of this year 283 pages of testimony was received and provided to the work group and Commission with 90% of comments stating they wanted a decrease or no increase of licenses. He believes the request to increase licenses came from commercial operators. Testimony in Brookings was overwhelming against additional licenses suggested fewer licenses. He believes the resident hunters should be spread out around the state within existing units and he would like to increase resident youth hunters. He read letter from non-resident hunter that likes come to South Dakota and does not want additional non-resident hunters. Dieter stated no more non-resident hunters; keep the number the same or reduce the licenses; and wait for five years before considering any waterfowl license changes again.

John Simpson of Pierre, SD, stated he is retired and has hunted since he was four years old and waterfowl hunting is the primary reason he became a resident in 1973 after serving in Vietnam. He stated that the last ten years North Dakota hunting has dramatically declined due to the increase of non-resident hunters. The number of lodges in North Dakota have increased and he believes this has reduced the quality and quantity of waterfowl hunting there and he does not want this to happen in South Dakota. He stated he does not want the proposed changes to move forward.

Arnie Goldade of Aberdeen, SD, representing himself and 300+ members of Brown County Sportsmen Club and they do not want these changes. All pheasant spots were lost due to commercial interests and now if more non-resident waterfowl permits are issued we will lose the greatest waterfowl hunting in the world here in South Dakota. Please do not approve these proposals; it is not good for our residents or waterfowl hunting in South Dakota.

Joe Long of Aberdeen, SD, stated he took a vacation day to testify, as this is important to him. He believes that every issue has a pro and con side. The SDWF indicates 90% of residents member disapprove of the changes. Commission, listen to these numbers, as the changes will lead to decreased opportunity. Disapprove changes and do not transfer licenses; and return licenses to the Pierre area.

Ed Keller of Aberdeen, SD, testified to reject all proposals except for youth. If it isn't broke, do not fix it.

Carter Ness of Aberdeen, SD, stated he is totally against any new licenses. Ness questioned-how do we keep the youth here? This is the best way to keep them here.

Tom Putzier of Aberdeen, SD, he participates in duck and waterfowl hunting and opposes the proposal. He believes in opportunity for his six grandchildren and great grandchildren and they should have the same opportunity he has had in the outdoors of South Dakota.

Bill Antonides of Aberdeen, SD, thanked the Commission and everyone who came to testify as well as those who wrote in. He stated he is President of SDFW

Camo-Coalition, the legislative branch of the SDWF, and is charged with protecting natural resources for all children and all grandchildren for an opportunity to hunt. South Dakota already has a number of non-resident waterfowl licenses for all areas of the state and the unsold Pierre commercial licenses are not to be sold or bartered and should not be moved; these licenses should probably be reduced to change the perception they are leftover licenses. He believes the desire for increase licenses come from commercial and tourism interests and are the driving forces for the increased licenses not hunting opportunity, not depredation concerns, and not wildlife management. Antonides asked for a no vote on the proposal.

Chris Helsa, of Pierre, SD, Executive Director of the SDWF, stated his opposition on this issue and thanked everyone for taking the day off to testimony. We should work together to save habitat for ducks and waterfowl and we do not need to provide a place for everyone to hunt. He does not support these changes.

Ben Burgess of Sioux Falls, SD, stated he lives here due to unmatched opportunity to hunt ducks but choose to stay here as it is a live style he chooses and he wants it [duck hunting] to stay as it is. The work group proposals had good intentions and way too many changes; and it is not broke - don't fix it. His non-resident friends look forward to vacationing in South Dakota with him due to good hunt. Burgess stated leave it alone -shoot the whole proposal down, if need to accept something keep the youth portion. If you make the changes keep them small and keep them for 2-3 years before revisiting them.

Larry Steffen of Pierre, SD, participated on work group and believes the license increase is not many. As President of the South Dakota Migratory Association and they are concerned reallocation of some of the 3-day and they want them to stay in central South Dakota. The license increases are small and he tried to compromise with work group to get a few additional licenses in other areas of the state.

Terry Liddick of Spearfish, SD, moved here because of waterfowl hunting critically important to him for waterfowl hunting. Non-resident pressure will be bad for South Dakota and provided graph showing downhill for wetlands in South Dakota. Believes fifty percent decrease since 2011 of wetlands and any additional hunting pressure due to lack of habitat and non-resident increase license will continue to compete for waterfowl hunting with South Dakota residents. He believes that non-resident hunters are ok with an every other year hunt to have a quality hunt. Liddick urged once again to disapprove any possible increase of licenses for non-resident hunters. Vote no to all of these proposals.

Paul Lipsto, of Pierre, SD, representing the Izaak Walton League of America, specifically, the South Dakota chapter and read a letter. The letter stated their concern for the loss of wetland habitat, critical breeding, and brood rearing habitat, and stated the league opposes increased license sales as this will result in lower quality hunting for everyone. The letter stated there should be no increase in number of non-resident licenses. The letter did support non-resident youth licenses valid for the youth waterfowl hunting season at the fee of \$10.

Jeff Liudahl of Pierre, SD, stated he hunts waterfowl in northeast South Dakota and non-resident waterfowl hunters a problem at the current license level. He does not support additional non-resident hunters as these hunters secure private land to hunt. He believes someone needs to support the resident waterfowl hunter because if we lose

them we will lose great waterfowl hunting opportunity. Liudahl takes kids waterfowl hunting and opportunity has diminished. He whole heartedly encouraged the Commission to vote down the proposals including the youth licenses. He agrees with Deiter about work group and politics behind the forming of the work group. He supports not revisiting this issue every year and wants decision for several years.

Don P. Roehr of Britton SD, representing himself and the Brown County Sportsman's Club and told stories about nonresidents that came to South Dakota to hunt. Roehr requested to not change it, South Dakota has something non-residents want [good waterfowl hunting] and they want to get it when they visit here.

Dick Werner of Huron, SD, stated he was the prime sponsor of HB 1185 and provided history of HB1185; he believes as does other legislators that the non-resident waterfowl licenses issue should be managed by the Game, Fish, and Park Commission not the Legislature. He does not want increased licenses except for the youth. Migration patterns and waterfowl hunters are down and waterfowl populations are three times what they were. He fully supports the prior comments on youth and geese. He focused on the 10-day licenses and he opposes the work group recommendations on this. He believes the Commission should eliminate the 25 licenses in Bennett County as they and roll them into the 3,725 available to non-residents. The 3-day license had 500 allocated to private land in the northeast unit and work group proposed to set up a northcentral unit. The Commission could add Potter and five other counties to a northcentral unit to encourage non-resident waterfowl hunters to travel there to hunt waterfowl as the population of those counties has not increase in years. Werner believes the Commission could give consideration to some minor changes to proposals that could be positive for waterfowl hunting in South Dakota.

Norman Brown of Memphis, TN, and has a farm south of Kimball, and stated he has considered comments about habitat and declining population. He spends lots of time in South Dakota as his second home and invests habitat improvement on his property. He would like consideration for preference for non-resident landowners to obtain some of the non-resident licenses.

George Vandel of Pierre, SD, provided read a letter from the High Plains Association stating the compromise agreed to in the 1990's for the 3-day licenses in Pierre works and went through the Legislature as a win-win compromise. The letter stated that they oppose most of the proposed changes especially the transfer of licenses from the Missouri River unit and outlined the specifics of their opposition. The letter included a request to establish a rule prohibit leaving decoys out overnight; and stated they have no opposition to the non-resident youth licenses if used during the resident youth hunting season; and no opposition to the change of the Bennett County licenses.

Alex Russo of Aberdeen, SD, indicated he gave his time and support to Casey.

Bill Koupal of Pierre, SD, stated he against any increase of non-resident waterfowl hunters and resident hunters oppose any increase. Where do we go from here, why 4,000, is there data for this number, what is right number? He would like to see reduction of non-resident hunters as there is lots of pressure out there. He urged some type of system or standard for a specific number of licenses as there is a need for good science as a basis for decisions and believes political pressure is why we are here today.

John Forsyth of Northville, SD, reiterates comments received and do not want change, leave it the same. What is object of the wildlife management of the state? Is it to maximize dollars of resources or maximize the hours of quality of outdoor time for residents and non-residents?

Mark Grasse of Aberdeen, SD, talked about the private land he lost to non-resident hunters and when he asked if he could lease the land the landowner indicated it is expensive for him. He believes in good hunting experiences for kids. He state the if we teach a South Dakota kid to hunt and fish; he will not have enough money left to do drugs and alcohol.

Janet Grasse of Aberdeen, SD, loves to duck hunt and don't want to see any changes and supports the youth non-resident changes.

Tom Curran of Yankton, SD, hunts Springfield area on the Missouri River supports the youth non-resident licenses for youth season and believes the youth licenses for season long will provides additional hunter licenses. He believes this is a social issue not a wildlife issue and is about the quality of a hunt and life and true resident waterfowl hunter dollars for this sport are great. GFP and work group has heard the majority of resident hunters and some non-resident hunters are satisfied with a quality hunt. He requested the Commission deny those parts of proposal that work to increases licenses including non-resident. He wants the Early September goose season off the table as there are not that many geese in the southeast corner of the state.

Casey Kruse of Lesterville, SD, deferred his time.

Tom Skinner of SD, moved here five years ago from out of state to train dogs and passion for waterfowl hunting and upland bird hunting. When he was a non-resident he never had an issue with system and was okay with it. He loves South Dakota and when he retired, he moved here. There is no reason to change anything, we have a wonderful state, this is God's country, and leave things as they are. Don't need to change anything.

Jay Fogarty of Pierre, SD, has been in Pierre here since the 1980's and is against this proposal except for youth issue. It is minimal where one can go to hunt and best we have is Sheehan goose hunting place and concerned about losing places to hunt as it is leased up. He does not want this to go thru and is against the proposal except youth.

Eric Paulson of Pierre, SD, about pressure in northeast and landowners indicated they had lots of non-resident hunters ask to hunt. He doesn't want any changes made, leave as is.

Bobby Cox of Ipswich, SD, moved to South Dakota for one reason and one reason only and that was for quality duck hunting. He indicated he would undergo severe hardships to hunt ducks and this is about quality of life for him. I lives here to watch pintail broods walk thru his yard and see the migration. He wants to watch the wildlife out his window. He opposes everything proposed and he wonders where the five county northcentral unit, which includes Ipswich, idea came from, the thin air of the work group? He really opposes this change. He heard the work group say they needed to do something and stated that doing nothing is doing something it is saying we are not going to change. He wants no more pressure here and wants to move the additional licenses in the northeast back to the river where they belong.

Kim Cox of Ipswich, SD, is Bobby Cox's wife and does not hunt ducks or at hunt all; and she does not want to move again and for this reason opposes the changes.

Bill Van Gerpen, Tyndall, SD, recognized this is a difficult task and appreciates efforts of Commission. He thanked work group for efforts and had diverse positions on the work group. Believes this proposed changes are for redistribution of licenses in South Dakota and this may open door to reciprocate to hunt in other states. What if the fly patterns would change and we become the non-resident applying for a license to hunt waterfowl in another state. U. S. Service people were happy to come to South Dakota to hunt and fish while serving in South Dakota. Van Gerpen indicated this is a fine proposal before the Commission that will not be a deterrent to South Dakota residents. He asked to look favorably on recommendations of the work group.

Frank Alvine of Sioux Falls, SD, is opposed to expansion of out-of-state licenses. Lake County has no sloughs left and the potholes are now lakes. The areas to hunt are fewer and the pressure on them has increased dramatically. He supports no change.

Dave Brandt of Bucannon, ND, does not support the proposed changes and the pressure will make the ducks leave. North Dakota duck hunting has increase due to additional non-resident hunters and please don't do this to South Dakota residents. He is against any liberalizing of duck hunting even if it means fewer hunters in North Dakota. Non-resident hunting in North Dakota has decreased opportunity and non-resident hunters have dropped. Politics and money should not drive wildlife policy. He is more than happy to wait every other year for the South Dakota world-class hunt. The policies in place today will best serve future generations of South Dakota residents. He urged do what is right and maintain the South Dakota world-class hunting heritage.

John Solberg of Bismarck, ND, was waterfowl biologist and hunts waterfowl. It is tough to go last and opposes any increase of any non-resident licenses in South Dakota. Does not agree with or support licenses moved to the northeast from Central South Dakota. He believes in maintaining hunting quality and access to South Dakota residents. The non-resident who draws every other year will benefit with the current system; the commercial interests are for money only. Base your decision on quality and access for South Dakota hunters. Landowners are tired and birds have moved out of an area in North Dakota. South Dakota has done a good job to regulate hunting quality and pressure. It is worth it to come every 2-3 years to have a quality waterfowl hunt. South Dakota is a premier destination to hunt waterfowl.

Public Hearing Officer Scott Simpson indicated that every written has been forwarded to Commissioners more than 100 comments on deer season and waterfowl comments were over 184 forwarded to Commission for consideration. About 80% oppose or want a decrease in non-resident licenses; 9-10% favors the proposal; and about 10% unsure of their position. The youth waterfowl comments had three in favor as proposed, three opposing the youth licenses in general, and eleven in favor of the youth licenses during the youth season. Bennett County unit change had two in support, eleven opposed, and one neutral.

Special Canada goose and non-resident waterfowl licenses written testimony:

Dr. TJ Johnson or Groton, SD, emailed, "...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.”

Justin Allen of Pierre, SD, emailed, “I do not support the proposed changes in non-resident waterfowl licenses...”

Lloyd Hodgin of Aberdeen, SD, emailed, “I am opposed to any change to our current system...”

Jim Kirk of Springfield, SD, emailed, “...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, where over time, the season-long allotment has grown from 150 to 2015...”

Matt Owens of Redfield, SD, emailed, “I am against additional allocation of nonresident waterfowl permits by gfp...”

Tim Brown of Watertown, SD, emailed, “I am writing 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...I do feel that increasing the number of non-resident youth licenses is a good thing as long as those licenses are valid during the youth seasons only...”

Curt Tesch of Rosholt, SD, emailed, “...Let’s remember we don’t own 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...”

Lynn Lander of Aberdeen, SD, emailed, “...I respectfully ask if you are going [to] concentrate license 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...”

Conrad P. Ferrar, Lawrenceville, GA, emailed, “...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...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 privilege, not a purchase.”

Daniel W. Milo of Mentor, OH, emailed, “...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...”

Clint Hay of Brookings, SD, emailed, “...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...”

Steve Hansen of Savage, MN, emailed, “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...I view these changes are government serving special interests 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?”

Larry Noteboom of Corsica, SD, emailed, "I oppose changing the Bennett Co. Canada Goose tag system to Unit 2."

Renee Allen of Pierre, SD, emailed, "...I am against any increase in licenses sold or any structure change to the current system and would like to see 5-10% decrease in NR fall licenses available/sold in NE SD, central SD, and eastern SD ring 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..."

David P. Pearson of Minneapolis, MN, emailed, "...I am very concerned about any proposal to reduce out of state licenses, which are already at a premium...I urge you to expand, not contract, the number of out of state license, especially in northeast SD..."

Ed Vanderbeck of Columbus, KS, emailed, "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."

Mike Olmstead of Cottage Grove, MN, emailed, "I'm against any change to the NRW zone structure or license allocations...Under the current structure you get drawn for a license every other year-that's more than fair. Don't ruin a good thing."

David Lyon of Hudson, SD, emailed, "I am against additional allocation of nonresident waterfowl permits by GFP...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."

Elmo Ziebach of Monroeville, AL, emailed, "...I have read over the changes and other than moving licenses around I do not see any improvement..."

Joel R. Knopf of Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, "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 number 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 no wonder why the decline in hunters in this state???"

Tanner Johnson of Aberdeen, SD emailed, "...The number of nonresident waterfowl licenses needs to be decreased, not increased..."

Jim Gruber of Estelline, SD, emailed, "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..."

Marty Ahrendt of Burr Ridge, IL, emailed, "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."

Murrall Stark of Plainwell, MI, emailed, "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...Please get this regulation removed."

Jeff Olson of Rapid City, SD, emailed, "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 cannot come to the commission and ask for more but offer nothing in return for the local sportsmen."

Joel Carlson of Omaha, NE, emailed, "...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."

Chris Daniel of Aberdeen, SD, emailed, "I would like to see things stay the way they are, personal with the waterfowl seasons and licensing..."

Joe Williams of Austin, TX, emailed, "...if I am reading them [proposed changes] correctly, it means that South Dakota will continue to use a lottery system for obtaining a non-resident hunting license, which is the point of my comments initially being a system where planning waterfowl hunts is almost impossible..."

Richard Simms of Chattanooga, TN, emailed, "...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..."

Paul and Karen Johnson of Webster, SD, emailed in response to the comment from Richard Simms, "Well said, young man! You have no idea how many would-be hunters agree with your statements."

Ryan Wendling of Beresford, SD, emailed, "...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..."

Stan Lucas of Washington State, emailed, "...Most of the items don't pertain to myself and friends who come out once per year at the start of the deer season. We hunt deer in the early hours and at the end of the day and in the daytime in between, we like to either hunt pheasant and/or waterfowl. We hunt in Bennett County near the town of Martin..."

Robert Naylor of Chapel Hill, NC, emailed, "...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.”

Mark Widman of Tea, SD, emailed, “I am asking you to vote NO on the Non-Resident Waterfowl proposal which will consider at the upcoming June meeting in Pierre...We have a good thing going here in South Dakota and that’s why non-residents want to come here to hunt...”

Paul J. Gillette of Redfield, SD, emailed, “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 interests for hunters and waterfowl enthusiasts.”

Dan Raderschadt of Watertown, SD, emailed, “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.”

Paul Bezdicsek of Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, “...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%+ Nonresidents 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.”

Rusty Hanson of Pierre, SD, emailed, “I am in favor of the transfer of 500 unsold licenses. Why these are not state birds, they are migratory birds and will always be there for the hunting public, whether that hunter is from in state 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 license that way they are not going to lease up land, they are here to hunt pheasants with waterfowl as a bonus.”

Jason E. Engbrecht of Pierre, SD, emailed, “...I was completely shocked with the committee’s recommendations. Why would we want more nonresidents here hunting our waterfowl in South Dakota...You can bet we will be there in force come June 4<sup>th</sup> and hopefully we will actually be listened to...Please don’t change anything...”

Jerry Soholt of Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, “...We’ve sold our pheasant hunting to nonresidents. We hear the question why are there fewer resident hunters today. Easy answer access is limited. Increasing the number in NE will further limit access. I encourage you to make no changes or reduce by 10%...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...”

Robert Foote of Whittier, CA, emailed, “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...and for only \$20...I am certainly not opposed to the creating of the new NE unit and making 2,000 10-day licenses available. My concern is: How do you know...2,000 is the correct number...”

Maynard Isaacson of Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, “...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..."

Pete Koupal of Rapid City, SD, emailed, "...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..."

John Nolen of West Frankfort, IL, emailed, "...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..."

Dave Feiner of Mitchell, SD, emailed, "Not in favor of letting more nonresidents hunt in SD. I find very few spots to hunt now and bringing in more nonresidents would certainly make it even more difficult..."

Alan D. Thomas of Huron, SD, emailed, "...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..."

Paul Knecht of Pierre, SD, emailed, "...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... 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."

Bruce Basom of Stanton, MI, emailed, "...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..."

Mark Heck of Mitchell, SD, emailed, "...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??...the resident hunter will lose...Please don't change the license allotment..."

D. Thompson of Boone, IA, emailed, "...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."

Robert L. Orton of Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, "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...This is a decision that be made for the benefit of the majority of South Dakotans and not for the profits of a few."

Casey Rorvick of Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, "...I oppose all 12 of the recommendations put forth by the committee...I oppose ALL recommendations."

William J. O'Brien of Minneapolis, MN, emailed, "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..."

Thomas G. Whiteing of Omaha, NE, emailed, "...I am not in support of any measure to increase the number of non-resident licenses...and feel that any increase in the non-resident licenses would be detrimental both to the resources and the experience."

David Nowak of Milwaukee, WI, emailed, "...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..."

Jim Blankenheim of Tomahawk, WI, emailed, "...My interest is strictly relates to the NE SD unit...we always do a 4 day hunt beginning opening day. We have never had any crowding issues and the hunts were extremely enjoyable...what I may be 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..."

Mick Hanan of Lake Andes, SD, emailed, "...I respectively think that the current proposal is taking the wrong approach...adding zones and moving around allocated licenses only increases the difficulty of understanding all the boundaries...I sincerely hope that this proposal is reconsidered before moving forward and putting it into practice...it appears to me that there is a lack of clear understating what is trying to be accomplished by the restructuring of license allocations."

Tom Fell of Mobile, AL, emailed, "...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..."

Arthur Russo of Aberdeen, SD, emailed, "...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 nonresidents being added is an excellent idea..."

Tom Gerlach of Corsica, SD, emailed, "I oppose changing the Bennett Co. Goose tag system to Unit 2."

Wayne and Cindy Steinhauer of Hartford, SD, emailed, "...I continue to hope for some special consideration to be giving to former South Dakota residents."

Tim Bjork of Pierre, SD, wrote, "So I am going to say no. No to increases in nonresident waterfowl licenses..."

Mark A. Rumble of Rapid City, SD, emailed, "I am writing to ask you to vote no on both proposals to alter the goose season in Bennett County..."

Scot Hamilton of Gray, TN, emailed, "most any other state you can buy a nonresident license over the counter and very few more ducks would be killed, I don't understand the system in place."

Dr. Douglas W. Allen of Willmar, MN, emailed, "...I'm disappointed in the proposed regulations...please consider other options...that the 10-day license be eliminated and a 5-day license be instituted instead. At least that move would allow NR a chance at drawing a license..."

Thomas J. Parker of Nashville, TN, emailed, "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...Hopefully, these new changes will increase our chances of being drawn..."

Ryan Roehr of Britton, SD emailed, "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 work group wants it to go to 2k!..."

Curt Koepp of Waubay, SD, emailed, "I read all the comments that were submitted and it is a fact that they were biased to the out of staters..."

Greg Borchard of Dousman, WI, emailed, "Our group of 5 like the proposed changes for NE South Dakota to make it easier for our whole group to get an out of state waterfowl lic..."

Charles "Mick" Hutchko of Sewickley, PA, emailed, "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."

Tim Ward of Milbank, SD, emailed, "Please consider these requests concerning the new proposals for nonresident 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 timeframe 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."

Larry Menning of Chamberlain, SD, emailed, "I oppose changing the Bennett Co. Canada Goose tag system to Unit 2."

Brent Andrews of Aberdeen, SD, emailed, "...I honestly do not support any of the 12 items on the proposal not even the youth one...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...SD has a good thing going right now for waterfowl hunting...please don't ruin it by flooding the state with non-resident hunters."

Aubrei-Llin S. Borah of Chamberlain, SD, emailed, "I oppose changing the Bennett County Canada goose tag system to Unit 2."

Bob Marquardt of Watertown, SD, emailed, "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 4<sup>th</sup> meeting. I believe this change does not reflect the opinions and interests of the sportsman and women of South Dakota, nor the public in general..."

Joel Will of Waseca, MN, emailed, "I believe the great state of South Dakota has answered and addressed some of the issues that nonresident waterfowl hunters have...I also agree in not increasing the number of licenses...the birds use SD as a resting area. I have actually heard people say that. I would have to agree..."

Robert Pries of Pierre, SD, wrote, "I am an 80-year old waterfowl hunter who is opposed to increasing the number of non-resident WF licenses...As for the 5 county, along the river, 3-day licenses, they were primarily for goose hunting. They were a trade off for resident access...the commission should not feel these licenses should be transferable to other areas..."

Larry Minter of Jefferson, SD, emailed, "Please vote against the proposal to increase nonresident waterfowl hunting permits...please support keeping the amount of nonresident permit the same or less in some zones."

Steve Dubiak of St. Louis Park, MN, emailed, "I have been coming to South Dakota for 30 years, and things are just fine the way they are..."

Dan Koch of Sioux Falls, SD, wrote, "I have hunted waterfowl in South Dakota since 1956. I enjoy being able to hunt ducks without all the out of state competition. Please don't open up our great hunting to people that don't live here."

Andrew Dolney of Grenville, SD, emailed, "the proposed changes are a start but just a start instead of all the confusion just make things simple. Meanwhile 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...I agree that youth should have some permits set aside for them..."

Stephen J. Foster of Watertown, SD, emailed, "Please...leave things as they are. I and many others oppose the proposal you folks are considering on June 4<sup>th</sup>..."

Sean Coykendall of Beulah, MI, emailed, "If you go ahead with the changing of the season, my dad and I will be forced to choose a different state to hunt..."

Michael Richardson of Fort Pierre, SD, emailed, "I am writing this email in opposition to the proposed waterfowl license increase for nonresidents...waterfowl hunting is one of the last hunting opportunities South Dakota residents have without having to compete with commercial hunting operations...please do not sell out our resident hunters anymore."

Phillip Lowe of Florence, SD, emailed, "Leave Potter County in the current lottery drawing. Do not make this change."

Dan Thayer of Aberdeen, SD, emailed, "...I would request the following changes in what is currently proposed: 1) A 10% decrease in the current number of non-resident licenses being issued, 2.) Move the 500 3-day licenses back to the Missouri River area as was the original agreement, 3.) I would not mind seeing some NR youth licenses so the youngsters could experience quality waterfowling with their parents or relatives, 4.) Ink the deal for a minimum of 5 years, this has to be a majorly expensive endeavor each and every year not to mention the time for you folks as well as my fellow waterfowlers in SD..."

Todd Van Maanen of Yankton, SD, emailed, "...I'd ask that you not to increase the number of out-of-state waterfowl hunting licenses."

Greg L. Hoftiezer of Watertown, SD, emailed, "...I am an avid outdoorsman and although I don't hunt as often as I did a few years ago I recognize the importance of quality time spent outdoors hunting. My oldest son recently graduated from SDSU. He had job opportunities in other states and other parts of SD. He chose to come back to Watertown mainly because of the outdoor opportunities available in NE SD. I have to believe other young people make similar decisions based on the quality of the hunting opportunities we have. I would hate to see waterfowl hunting become as commercialized as pheasant hunting has. We may get some non-residents here for 3 day or 1 week hunts, but if the waterfowl opportunities become less appealing, or more crowded, to residents like my son or other young people they may choose other states in which to live and work. I understand the economics the other side presents as I am a business owner myself. I just think the big picture is more important than a few extra dollars in October and November."

Mark Peterson of Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, "...Leave this state to residents. Quit taking away from my family, quit trying to make money off of my benefit as a South Dakotan... This is about our quality of life not the non-residents..."

Robert J. Young of Stratford, SD, emailed, "no on proposed waterfowl changes..."

Michael Peterson of Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, "...The main people to benefit from this should be residents of the State of South Dakota. No changes to the current 9 County NE Unit. No more non-resident licenses or access period. No non-residents in SE Early Season. No non-resident youth..."

Jack Broome of Burke, SD, emailed, "...I have hunted the Bennett Co. special goose season for over 20 years with a group of resident hunters. We have discussed the proposed changes and the group is strongly in favor of retaining the tagged system. We strongly feel that eliminating the tag hunts and simply including it another waterfowl unit will very quickly lead to a system of leased land barring the resident hunters to opportunity to hunt. WE are strongly opposed to his change..."

Arnie Goldade of Aberdeen, SD, emailed, "Please vote no on June 4<sup>th</sup> for the proposed changes to the 2015 Non Resident waterfowl season..."

Dan or Amy Gooding of Aberdeen, SD, emailed, "I would like you to consider the residents of South Dakota before you consider opening more doors for out of state waterfowl hunters..."

Jeff Rudd of Madison, SD, emailed, "Any review of the public testimony and public comments received to date on this issue really leaves you no logical choice but to vote no on this issue...Vote no and save SD waterfowl from commercial hunting..."

Jason Lorenz of Aberdeen, SD, emailed, "...I am strongly opposed to increasing the waterfowl licenses especially in northeastern South Dakota..."

Miek Stenson of Fort Pierre, SD, emailed, "...I do not support any additional nonresident waterfowl licenses...From my many conversations with both residents and nonresidents that hunt waterfowl in South Dakota, it is overwhelmingly clear that none of them support increases in nonresidents licenses...I have no issue with the addition of 100 nonresident youth waterfowl licenses..."

Gary Wickre of Marshall County Sportsman's Club, Marshall County, SD, emailed, "We, as the Marshall Co. Sportsman's Club, strongly oppose any increase in the number of non-resident waterfowl licenses, or the transfer of non-resident waterfowl licenses from other areas of South Dakota to the NE region of SD. Waterfowl hunting sites in NE SD are heavily hunted now, and any increase in licenses will reduce the hunting experience for all hunters. We want to keep waterfowl hunting as we know it now."

Mark Richardson of Brookings, SD, emailed, "...One of the main reasons that I continue to live in SD is due to the hunting and fishing opportunities...I stick more to waterfowl hunting. I would hate to see that change..."

Adrian Heitmann of Lake City, SD, emailed, "...I am not in favor of more out of state licenses..."

Barry Diede of Moberly, MO, emailed, "...I live down in Missouri, and twice a year I mail large checks for taxes to SD for cyn-bar farms. I wish that as a tax payer and large land owner I could have the same opportunity to at least hunt on my land as the locals..."

Carter Knecht of Pierre, SD, emailed, "I am 15 years old and water fowling is my passion. Hunting is the only thing I have ever truly ever been good at in my life. Nearly all the good memories I have in my life center around hunting, especially duck hunting. I have had these good experiences because the state of South Dakota has provided me and many others a good quality hunting experience, water fowling has been an enjoyable experience for me in this state because of how we run the licensing system. I fear greatly that if we change this system the way it has been proposed to change, that the hunting qualities and experiences will decrease remarkably. When I heard about the proposed idea to move nonresident waterfowl licenses from the Missouri river to the north central part of the state where I hunt waterfowl almost every weekend of the duck hunting season, I was frustrated to say the least. The fact alone that this idea has gotten these far scares me..."

Timothy Even of Aberdeen, SD, emailed, "I am concerned that this proposal is only for the Short Term benefit of a few commercial interests. Please keep the resident hunters in mind when you decide on this...Please oppose this proposal."

Warren Jackson of Egan, SD, emailed, "I am writing to express my opposition to the non-resident waterfowl proposal that will be considered...It is not in the best interest of South Dakota sportsmen...reduce the number of regular NR licenses; then add a FEW of the number being reduced for the NR youth licenses to be valid during the same time as the resident youth licenses are valid..."

Gary Ladner of Rapid City, SD, emailed, "...I am opposed to any increase nonresident waterfowl licenses as it will only continue to erode the opportunities for the hunters that are unable to compete with "Wall Street" hunters..."

Bob Krutzfeldt of Huron, SD, emailed, "I am a lifelong resident of South Dakota who chose to live here to enjoy all of the things our state has to offer, including hunting and fishing opportunities. My request is that you listen to the sportsmen of South Dakota and act to limit non-resident waterfowl licenses."

Lee Fonken of Romance, AR, emailed, "I would like to see Kingsbury County added to the northeast section of the non-resident waterfowl map."

Craig Pugsley of Custer, SD, emailed, "I would like to offer the following comments about the proposal to eliminate the Bennett County Goose Tags...the current system allows everyone an (equal chance) to apply for a tag, secure leftover tags if they are available and provides everyone with an equal opportunity to hunt gees in this special unit."

William Koupal of Pierre, SD, emailed, "...I oppose any increase in non-resident waterfowl hunters in South Dakota..."

Bill Willroth of Vermillion, SD, emailed, "I urge you to please oppose the proposed waterfowl proposal in June. This would be another instance of forcing residents of our great state out of already crowded field and waters."

S. Patrick Donovan of Arlington, SD, emailed, "...I support the expansion of non-resident waterfowl hunting licenses and opportunities."

Charlie Moore of Madison, SD, emailed, "...I am opposed to these new proposals/ideas on raising the number of non-resident licenses..."

Earl Graham of Tellico Plains, TX, emailed, "...I have hunted as non-resident 13 of 15 years and do not want to see system changed do not mess up the great experience of duck hunting in SD!!!!..."

Jeff Clow of Harrisburg, SD, emailed, "Please leave the current number of NR waterfowl license alone...Do no transfer licenses from the Missouri River to anywhere else in the state...allowing some NR youth hunters with the resident youth season would be good..."

Dana Iverson of Harrisburg, SD, emailed, "Please consider the following to help alleviate the overpopulation of the Canadian goose: Since the geese are not gender specific, allow hunters to harvest them ½ hour past sunset. Although geese are not classified under big game, this would give hunters additional time in the field at the prime opportunity when geese are moving back and forth from feeding to nesting. If a survey was done, I am fairly certain that you would find out that a much higher harvest rate could be accomplished by this simple adjustment."

Gregg Lawrence of Wilmer, MN, emailed, "...What would really get us to come back would be if there were 3-day licenses available for more areas of the state..."

John Fuglsang of Pierre, SD, emailed, "I am writing you to voice my opposition to the current proposal for non-resident waterfowl licenses. I am not in favor of any of the proposed changes..."

Gregory Locy of Canonsburg, PA, emailed, "First, I would like to thank you for allowing the non-residents a voice with the issue of non-resident waterfowl licensing...The Workgroup proposal regarding the allocation of 2,000 10-day licenses for the NE SD license unit sounds ok on the surface, but since most are likely wanting to hunt in that area the new allocation would additionally limit the chances of getting drawn for the area that we regularly hunt. I would also favor a 5-day license in lieu of 10 day licenses..."

Chris Hesla, of Pierre, SD, emailed, "Please do not change anything to do with the current NR Waterfowl licenses. If you do want to do something reduce them!!!"

Colin Knudson of Tea, SD, emailed, "...I am adamantly against increasing licenses and opening doors to increased traffic to the state of South Dakota's wonderful waterfowl opportunities..."

Rich Rovang of Aberdeen, SD, emailed, "I am against the proposed changes to the 2015 nonresident waterfowl season, particularly changes that allow an increase in nonresident licenses for the northeast unit..."

Glen Carlson of Lake Andes, SD, emailed, "I don't think we need any additional zones set up for non-resident waterfowl..."

Richard Visker of Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, "there is some serious concern about this topic as a whole and how it is being handled...here are my suggestions: There MUST be a 5-10% decrease in all non-resident licenses. Need to remove 500 of the 3-day licenses in NE SD and have them returned to the Missouri River area. Some NR youth licenses should be added for the same timeframe as the resident youth season. These rules should stay in effect for 3-5 years so we don't have this consternation every year..."

David Jacobson of Pierre, SD, emailed, "...Please do NOT APPROVE the changes proposed by the Governor's Work Group..."

Lori Goldade of Aberdeen, SD, emailed, "...Please keep these young residents, and the next generation they bring into SD, in mind when you vote for the NR Waterfowl Licenses. Believe me, the number of young residents who stay here far outnumber the folks who want to take money from the NR hunters. Let's keep the access open for our young waterfowl hunters by not changing the regulations we already have in place..."

Andrew Richwalski of Pollock, SD, emailed, "It's very simple...Leave the non-resident waterfowl licenses the way it is."

Terry Nemitz of Brookings, SD, emailed, "I would strongly urge the board to consider the following for criteria in allocating non-resident waterfowl licenses: Request a 5-10% decrease in all non-resident licenses, request the removal of the 500 3-day licenses in NE SD and have them returned to the Missouri River area, allow some NR youth licenses for the same time frame as the resident youth season, and request that rules stay in effect for 3-5 years so we don't have this consternation every year..."

David M. Hettick of Hot Springs, SD, emailed, "Please keep the Bennett County Special Canada Goose Season...Right now it is a quality hunt..."

Dennie Mann, President of Greater Dakotah Chapter-SCI, Rapid City, SD, wrote: "The Greater Dakotah Chapter of SCI would like to express their support for continuing with the special Canada goose hunting season in Bennett County..."

Matt Nofziger of Harrisburg, SD, emailed, "Please do no increase the amount of waterfowl licenses. We don't need any more out of state hunters."

Mark Stults of Spearfish, SD, emailed, "Please leave non-resident waterfowl license requirements as they are."

Tom Black of Aberdeen, SD, emailed, "...Do not allow for the expansion of the number of nonresident waterfowl hunters...Protect at least one resource for the local hunters."

Colette Hesla of Fort Pierre, SD, emailed, "please leave nonresident waterfowl the way it is."

Harold R. Bickner of Kimball, SD, emailed, "...I would oppose any increase in the amount of out of state licenses or any increase in the amount of days allowed to hunt..."

Jesse Weeks of Watertown, SD, emailed, "...Over the years it has become increasingly difficult to secure land suitable for hunting, and an increase in the number of non-resident licenses will only make it more difficult for those of us who live here..."

Ben Burris of Brookings, SD, emailed, "I am writing in strong opposition of the newly formed proposal for non-resident waterfowl hunting..."

Rick or Dee Dannen of Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, "...By adding more hunters, changing license allocation, and along with fewer places to go this proposal is not good for anyone. Please listen to the average hunters and keep things the way they are, and not ruin a good thing."

Everett Randall of Redfield, SD, emailed, "Writing in opposition to any changes to increase...Do not allow more licenses."

Rik Bartels, President of Center of the Nation Sportsman's Club of Belle Fourche, SD, wrote: "We are writing to voice our disapproval of the proposal to repeal the Special Canada Goose season in Bennett County...This club of 450 members is opposed to eliminating the current special Canada goose season in Bennett County."

Mark Jenzen of Minnesota Lake, MN, emailed, "...I cannot express to you the anticipation our group of 3 fathers and sons have, when we draw SD waterfowl, but the time we spend and the experiences are valuable enough to build family traditions on. Please consider the average family and modest water fowlers and not just outfitters, and guides. Our moneys help ND families just as much. Don't shut us out!"

Scott Hed of Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, "...I am asking you to oppose the proposal formed from a supposed "consensus" from the Non-Resident Waterfowl License Working Group..."

Glenn Moravek of Pierre, SD, emailed, "...I'm opposed to reducing the number of three-day nonresident waterfowl licenses for central SD and transferring them to other areas of the state. I'm opposed to absorbing Bennett County 10-day goose licenses into a larger..."

Andy Vandel of Pierre, SD, emailed, "I am in strong opposition to any increase (including the shift of exiting Missouri River unit licenses) in non-resident waterfowl licenses. In addition, I would recommend that the 500 3-day licenses that have already been shifted by the legislature to the southeast corner of the state be returned to the central Missouri River unit..."

Michael Klienwolterink of Yale, IA, emailed, "...It is my recommendation that the quota for nonresidents stay the same for all areas of South Dakota like last year."

Mitchell Reuss of Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, "I am writing this to express my opposition to the 12 proposals currently on the table regarding non-resident waterfowl licenses..."

Richard Carlson of Brandon, SD, emailed, "...we don't need any more non-residents that we have..."

Lee Mischke of Westbrook, MN, emailed, "I would like to express to you my disappointment with the proposed changes to the South Dakota Non-resident Waterfowl regulations..."

George Vandel of Pierre, emailed, "I am opposed the changes in waterfowl regulations that will increase the number of nonresident waterfowl hunters. I am also in opposition to creating more units and further complicating an already over-complex set of nonresident waterfowl hunting regulations. I am most opposed to the transfer of 3-day permits out of the Missouri River unit...I do not oppose your rule proposals to create 100 nonresident youth licenses, valid only during the youth waterfowl season. I support your rule to eliminate the Bennett County unit..."

Leonard Skovly of Brookings, SD, emailed, "...Let's not destroy what we have worked for by opening the gates for non-residents and lose the support of our hunters out here right now..."

Cody Warner of Roslyn, SD, emailed, "...After the overall opposition from the majority of residents and nonresidents, I find it hard to believe that the GFP would still propose a change in the licensing structure. I believe there is a good balance of residents and nonresidents at the moment. Please listen to the residents and nonresidents that value quality hunting in SD and vote to keep SD licensing the same."

Francis Barnett of Aberdeen, SD, emailed, "...This sounds like it is a done deal. It will be interesting to see how it affects me and my 2 boys (ages 13 and 14 and their friends) waterfowl hunting experiences. We have thoroughly enjoyed our outings in Faulk, Edmunds, McPherson, and Campbell Counties. It really is top quality hunting. I realize it is nice to share, but some things a person likes to keep for themselves. Please don't share too much."

Mark Williamson of Britton, SD, emailed, "...The resident sportsman of this fine state deserve to be considered first. PLEASE vote against the proposal..."

Derek Schiefelbein of Pierre, SD, emailed, "...I oppose any increase to the number of non-resident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota..."

Mark Hamiel of Aberdeen, SD, emailed, "...As far as I see it, waterfowl hunting is the only real uninhibited hunting perk residents have left in South Dakota. Please keep it that way. Let the non-residents go after our pheasants & deer. Let the residents have our waterfowl. Please do not increase non-resident licenses."

Leonard Spomer of Pierre, SD, emailed, "The resident expenditures for material to support their waterfowl hunting activities range from vehicle purchases to dog food, from insurance to boat gas, from clothing to household furnishings, along with the basic hunting supplies, that they buy all year long to support their waterfowl hunting activities. The residents spend money twelve months of the year, not just in a 3-10 day window in October or November. And the sad part is that every time nonresident licenses are increased, scores of residents hang up their gun, decoys and waders. The net loss to the State is great, not only socially, but economically... In closing, please remember that it is the resident sportsmen and their forefathers, who have created the waterfowl oasis that both resident and nonresident now enjoy."

David Ciani of Spearfish, SD, requested consideration for a 3-day non-resident waterfowl license for the Black Hills.

Gary Roth of Aberdeen, SD, emailed, "I support the SDWF proposal for Non-resident waterfowl licenses as follows: REMOVE 500 3-day NR licenses from Northeast South Dakota, decrease non-resident by 10%, AFTER passage of the proposed rules in favor of these recommendations, the rules shall stay in effect for 5 years. Please support these recommendations in your considerations!"

Greg Fischer of Lake City, SD, emailed, "...people that come to the state are interested in a quality hunt. They are not going to give up their hard earned bucks for a poor hunting experience...People in this day and age demand quality!...There is a reason why they all are heading here!..."

Wade Harkema of Volga, SD, emailed, "...I'm opposed to the recommendations by the waterfowl work..."

Jason Gilb of Mitchell, SD, emailed, "...I strongly oppose increasing nonresident licenses and support maintaining the current nonresident licenses as they currently allocated...Please respect the wishes of your resident hunters and don't increase waterfowl license."

Eric Hamiel of Aberdeen, SD, emailed, "I moved to Aberdeen, SD 10 year ago and was introduced to waterfowl hunting. Over the past 10 years, I have become an avid waterfowl hunter primarily due to the opportunity that it currently offers resident hunters in this state. If our state starts to allocate more licenses to non-residents, waterfowl hunting will take the same path as deer & pheasant hunting has...Let the residents have our waterfowl. Please do not increase non-resident licenses."

William E. Clayton of Sioux Falls, SD, wrote: "...It my understanding...that the proposal on which you will vote is not in the best interest of the average hunter like myself. Thus, I urge you to vote against the present proposal!!"

Charles Berdan of Belle Fourche, SD, emailed, "...I am opposed repealing the current Special Canada goose season in Bennett County. I ask the commission to vote against the following proposals: 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; and...repeal the special Canada goose hunting season for Bennett County and place into Unit 2 of the regular goose hunting season..."

Andrew Johnson of Dell Rapids, SD, emailed, "I am voicing my opposition to the current nonresident waterfowl proposal on which you'll be voting...please consider your votes carefully, and please don't let the voice of so many go unheard in favor of a few..."

Leon Fenhaus of Rapid City, SD, emailed, "I strongly encourage you to reject the proposal...I am totally opposed to providing opportunities for non-residents. However, I believe the highest priority is maximizing the opportunity for SD residents first, before making opportunity available to or expanding opportunity for non-residents..."

Curtis Gustafson of Huron, SD, emailed, "...I am asking with all respect to the tremendous work the Game and Fish Department has done in this state, not for just Waterfowl Hunting, but for all the freedom which we Residents have to take advantage of the wildlife, fishing, camping etc., that we do not change the number of Non-Resident Waterfowl permits allowed for them..."

John Pollmann of Dell Rapids, SD, emailed, "I am writing to you today to urge you to vote "No" on the proposed changes to the nonresident waterfowl license system..."

Mark Lawrenson of Pierre, SD, emailed, "I do not agree with any changes or increases to the number of non-resident waterfowl hunting licenses. South Dakota resident hunters should not have their quality of life experience in waterfowl hunting be decreased by an increase in nonresident waterfowl licenses."

Mike Fischer of Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, "...There is no doubt the reason for the high quality hunting is due to limiting the number of non-resident hunters. Even with the lottery system in place today, non-residents can still draw 4 out of every 5 years. Many of my hunting days during the year are with non-residents, and they are perfectly happy with how things are right now..."

Mark Steinborn of Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, "I reviewed the proposed changes in the nonresident waterfowl licenses. I struggled with accurately assessing the actual increase in the number of permits."

Andrew Nielson of Lennox, SD, emailed, "I am opposed to the proposal with changes in waterfowl regulations that will increase the number of nonresident waterfowl hunters. I am most opposed to the transfer of 3-day permits out of the Missouri River unit. They were specifically tied to increased public waterfowl hunting access in counties along the Mo. River. I am in favor of a 10% overall decrease in the number of all nonresident waterfowl licenses. I do not oppose your rule proposals to create 100 nonresident youth licenses, valid only during the youth waterfowl season."

Jim Vinella of Watertown, SD, emailed, "I urge you to vote against the proposal to add 2000 ten day non-resident waterfowl licenses to NE South Dakota area...I'm in favor of youth NR hunting during the current resident season..."

Berdette Zastrow of Grenville, SD, emailed, "...I strongly disagree with the Non-Resident Waterfowl License Working Group's final recommendation to increase the number of non-resident waterfowl hunters. Please vote no on the non-resident waterfowl license proposal. I also request removal of the 500 3-day licenses in northeast South Dakota. Please move them back to the Missouri River area..."

Jeff Sorensen of Viborg, SD, emailed, "Plz do not do away with the special Canada goose season in Bennett County."

Bob Hodorff of Hot Springs, SD, emailed, "I object to eliminating the tag system that is currently in place for goose hunting in Bennett County..."

Don Scherschligt of Huron, SD, wrote: "...Don't open Pandora's Box--Leave Well Enough Alone concerning the number of out of state waterfowl licenses....Leave it..."

Dennis M. Jones of Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, "It is my understanding that recommendations have been proposed to the commission by a non-resident committee, especially for northeastern South Dakota...Please don't buy into public pressure to over hunting..."

The Public Hearing concluded at 3:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly R. Hepler, Department Secretary