



## **AGENDA**

### **Game, Fish and Parks Commission**

May 2-3, 2019

Custer State Park – **Event Barn**

US HWY 16A, Custer, SD Livestream link

<http://www.sd.net/home/>

#### **Call to order 1:00 PM MT**

##### **Division of Administration**

###### Action Items:

1. Conflict of Interest Disclosure
2. Approve Minutes of the April 2019 Meeting <https://gfp.sd.gov/commission/archives/>
3. Additional Commissioner Salary Days
4. License List Request

###### Information Items:

5. Budget FY2020 Overview
6. Public Involvement
7. Habitat/ Second Century Initiatives Update
8. WDM Program Review
9. Non-meandered Waters Update
10. Foundation Update
11. Commission Meeting Schedule 2020

##### **Petitions**

12. Boat Restrictions on Deerfield
13. Restrict Spearfishing of Bass on Pactola Reservoir

#### **Public Hearing 2:00 PM**

##### **Open Forum**

##### **Finalizations**

14. Resident Nonresident Criteria (Administrative Action)
15. Deer Hunting Seasons (CSP, BH, WR, ER, Archery, MZ, Refuge, and Apprentice)
16. Special Buck Licenses
17. Public Water – Compton Cove No Wake Zone -Stanley County
18. Public Water Zoning - Long Lake– Codrington County
19. Public Water Zoning – Putney Slough – Brown County

##### **Proposals**

20. Bighorn Sheep Auction License
21. Archery Deer License Allocations

22. Restrictions on the Use of Firearms, Crossbows and Bows in State Parks and Rec Areas

**Division of Wildlife**

Information Items:

23. Fishery and Wildlife Management Plans Updates
24. Planned Fish Stockings for 2019
25. Paddlefish Program Update
26. Fishing Promotion and Trophy Recognition Program
27. Walk In Area Comment Opportunity
28. License Sales Update

**Division of Parks and Recreation**

Action Item:

29. Concession Resort Prospectus & Settlement Agreement

Information Items:

30. Archive and History of Custer State Park Projects
31. 100 Years of State Parks
32. Sylvan Lake Custer Park Planning Project
33. Flood Report
34. Revenue, Camping and Visitation Reports

**Solicitation of Agenda Items from Commissioners**

**Adjourn**

Next meeting information:

June 6-7, 2019

Ramkota Hotel & Convention Center

920 W Sioux Ave., Pierre, SD

GFP Commission Meeting Archives <https://gfp.sd.gov/commission/archives/4/>



## Considerations for Scheduling GFP Commission Meetings

Last Updated August 2018

- Administrative Rule Deadlines per SDCL 1-26-4:
  - Notice of Public Hearing must be published and served to LRC, BFM and interested parties at least 20 day prior to the hearing. 1-26-4(2) & 1-26-4(3)
  - Service of document to IRRC 5 days before committee meeting 1-26-2.1 and 1-26-4(9).
- Season, Regulation and Management Plan Schedules
- Federal Framework
- Conflicting Dates of the following:
  - Legislative Session
  - National and Regional Association Conferences
  - Commissioner Commitments

## Criteria for Consideration on Reviewing Meeting Locations

Last Updated :: July 2016

*In April 2016 the department decided there was a need to identify factors used when determining the location for holding future meetings. The key factors below must be considered in selection of all Commission meeting sites. (GFP properties are excluded from these requirements)*

- Cellular service.
- High speed internet access (Wi-Fi).
- Adequate meeting room facility and associated staff requirements:
  - Space: minimum of 2,000 square feet.
  - Audio Visual Equipment: projector, screen, microphone, power hookups and phone line access.
  - Business Equipment: printer, copier, etc.
  - Support available to setup and handle any technical difficulties should they arise.
- Relative Comfort (temperature inside, tables/chairs, etc.).
- Adequate hotel rooms and capacity of rooms for expected influx at state per diem rate.
- Proximity to dining facilities offering breakfast, lunch and dinner and capacity for the Commission, staff and expected members of the public traveling from other communities.
- Efficient access for public participation.
- Relationship of community to Commission topics of discussion.
- Travel time required.
- Cost to the Department of Game, Fish and Parks.

**From:** [info@gfp.sd.us](mailto:info@gfp.sd.us)  
**To:** [kpedel@midco.net](mailto:kpedel@midco.net)  
**Cc:** [Comes, Rachel](#)  
**Subject:** Petition for Rule Change Form  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 16, 2019 5:28:48 PM

---

## South Dakota - Game, Fish, and Parks

### Petition for Rule Change

A new form was just submitted from the <http://gfp.sd.gov/> website with the following information:

ID: 70

Petitioner Name: KEN EDEL

Address: 20 ANACONDA ROAD  
RAPID CITY, SD 57701

Email: [kpedel@midco.net](mailto:kpedel@midco.net)

Phone: 605-348-1470

Rule Identification: 41:04:02:51(1)

Describe Change: I am requesting the 5-mph restriction on Deerfield Reservoir be modified to read 25-mph.

Reason for Change: Deerfield is the second largest lake in the Black Hills (420 acres) and is an under utilized resource because of an outdated restriction and lack of management by other controlling agencies. There is no underlying reason why the 5-mph regulation exists or its intended purpose. I believe many years ago it was merely a nice gesture to give anglers a lake without the pestering of other water activities. It may have been a nice gesture 35 years ago, but the regulation is no longer practical. Winter activities allow unrestricted travel on Deerfield, snowmobiles cruise down the lake that are dotted with ice fishermen and ice houses, and have done so for years without any problems. Ice racing on the reservoir is annual event as well as other activities. Data indicates the reservoir is under utilized during the summer months. Creel survey conducted in 2016 during the month of August, at the summer peak of water activities, indicate a total of 38 surveys where conducted with 32% of them boaters. That's approximately 12 boaters where surveyed. Deerfield reservoir is 74 years old and is a valuable resource. It was only 5 years ago that Deerfield finally got a serviceable boat ramp with a dock, thanks for federal dollars from the Resource Advisory Committee (RAC), the South Dakota Game, Fish & Parks, and Walleyes Unlimited, Its time to make some changes and allow the public a chance to better utilize this resource.



**From:** [info@gfp.sd.us](mailto:info@gfp.sd.us)  
**To:** [kpedel@midco.net](mailto:kpedel@midco.net)  
**Cc:** [Comes, Rachel](#)  
**Subject:** Petition for Rule Change Form  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 16, 2019 4:34:16 PM

---

## South Dakota - Game, Fish, and Parks

### Petition for Rule Change

A new form was just submitted from the <http://gfp.sd.gov/> website with the following information:

ID: 69

Petitioner Name: KEN EDEL

Address: 20 ANACONDA ROAD  
RAPID CITY, SD 57701

Email: [kpedel@midco.net](mailto:kpedel@midco.net)

Phone: 605- 348-1470

Rule Identification: 41:07:06:03(5)

Describe Change: Rescind the spearing of largemouth and smallmouth bass year-round

Reason for Change: Spearing of largemouth bass in Pactola was implemented some time in the 1980's. Over the years the spearing pressure of bass has taken its toll on the bass population. For many years Pactola supported a decent bass fishery for traditional anglers, but that no longer exists. The bass population has been depressed for a long time, and comparison data is mostly unavailable that would indicate the decline in the bass population. Bass in Pactola are difficult to obtain data, due to the clear water and bass being relatively net shy. Data does indicate the large population of bluegill and rock bass. Reestablishing the bass population would help control the increasing panfish population. We tend to pass regulations and then forget them, until the negative impact is realized. It takes years to develop a fishery of any species, if the bass are protected, they will rebound and provide opportunity for traditional anglers once again. Pactola has always been a self sustaining bass fishery. As the department is looking for ways to increase angler interest and provide angler opportunity, you have to be willing to make changes that will allow that to happen. This commission has an opportunity to make a regulation change that is long overdue.

**Minutes of the Game, Fish, and Parks Commission**  
**April 4-5, 2019**

Chairman Gary Jensen called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. MT at GFP Outdoor Campus West in Rapid City, South Dakota. Commissioners Gary Jensen, Travis Bies, Mary Anne Boyd, Jon Locken, Scott Phillips, Russell Olson, Douglas Sharp, Robert Whitmyre and approximately 70 public, staff, and media were present.

**DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION**

**Conflict of Interest Disclosure**

Chair Jensen called for conflicts of interest to be disclosed. None were presented.

**Approval of Minutes**

Olson called for any additions or corrections to the February 28 – March 1, 2019 minutes or a motion for approval.

Motion by Sharp with second by Bies TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 28 – MARCH 1, 2019 MEETING. Motion carried unanimously.

**Additional Commissioner Salary Days**

One additional salary day for Jensen, Phillips, Boyd, Sharp and Whitmyre was requested for attendance at the Conservation Summit.

Motioned by Locken, second by Sharp TO APPROVE THE ADDITIONAL SALARY DAY. Motion carried unanimously.

**License List Request**

Chris Petersen, administration division director, presented a license list requests to the Commission from Sunrise Ranch LLC from Edgemont, South Dakota for a full fee license list request for nonresident 2018 small game license holders west of South Dakota. It was noted this request is for one-time to distribute promotional materials.

Motioned by Sharp, second by Bies TO APPROVE THE LICENSE LIST REQUEST. Motion carried unanimously.

**Conservation Summit**

Kevin Robling, deputy secretary, provided an update on the Conservation Summit that was held on March 28 in Pierre. The Summit was the culmination of a series of forums the Department hosted over the past year. Approximately 70 people attended the Summit, including representatives of agricultural and conservation organizations, sportsmen groups and shooting preserve operators, most who had attended one of the previous forums. Governor Noem kicked off the Conservation Summit with her vision for the Second Century Initiative. She was very engaged with the group and answered questions regarding the Initiative. The Governor's kickoff set the stage, where sustainable funding for wildlife habitat in South Dakota was the topic of the day. During the afternoon there was live text polling by the group to determine the top ideas for sustainable funding of habitat. Those ideas were from a combination of

the Governor's Second Century Initiative, previous Forums and Crowdsourcing efforts. The group was very engaged throughout the day, with great dialogue and networking taking place. They are ready to continue working together on developing and implementing solutions and realize that there is still a lot to be accomplished.

### **Habitat/Second Century Initiatives**

Tom Kirschenmann, wildlife deputy director, started the Second Century Initiative presentation by discussing the habitat approaches and efforts that will be happening over the short and long-term. Programs discussed were the Saline Soil program administered by Pheasants Forever and SD Corn, the Soil Health and Income Protection Program that is part of the federal Farm Bill, the new Second Century Habitat Restoration Program (working lands approach) which will follow similar structure as the two programs mentioned prior but implemented and administered at a state level through the Second Century Habitat Fund, and the Every Acre Counts research project at South Dakota State University. Kirschenmann also provided information on the Department of Game, Fish and Parks private lands programs (grassland management through grazing, food plots, woody habitat, and access), details, payment schedules, and how those efforts compare to the overall expenditures associated with the implementation of approximately 1 million acres of the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) currently enrolled. Robling provided information on habitat funding efforts such as specialty habitat vehicle decals, the hunt for habitat big game license raffle concept and also the expansion of the bighorn sheep auction license unit to include the Badlands hunting unit. Robling also provided details on the ongoing trapping education efforts which includes 13 classes across the state that focuses on trapping guidelines and regulations, ethics, wildlife conservation, how and where to set traps, baits and lures, humane dispatch, non-target species, and safety. The live trap giveaway program was presented as an effort to increase participation in trapping from all ages while at the same time, reduce localized populations of nest predators as a way to enhance pheasant and duck nest success. Details regarding the nest Predator Bounty Program were discussed such as the activity of trapping egg eating predators during the nesting season has been a utilized management technique for decades, goals of the nest predator bounty program is to enhance duck and pheasant nest success, increase trapping participation, ensure hunting and trapping tradition remain strong, engage the next generation in conservation and recreation. The last topic presented was crowdsourcing habitat ideas. The Department used Facebook and the option to submit ideas via email through Habitat Pays. Over 750 emails and 300 members on Facebook provided ideas. Implemented ideas will have the choice of either a free hunting license or state park entrance permit granted for one year.

Question

### **Trapping Education Program**

Taniya Bethke, education coordinator, explained how the education staff has teamed up with Wildlife Damage Specialists across the state to offer 13 Live-Trapping 101 classes during the month of April. Classes cover basic introductory information on trapping laws and regulations, ethics and respect for wildlife, how to select a trapping site, baiting and setting traps, release of non-target species, humane dispatch, and discussion on wise use of carcasses to support the Governor's Second Century Initiative. Participants have been given a pre-survey to assess their level of interest in future trapping classes, whether they already trap, and to collect contact information for

future outreach. Participants will also be given a post-survey to assess whether the class resulted in a license purchase and enabled them to participate in trapping independently. Interest and demand will drive future trapping education opportunities in the state. Additional Live-Trapping 101 classes have already been scheduled in locations that filled right away, such as Sioux Falls and Rapid City.

### **Non-meandered Waters**

Kevin Robling, special projects coordinator, provided an update on non-meandered waters stating 4,280 acres have been marked closed to public recreational use. This is less than 2 percent of the publicly-accessible nonmeandered water acres across the state and down from the peak of over 5,000 nonmeandered water acres closed in March 2018. The department's goal is to continue providing recreational opportunities for families and outdoor enthusiasts who enjoy South Dakota's great outdoor resources, while also addressing concerns of landowners who own the land under the water. The "Recreation and Respect" campaign and the "Adopt-a-Lake" program have been front and center. The department has been strongly encouraging recreational users to "leave no trace" and pick up all garbage.

### **Foundation Update**

Sean Blanchette, Foundations Director, briefed the Commission on the current work of the two nonprofit Foundations which provide support to the Department. Blanchette stated that the South Dakota Habitat Foundation is currently seeing a leadership transition as the President of the Board of Directors recently stepped down and the Foundation will find a new President to take over those duties. Blanchette also provided information regarding grant monies the Foundation received recently. The Foundation has one million dollars dedicated towards helping to fund that Every Acre Counts study that is being undertaken by SDGFP and SDSU. The Foundation also has one hundred thousand dollars dedicated towards hiring a development director. In addition to those fund, the Foundation is to be the recipient of a one million dollar appropriation that will be utilized towards the Departments working lands initiatives.

Blanchette also briefed the Commission on the status of the recent land purchases by the South Dakota Parks and Wildlife Foundation and that all lands have been transferred over to the Department via past Commission approvals. The SDPWF is also pursuing an additional 10 acre parcel at Palisades which would complete the current vision. Dick Brown, SDPWF Development Director, briefed the Commission on the current fundraising campaign being undertaken to raise a total of \$1.6 Million for land purchases and park development match dollars at Palisades.

### **PETITIONS**

Leif provided information on the petition process and options available for commission action.

### **East River Rifle Deer Season**

Tony Leif, wildlife division director, presented the petition submitted by David Iverson, Baltic, SD to extend the East River rifled season start to be the weekend before Christmas and end the weekend after New Year's. Iverson's petitions noted this would be beneficial for active duty military and guard personnel as well as allow active duty



military personnel the allowance to purchase and use an any deer license during that timeframe.

Phillips I believe this issue has been discussed at great length and a decision was made.

Motioned by Phillips, second by Boyd TO DENY THE PETITION. Motion passes unanimously.

Motion by Phillips, second by Bies TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 19-13 (APPENDIX A) DENYING THE PETITION. Motion passes unanimously.

### **Smallmouth Bass Length Limits**

Leif presented the petition submitted by Steve Baumberger of Sioux Falls, SD requesting that the Game, Fish and Parks Commission amend administrative rule on daily, possession and length limit restrictions on special management waters proposing to prohibit the harvest of smallmouth bass between 14 and 18 inches in length (protective slot limit) and allow at most one smallmouth bass 18 inches or longer in the daily limit on the waters of the Missouri River

Phillips said do we have proof or statistic to back this up as to pressure growing every year.

Motioned by Phillips, second by Locken TO DENY THE PETITION. Motion passes unanimously.

Motion by Boyd, second by Sharp TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 19-14 (APPENDIX B) DENYING THE PETITION. Motion passes unanimously.

### **Black Bass Daily Possession Limits**

Leif presented the petition submitted by Steve Baumberger of Sioux Falls, SD requesting that the Game, Fish and Parks Commission amend administrative rule on fish limits and boundary waters to establish a statewide daily limit for largemouth and smallmouth bass in combination, of four fish and a statewide possession limit of eight fish

Motioned by Sharp, second by Whitmyre TO DENY THE PETITION. Motion passes unanimously.

Motion by Sharp, second by Locken TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 19-15 (APPENDIX C) DENYING THE PETITION. Motion passes unanimously.

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

The Public Hearing began at 2:00 p.m. and concluded at 2:36 p.m. The minutes follow these Commission meeting minutes.

## OPEN FORUM

Olson opened the floor for discussion from those in attendance on matters of importance to them that may not be on the agenda.

John Cooper, Pierre, SD spoke in regards to concerns on the establishment of the Nest Predator Bounty Program reading the following from a letter recently submitted. In order to be succinct and clear in our opposition comment we offer the following for the Commission's use and for the public record. Governors and GFP's Program: The Nest Predator Bounty Program was apparently conceived by the Governor, her advisors and the GFP and then presented to the Commission and the outdoor community as the reason for a formal Commission Proposal to make minor rule changes to address issues such as eligible species for bounties; requirements for harvest submission of electronic bounty forms, etc. That Commission proposal and a related one addressing trapping dates on public lands and certain rights of way are now before the Commission at your April meeting after the required 30 day public comment period to adopt a rule. We are particularly concerned that the basics of the Program and the resulting Live Trap Giveaway were NOT discussed with the sportsmen of South Dakota, SD conservation organizations, or the GFP Commission. In fact, there was NO public input or discussion of the new Program prior to GFP'S launch and now pending expenditure of license buyer's dollars for the purchase and distribution of free live traps, to the first 5,500 households who requested them, with an original limit of 5 traps (later reduced to a limit of 3 traps because of demand). Reportedly, the costs of these traps, purchased from the Department of Corrections (Pheasant Land Industries) and private business (True Catch Traps) were between \$50 - \$55 each, not counting administrative and delivery costs. If our understanding of these costs and math are correct, hunters and anglers, through the Department, have purchased 15,500 live traps at an approximate cost of between \$800,000 and \$907,500 in order to implement part of Governor Noem's Second Century Initiative without even briefing the GFP Commission and the public that supports and funds South Dakota's wildlife management program(s). By statute, the GFP Commission has budget authority over the Division of Wildlife expenditures and proposed budgets. While we understand that the Commission doesn't normally delve into the details of the Division's budget, it is frankly disturbing that the details of the Program, which comes with a large price tag, were NOT disclosed to the very people (GFP commission) who have the responsibility for budget transparency and accountability in our state government! If those details would have been open for discussion, there would have been an opportunity to learn and discuss such critical issues as defining the time length of this Program - is it planned to be 1 year; 2 years; 4 years..??? Program duration determines how many sportsmen's dollars are expected to be spent and what the Commission would be expected to approve? After all, it appears that the Governor is expecting the Wildlife Fund to be the sole supplier of these funds over the unspecified length of the Program? Was there any consideration of obtaining "outside" dollars from the visitor industry, which obviously prospers from the estimated \$1.9 Billion which outdoor recreation brings to the state annually to help pay for the program. The issue is the ability for the public to have comments on these type of large expenditures. Its just the deal of doing good business as it is legal for staff to do this but legal does not necessarily make it right.

Jeff Olson, Rapid City, SD spoke in regards to the importance of the Commission and the Governance meetings that are typically held annual and the manual provided describes duties, roles, commitments and who the Commission represents which are

outdoor users. These users generate funds therefore Olson feels the primary role of the Commission is budget duties. Noted in 2012 there was an independent review of the Commission and Department. Encouraged the Commission to read the report from the review and spend some time looking at the budget.

Tom Krafka, Rapid City, SD Greater Dakota SCI spoke on concerns for lack of process for the implementation of the nest predator bounty program and this has hurt the credibility of the department. Support the comments made by John Cooper.

Jim Dalberg, Hot Springs, SD concerns that a lot of young animals will starve to death due to this program because of the timeframe in which it takes place.

Justin Bell, Pierre, SD attorney representing SD Landowner and Outfitter Alliance Thanked staff for work on special buck tags proposal and requested the Commission support it. Discussion between alliance and department is a good example of recreation and respect which does not only pertain to nonmeandered waters. Also thanked the Commission for their work on the resident nonresident criteria.

Quintin Bienmann, Rapid City, SD spoke in regards to the special buck allocation. As a longtime hunter of this state thinks this is a bad direction for our state and alliance knows exactly what they are doing to get multiple landowner tags for the guided outfitter hunter and not residents.

Jim Mundt, Britton, SD has attended GFP meetings over the last few months. Most topic matter is well thought out and fact based. The primary focus is big game and lottery draw system. Gives credit to all involved in the process. There is nothing wrong with looking over processes and systems, but in the case of the rifle deer process the issue was not address which is simply the population of the species/habitat. Hopeful we can get on the rightside of expanding habitat through the second century initiatives. As for the resident/nonresidents issue asks the Commission to proceed on fact based information.

Representative Tim Goodwin, Hill City, SD spoke in regards to the mountain lion season that ended Sunday. It was not a good year as it was cold and there was too much snow with only 21 lions harvested with the goal being 60. May want to propose an extended season in the future to go into April until Turkey season starts. Thanks the Department for a user friendly website.

## **FINALIZATIONS**

### **Use of Parks and Public Lands**

Katie Ceroll, parks and recreation director, presented 11 rule changes to the Use of Parks & Public Lands Chapter. These are the general rules that guide activity on all GFP controlled lands but most of rules in the chapter apply to state park area lands.

41:03:01.02 defines the time restrictions for use of state park system – simply speaking, this is the curfew. It allows people to be in parks late at night for camping, fishing, boating and other intended purposes but not for unauthorized reasons. Currently the curfew is 11 pm during the summer and 9 pm the rest of the year - October to April. The proposal changes it to 11 pm year round.

Commercial activity is allowed in parks through a permitting system. Activity might include a food vendor, a horseback or bicycle tour on one of our trails, a rock climbing school at CSP or Palisades, kayaking lessons at Lake Alvin or a film or photography company making a production in a park area (quite common at CSP). These are for profit activities. The proposed changes to rule 41:03:01:07 Commercial Use Prohibited would do three things. First, it eliminates Ag leases (cropping/haying/grazing) from the activities regulated. This activity is authorized by statute and the rule is redundant. Second, it limits the rule to the state park system – this is where these activities occur. Third, it establishes a pricing structure for the activities that are permitted. For activities other than commercial filming and photography, the fee is \$100 or 3% of gross receipts, whichever is greater. For film and photography, the fee is based on the size of the crew.

41:03:01:15 is the camping stay restriction rule. We limit the length of camping stay to two weeks so that all have an opportunity to camp and prevent undue strain on the resources. The Camping Rules chapter refers to a 14 night limitation and rule uses 15 day language. We would change this rule to use the 14 day night language for consistency.

41:03:01:15 is the rule that states that uncased .22 firearms are prohibited in parks. We would propose to repeal the 37 year old rule. Presumably the rule was put in place to deal with vandalism in parks. With staffing & law enforcement in place today, we don't see the problem and are better equipped to deal with it. Repealing this rule will allow use of 22s in parks for small game during designated seasons in accordance with the state park restrictions.

41:03:01:19 deals with tree stands and hunting blinds on department lands. The proposed change would move the date that tree stands and blinds can be set up from August 25 to August 1 to accommodate the recent change to September 1 of the archery season opening date. Also moves the date that stands must be taken down from Feb 15 to March 31. Oftentimes snow makes it impractical to take a tree stand down by February 15.

Motion by Phillips, second by Olson TO APPROVE THE FINALIZATION OF CHANGES TO USE OF PARKS AND PUBLIC LANDS 41:03:01. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Park License and Trail Use Passes**

Katie Ceroll, parks and recreation division director, presented the proposed changes to rule 41:03:03:01 or the Park entrance license exemptions rule. We depend on user fees to support the day to day operation of the state park system – the most significant fees being a park entrance license and camping fees. The park entrance requirement is applied broadly but exemptions include non-profit youth groups, veterans group activities, 100% disabled veterans, park volunteers, open house & free fishing weekend in May, religious activities at Bear Butte and the day of the Buffalo Roundup at Custer State park. This proposal would exempt enrolled Crow Creek tribal members and members of their family from the entrance license requirement at West Bend Recreation Area on Lake Sharpe. West Bend has a large campground and is the most heavily used boat and fishing access site on Lake Sharpe. The park also has a popular swimming beach, picnic areas and playgrounds. It is also immediately adjacent to the Crow Creek Sioux Indian Reservation. Outdoor recreation offerings such as West Bend has are limited on the Crow Creek reservation. The greatest management challenge at West Bend recreation area is potable water. We hope to work with the Crow Creek Tribe to find solutions to the water challenge.

Rule 41:03:01:04 sets the time limits on daily park entrance license. The proposed change would make the daily PEL valid until 11pm year around – consistent with the park curfew change to 11pm year round that we discussed earlier.

Motion by Sharp, second by Olson TO APPROVE THE FINALIZATION OF CHANGES TO PARK ENTRANCE LICENSE EXEMPTION 41:03:03. Motion carried unanimously.

### **George S. Mickelson Trail User Service Fees**

Ceroll presented the changes to 41:03:05:02 would exempt SD military veterans groups and SD veteran's hospital patients from the GSM trail pass requirement when participating in a group event that has been permitted by the park manager at least 5 days prior to the event. This exemption would mirror a veteran's group exemption to the park entrance license that the Commission approved three years ago. 41:03:05:03 requires that Mickelson Trail users 12 years of age and older, are required to have a trail pass (annual or daily) in their possession when using the trail and be able to display it to a department representative. This rule also establishes the trail fees, one of which is a \$15 "late fee". If a trail user cannot produce a pass, they must pay a \$15 fee and in return they are given a \$15 annual trail pass. The proposed change would create \$4 late fee option and allow a trail user unable to produce a pass, the option of purchasing either a \$4 daily or a \$15 annual trail pass. This would lessen the penalty and hopefully encourage trail use. Finally, 41:03:05:06 is the rule that defines how the display of the trail use pass. The proposed change to this rule would put into effect the \$4 late fee option.

Motion Sharp, second by Bies TO APPROVE THE FINALIZATION OF CHANGES TO MICKELSON TRAIL FEES 41:03:05. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Bighorn Sheep Hunting Season**

Kirschenmann provided the recommended changes to the 2019 Bighorn Sheep Hunting Season to modify unit BH3 from "that portion of Pennington County east of the Cheyenne River and that portion of Jackson County north of the White River, excluding the Badlands National Park" to "that portion of Pennington County east of the Cheyenne River and north of Hwy 44 and that portion of Jackson County north of the White River, excluding the Badlands National Park".

John Kanta, wildlife regional supervisor, explained the Department was approached by the Oglala Sioux Parks and Recreation Authority (OSPRA) requesting an adjustment to boundary of Unit BH3. The request was based on the fact that OSPRA manages a bighorn sheep population that typically occupies the south unit of Badlands National Park in Oglala Lakota County. This respective bighorn sheep population typically resides on tribal property, but at times can make forays onto other property including private, Forest Service National Grasslands and State lands. Individuals from this population also make forays into Pennington County where Unit BH3 is currently open. As a result, there is opportunity for a state-licensed hunter to harvest a bighorn sheep from the herd that OSPRA is managing. The Department agrees to accommodate this request and is recommending that the GFP Commission adjust the unit boundary for Unit BH3 to exclude a portion of lower Pennington County from the current unit boundary to reduce the chance for a state-licensed hunter to harvest a bighorn sheep from this population managed by OSPRA.



Motion by Olson, second by Sharp TO APPROVE THE FINALIZATION OF CHANGES TO THE BIGHORN SHEEP HUNTING SEASON 41:06:56 AS PRESENTED. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Custer State Park Antlerless Elk Hunting Season**

Kirschenmann presented the recommended change to close the antlerless elk hunting season. He explained The CSP antlerless elk season was opened again in 2017 based on new information on chronic wasting disease (CWD) prevalence rates from both Custer State Park (CSP) and Wind Cave National Park (2016/2017 culling program). At this time, the season was justified to learn more about the CWD infection rate of CSP elk, begin managing at a lower population density in the identified area due to concerns of over-utilization of forage, and to evaluate and respond accordingly for future management actions.

Through the development of the “draft” CWD action plan, the goal of surveillance strategies in South Dakota is to determine the likely spread of CWD to new units where the disease has not been detected in wild, free-ranging cervids. Without pre-determined research design and management objectives, prevalence rates will not be quantified. If research objectives require prevalence rates or a management strategy will be implemented based on prevalence rate thresholds (i.e., implement management strategy X if prevalence exceeds Y%), prevalence will be estimated by collecting a representative sample with desired levels of precision.

The current population objective for CSP is 800 wintering elk and will general range from 700-900 depending on habitat conditions; the current CSP elk population estimate is 552 (95% CI=483-620). With the current dispersal of elk from this antlerless unit and no identified management response actions if CWD prevalence reaches a certain threshold, there is no current need for this antlerless elk season. Mandatory submission of samples for CWD will still be required from all deer and elk hunters for any future management considerations.

Motion by Olson, second by Sharp TO APPROVE THE CLOSING THE CUSTER STATE PARK ANTLERLESS ELK HUNTING SEASON 41:06:47 FOR 2019. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Authorization to Hunt or Access State Park and Recreation Areas**

Tony Leif informed the Commission that Under Governor Noem’s Second Century Initiative, the Department is using crowdsourcing to solicit ideas to create more and better habitat. GFP is using Facebook as the platform to crowdsource habitat solutions and promote idea-driven dialogue for a period of 2-3 months. This platform is free and allows for a transparent submission process, where participants can engage and respond to proposed ideas. If constituents are not on Facebook, an email account, [habitatpays@state.sd.us](mailto:habitatpays@state.sd.us) is being provided as a secondary option for idea submission. At the end of the effort, GFP staff and 2nd Century Habitat Foundation members will review all comments and ideas and provide their recommendation for final approval to Secretary Hepler and Commission Chairman Jensen. It is anticipated that there could be multiple “winners” of free hunting privileges or free access to state parks and recreation areas.

Motion by Phillips, second by Whitmyre TO FINALIZE THE AUTHORIZATION OF A RESIDENT STATE PARK ACCESS OR SMALL GAME HUNTING PRIVILAGES WITHOUT FEE FOR ONE YEAR 41:03:03 & 41:06:01. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Hunt for Habitat Licenses**

Leif presented the recommended change to establish a hunt for habitat licenses that would allow residents and nonresidents the opportunity to purchase raffle chances through the state licensing system without restriction on the number that can be purchased with the revenue dedicated exclusively for habitat projects.

1. Create one Custer State Park any bison "Hunt for Habitat" license and 3 "Hunts for Habitat" super license packages. The 3 super licenses will each include a tag for one:
  - a. Any Elk,
  - b. Any Deer, and
  - c. Any Antelope.
2. These licenses would be valid at any time and place that a hunting season is open in South Dakota for the big game animal as long as the regulations for the open season are followed.
3. The recipient must be eligible to hold the licenses although any ineligibility due to a previous license draw would be exempt.
4. Recipients will be able to select either of the current or next year as when their tag(s) would be valid.
5. Both residents and nonresidents will be eligible to submit applications for the super tag licenses although no more than 1 of the 3 license packages could be issued to a nonresident.
6. Both residents and nonresidents will be eligible to submit applications for the "Hunt for Habitat" trophy bison license
7. Establish an application fee of \$10 for residents and \$20 for nonresidents.
8. A person may submit an unlimited number of applications.
9. Applications will be accepted on-line only.
10. No additional fee will be charged for licenses drawn.
11. No preference points may be earned or used in the "Hunts for Habitat" drawings.

Motion by Bies, second by Olson TO FINALIZE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF HUNT FOR HABITAT LICENSES AS PRESENTED 41:06:01 & 41:06:02. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Trapping Prohibitions**

Keith Fisk, wildlife damage program administrator, presented the recommended changes to the trapping regulations as follows.

Amend 41:08:02:13. Traps to be rendered inoperable – Removal of trapping devices.

1. Modify the existing rule to allow the use of traps, snares and associated equipment to be used on public lands and improved road rights-of-ways, through August 31. \*(currently May 1)

Fisk explained with the launch of Governor Noem's Second Century Initiatives, in particular the Live Trap Giveaway Program and the Nest Predator Bounty Program; this modification would allow trappers to use traps and snares (which are actively being used) on public lands and improved road rights-of-ways, through August 31. Public lands hold some of the best nesting habitat in the state and in order to remove nest predators during the nesting season, this modification would be needed.

Fisk also recommended a change from proposal to remove the trap-check rule as administrative rule already provides that equipment must be checked within allotted time-frames (48 hours East River and 72 hours West River)

2. Modify the existing rule so that traps, snares and associated equipment must be actively operated and checked in accordance to trap-check rules.

Motion by Sharp, second by Bies TO AMEND THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE TRAPPING REGULATIONS TO REMOVE THE TRAP-CHECK RULE. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion by Sharp, second by Olson TO APPROVE THE FINALIZATION OF CHANGES TO THE TRAPPING REGULATIONS 41:08:02 AS AMENDED. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Nest Predator Bounty Program**

Fisk presented the change to add a new administrative rule to the bounty chapter which outlines the provisions of the nest predator bounty program. These changes include the following:

1. Eligible species: raccoon, striped skunk, opossum, badger or red fox.
2. Only residents of South Dakota may participate.
3. Animals must be harvested in South Dakota by the resident participant.
4. If under the age of 18 years old, a parent/legal guardian must submit the electronic bounty form on behalf of the youth.
5. Information on the electronic bounty form must be true and accurate.

Motion by Sharp, second by Phillips TO APPROVE THE FINALIZATION TO CREATE NEW RULE ALLOWING LAW ENFORCEMENT FLEXIBILITY IN DEALING WITH COMPLIANCE OF THE BOUNTY PROGRAM 41:08:03. Motion carried unanimously.

## **PROPOSALS**

### **Resident Nonresident Criteria**

Leif and Simpson presented the recommended resident/nonresident criteria which was initially discussed and created by a citizen work group, consisting of commission representatives, hunters, anglers, sportsmen/women groups, outfitters, tourism and retail representatives. The proposed criteria would be used to consider future license allocations; however, when using the criteria it is understood that not all items would need to be addressed.

Motion by Phillips, second by Sharp TO APPROVE THE ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION TO CREATE THE RESIDENT/NONRESIDENT CRITERIA. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Deer Hunting Seasons**

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

Chad Switzer, wildlife program administrator, presented the recommended changes to the East River deer hunting season as specified below.

1. Adjust resident license numbers from no more than 21,075 one-tag and 5,250 two-tag deer licenses to no more than 24,510 one-tag and 2,800 two-tag tag deer licenses.
2. Establish Units 13P (Brule County), 33P (Hand County), 36P (Hughes County), and 38P (Hyde County). These units are for antlerless whitetail deer licenses and would be valid on private land

only; all public lands are closed to license holders within these respective units, including Walk-in Areas.

Year	Buck Tags	Doe Tags	Total Tags
2017-2018	18,855	12,715	31,575
2019-2020	19,085	11,025	30,110

Buck Tags (+5%)  
Doe Tags (-13%)

Switzer explained the recommendation to establish private land-only units is a management tool that is being considered to meet deer management population objectives and focus the harvest of antlerless whitetail deer on private land.

Motion by Sharp, second by Phillips TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE EAST RIVER DEER HUNTING SEASON. Motion carried unanimously.

### West River Deer Hunting Season

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the West River deer hunting season as specified below.

1. Adjust resident license numbers from no more than 15,340 one-tag and 3,320 two-tag deer licenses to 12,308 one-tag, 5,220 two-tag deer licenses and 400 three-tag deer licenses.
2. Establish Units 15P (includes that portion valid within Unit 15A of Butte County), 27P (includes that portion valid within Unit 27B of Fall River County), and 45P (includes that portion valid within Unit 45B of Lyman County). These units are for antlerless whitetail deer licenses and would be private land only; all public lands are closed to license holders within these respective units, including Walk-in Areas.

Year	Buck Tags	Doe Tags	Total Tags
2017-2018	16,175	5,805	21,980
2019-2020	15,895	8,053	23,948

Buck Tags (-2%)  
Doe Tags (+39%)

Motion by Phillips, second by Boyd TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE WEST RIVER DEER HUNTING SEASON. Motion carried unanimously.

### Black Hills Deer Hunting Season

Switzer presented the recommended change to adjust the number of resident licenses from no more than 4,300 one-tag deer licenses to no more than 4,800 one-tag deer licenses.

Motion by Locken, second by Bies TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE BLACK HILLS RIVER DEER HUNTING SEASON. Motion carried unanimously.

### Refuge Deer Hunting Season

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the Refuge deer hunting season as specified below.

1. For Lacreek National Wildlife Refuge, adjust the number of resident licenses from no more than 25 one-tag deer licenses to no more than 20 one-tag licenses.
2. For Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge, adjust the number of resident licenses from no more than 150 one-tag deer licenses to no more than 105 one-tag licenses.
3. For Waubay National Wildlife Refuge, modify the season dates as follows: WA1 would open for ~~8~~ 9 consecutive days beginning seven days before the beginning of the East River deer season; WA2 would open for ~~8~~ 5 consecutive days beginning on day following the end of WA1; and WA3 would open for ~~7~~ 9 consecutive days beginning on the day following the end of WA2.
4. Make an allowance for antlerless archery deer licenses to be valid for the Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge.
5. For unfilled antlerless deer licenses for the Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge, change current rule from "nine consecutive days beginning on the Saturday following December 25" to "nine consecutive days beginning on the day following the end of the Unit RFD-SL5 season".

Switzer noted the Waubay National Wildlife Refuge currently has 2 of 3 seasons open. The recommended changes to the respective season dates would allow for the current open seasons to run for 9 consecutive days and include two full weekends for licensed hunters.

Motion by Sharp, second by Bies TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE REFUGE DEER HUNTING SEASON. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Custer State Park Deer Hunting Season**

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the Custer State Park deer hunting season as specified below.

1. Increase the total number of one-tag licenses from no more than 64 to no more than 88.
2. For Unit CUD-2, change from muzzleloader only to any weapon.

Motion by Sharp, second by Whitmyre TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE CUSTER STATE PARK DEER HUNTING SEASON. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Archery Deer Hunting Season**

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the Archery deer hunting seasons as specified below.

1. For Unit ARD-LM1, close units 59A and open units 05A, 11A, 11B, 17A, 18A, 22A, 23A, 25A, 32A, 39B, 45B, 48A, 50A, 55A.
2. For Adams Homestead and Nature Preserve, increase the number of access permits for antlerless whitetail deer from 25 to 30.

Motion by Locken, second by Olson TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE ARCHERY DEER HUNTING SEASON. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Muzzleloader Deer Hunting Season**

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the Muzzleloader deer hunting seasons as specified below.

1. For Unit MZD-LM1, close units 59A and open units 05A, 11A, 11B, 17A, 18A, 22A, 23A, 25A, 32A, 39B, 45B, 48A, 50A, 55A.



Motion by Whitmyre, second by Phillips TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE MUZZLELOADER DEER HUNTING SEASON. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Apprentice Hunter Deer Season**

Switzer presented the apprentice hunter deer season with no recommended changes. He noted of the 4,845 apprentice hunter deer licenses issued for the 2018 deer hunting season, 531 licenses (11%) were issued to residents that were 18 years of age or older.

### **Deer Hunting Seasons – Hunting Unit License & Access Permit Allocations**

Switzer presented the recommended change in administrative action to allocate deer hunting licenses and access permits by unit for the 2019-2020 hunting season.

Motioned by Bies with second by Phillips TO APPROVE THE ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION ALLOCATING DEER LICENSES AND ACCESS PERMITS (Appendix D). Motion carried unanimously.

### **Special Buck Licenses**

Robling presented the recommended changes to the west river special buck season. He explained per discussions with representatives of the Landowner and Outfitter Alliance, it was requested the department bring forward a recommendation of providing additional hunting licenses under the special buck structure to assure there would be available licenses as experienced in previous years by nonresident hunters drawing leftover licenses. Under the changes to the deer drawing license structure, nonresidents will not be able to pick up licenses originally allocated to residents until after the 4th draw. In the past those leftover license were available after the 2nd draw and in 2018, 187 “any whitetail” licenses went to nonresidents that were originally allocated to residents. The concern from the Landowner and Outfitter Alliance is that the reduction in nonresident license opportunity would reduce client participation. The proposal would allocate 500 nonresident “any whitetail” West River licenses and 500 resident “any whitetail” West River licenses. The biological impacts are negligible and the licenses are only valid on private land. The generated revenue from this increase in nonresident and resident opportunity would be used for Walk-in area public hunting incentive payments. This is the same proposal that was presented to the Commission in March with no recommended changes.

Recommended changes: Beginning with the 2020 West River Deer season

1. Establish Resident special Any Whitetail Deer license and fee of \$169.
2. Establish Nonresident special Any Whitetail Deer license and fee of \$554.
3. Special Any Whitetail Deer licenses to be allocated at the greater of 4% of the total resident West River deer licenses that include a “Any Whitetail Deer” tag from the previous year OR 500 for each for residents and nonresident hunters.
4. If a person successfully draws a special Any Whitetail Deer license the licensee will not be able to apply for a West River deer license in the initial and second drawings.
5. If a person successfully draws a West River deer license they may not apply for a leftover special Any Whitetail Deer license.
6. Applicant must have permission from an owner or lessee of private land before applying.
7. Applicant for special Any Whitetail Buck must also include the name and telephone number of the owner or lessee providing permission.

Motion by Sharp, second by Locken TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO THE 2020 WEST RIVER DEER SPECIAL BUCK SEASON AS PRESENTED. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Furbearer and Trapping Seasons**

Fisk presented beaver trapping season for 2019-2020 with no recommended changes from last year.

Fisk presented the skunk opossum, jackrabbit, fox, raccoon and badger trapping seasons for 2019-2020 with no recommended changes from last year.

Fisk presented the mink, weasel and muskrat trapping seasons for 2019-2020 with no recommended changes from last year.

Fisk presented muskrat hunting/trapping season for 2020-2021 with no recommended changes.

### **Public Water Zoning**

Robling and Mike Klosowski, wildlife regional supervisor, discussed three public water zoning proposals:

#### **Compton Cover No Wake Zone – Stanley County**

Add a “no wake zone” at Compton’s Cove in Stanley County. This area is just north of Marion’s Gardens, in Fort Pierre, on the Missouri River. This restriction was requested by the public and would add the same safety measures to Compton’s Cove as Marion’s Gardens

Motioned by Olson, second by Sharp TO ADD A NO WAKE ZONE AT COMPTON COVE. Motion carried unanimously.

#### **Putney Slough – Brown County**

Modify the “no boating zone” dates on Putney Slough Game Production Area from October 15 – December 31 to October 20 – December 31. Modifying this public water zoning rule will marry up similar restrictions in the rest of the state.

Motioned by Sharp, second by Bies TO MODIFY THE NO BOATING ZONE AT PUTNEY SLOUGH. Motion carried unanimously.

#### **Long Lake – Codington County**

Modify the “no boating zone” year round on Long Lake to open year round. This will allow more recreational opportunity, specifically fishing, as the north end of the lake has the most ‘fishable’ water. The lake is managed by the northeast aquatics staff. Staff routinely stock the lake with walleye on a bi-annual schedule. The lake also has a strong population of yellow perch. This area has become a popular fishery close to the city of Watertown. If this area is opened to boating, GFP will develop a modern boat ramp on the NW side of the lake to provide better public access.

Motioned by Sharp, second by Olson TO MODIFY THE NO BOATING ZONE AT LONG LAKE TO BE OPEN YEAR ROUND. Motion carried unanimously.

## **Custer State Park Bison Harvest**

Matt Snyder, parks regional supervisor presented the trophy bison bull harvest season with no recommended changes.

Matt Snyder, parks regional supervisor presented the non-trophy bison bull harvest season with no recommended changes.

## **DIVISION OF WILDLIFE**

### **Deer License Drawing Implementation Plan**

Simpson advised the commission that all updates had been completed to the license application system. Testing is finishing up and the program will be ready to go when applications open. The biggest adjustment will be for users will be the need to move deadlines for several drawings. Simpson advised that June 14th will be the paper deadline for the initial drawing with subsequent drawings taking place throughout the summer. The final drawings will be held in mid-September.

Because of the earlier deadlines, communications staff will be working diligently to get the word out. That planning is already taking place.

### **Deer Population Information**

Andy Lindbloom, senior wildlife biologist, explained how conducts several surveys to assess the biological status of white-tailed deer and mule deer populations. Herd composition surveys are ground counts completed in the fall to assess age and sex ratios. In 2018, the observed age ratios were 87 fawns:100 white-tailed deer does and 75 fawns:100 mule deer does. Sex ratios for white-tailed deer and mule deer were 23 and 39 bucks:100 does, respectively. Total deer harvest was up slightly at 53,100, with 45,300 white-tailed deer and 7,800 mule deer being harvested in 2018. West River deer preliminary harvest estimates were approximately 13,200, with tag success at 56%. East River deer preliminary harvest estimates and success were 14,900 and 48%. In 2018, Black Hills firearm harvest and success were approximately 3,000 and 64%. Survival rates are being monitored in 6 study areas for white-tailed deer, and 4 areas for mule deer. Survival rates for adult does in most areas has been about 80-85%, with juvenile rates more variable between years and across areas. Aerial deer surveys were completed in the Upper James River Study area in 2019, with a projected estimate of 32,400 deer. Department staff use biological data to model deer populations, and evaluate projected changes in populations under different license allocations. Staff set population objectives based on biological and social inputs, and strive to meet both population objectives and hunter success objectives. Population modeling starts with an abundance estimate from harvest population reconstruction, aerial surveys, or distance sample. The modeled population is affected by deaths and births, the later primarily determined by fall recruitment estimates. Deaths are quantified by radio-collared deer, and affected by variables such as hunter harvest, winter severity, disease, and predation. Winter severity impacts will continue to be quantified this year, and effects on future recruitment will be monitored. In summary, past harvest rates have been conservative which has resulted in deer population increases in most areas. Firearm season recommendations for proposals were made to guide deer populations towards management objectives, while attempting to meeting established hunter success thresholds.

### **Mountain Lion Case Presentation**

Jeff Edwards, conservation officer, and Joe Keeton, conservation officer specialist, brief the Commission on a recent mountain lion violation case that resulted in a combination of 12 counts of unlawful possession of big game, 1 count closed season big game hunting, 1 count hunting big game over bait, 16 years revocation, \$16,670 in fines and \$28,000 in civil fines and a federal felony resulting in 8 months prison. They walked through the process beginning with the incoming tip, patrols, investigations and staff support.

### **Black Hills Fisheries Update**

Jake Davis, senior fisheries biologist, provided a brief summary of the status of the Black Hills Fish Management Area Plan and associated sub-plans. He briefed the Commission on the status of objectives within specific components of the plan. Additionally, he highlighted some of the accomplishments that were achieved with the completion of many of the objectives. Lastly he provided timelines on the remaining objectives and the current status of the revision process.

### **Outdoor Campus West Facilities and Program Update**

John Kanta, wildlife regional supervisor, and Chad Tussing, visitors services coordinator, gave the Commissioners a tour of the new archery park. The park is an addition to the Outdoor Campus property in Rapid City and was completed in October 2018. The complex includes two public, outdoor archery ranges and an indoor classroom building for Campus classes and events. The outdoor ranges are open to the public 365 days/year from sunrise to sunset and have already been receiving frequent use by the public.

### **License Sales Update**

Simpson provided a summary of year to date sales for over the counter fishing and hunting license sales. Sales are down 30-40% compared to this time last year. The lag in sales is primarily due to the heavy amounts of snow which prevented access to many lakes during the traditional ice fishing period. While sales are expected to rebound, history shows that early lost sales are not likely to be entirely recuperated by the end of the year.

## **DIVISION OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

### **SDSU Veterans Snowmobile Ride Partnership and Season**

Ryan Raynor, district park supervisor/snowmobile trails coordinator, provided information to the Commission explaining how GFP partnered with the SDSU Veteran's Affairs Office to provide one day of snowmobiling on a three day veteran's retreat over the Martin Luther King holiday weekend. The event took place on Saturday, January 19th and was based out of Hardy Camp. GFP partnered with the Snowmobile Advisory Council and SD Snowmobile Association to raise the funds through snowmobile club donations across the state to rent the snowmobiles. In attendance were 9 Army Veterans, 5 Marine Veterans, and 9 service members who are still serving through National Army or Air Guards. While one group was sledding the other group was meeting with mental health provider, Jessica McLaughlin MA, LPC-MH, QMHP (Iraq War Veteran), and 2 veterans that had met with her asked for follow up regarding their mental health once back on campus. This retreat idea won the best session for the South Dakota Higher Education conference and was presented at the National Level for

the Military Connected Symposium for NASPA. Raynor said there was great snow and trail conditions across SD this season.

### **Shadehill and Belle Fourche Resource Management Plan (RMP)**

Al Nedved, parks and recreation assistant director, and Chris Langstaff with the Bureau of Reclamation in Rapid City provided an update on the Shadehill and Belle Fourche Resource Management Plans (RMP's). The Shadehill Final draft of the RMP has been issued and there were only a few comments received. The RMP pointed out continued need for recreational development and infrastructure improvements. At Belle Fourche, the RMP has gone through the scoping phase. A public meeting was held on August 23, 2018, and a survey was conducted that provided nearly 560 responses. Reclamation is currently analyzing those comments and putting together options that will go into the Draft RMP, which will go out for further public comment. There will be another public open house this summer, and it is expected that the EIS will be concluded by the end of the year. Also, the management agreement that authorizes the Department to operate Rocky Point Recreation Area and some wildlife management acres will expire at the end of the year. The outcome of the RMP process will help determine what the next management agreement looks like.

### **Recreational Trails Program**

Randy Kittle, parks and recreation grants coordinator, provided the Commission an update on the Recreational Trails Program (RTP). He explained how the program funds motorized and non-motorized trail projects. Funds come to the State through the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). RTP grants reimburse project sponsors up to 80% of the approved project cost. There is a 5 person Governor appointed citizen advisory council that oversees awarding of program grant dollars. Kitty Kinsman, Rapid City, Chair; Dave Sweet, Sioux Falls; DeEtte Goss, Belle Fourche; Ken Buhler, Pierre; Mel Fish, Yankton make up the RTP Advisory Council. 30% of the RTP funding must go to motorized trail projects, 30% to non-motorized trail projects and 40 percent to diverse trail projects. SD has approximately \$1.3 million to allocate to projects this year. Eligible applicants include: cities, counties, State Parks, Federal Land Management Agencies, Tribal Governments, private and non-profit trail organizations that produce a public trail benefit. The RTP Advisory Council will meet in June 2019 to review grant applications and award grant funding

### **Reservation and Revenue Reports**

Katie Ceroll, parks and recreation assistant director, provided the year to date revenue report by item as well as the breakout of district revenue. The revenue report indicated a decrease of 6 percent in total revenue. She reported permits are down 7 percent and lodging is down 6 percent, but it is early in the season and flooding has been a factor.

### **Solicitation of Agenda Items from Commissioners**

No agenda items were recommended

### **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Kelly R Hepler

Kelly R. Hepler, Department Secretary

**Appendix A**  
RESOLUTION 19-13

WHEREAS, David Iverson of Baltic, South Dakota, submitted a Petition to the Game, Fish and Parks Commission (Commission) dated March 3, 2019, requesting that the Game, Fish and Parks Commission amend ARSD § 41:06:21:01 (East River deer hunting season) § ARSD 41:06:21:02.01 (Special any deer license) and proposing to make the extended season start the weekend before Christmas and conclude the weekend after New Years as well as allow active duty military personnel the allowance to purchase and use an any deer license during that timeframe for the reasons more fully set out in the petition (hereinafter referred to as "the Petition"); and

WHEREAS, all members of the Commission have been furnished with and have reviewed a copy of the Petition; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has been advised that a copy of the Petition has been served on all members of the Interim Rules Review Committee and Director of the Legislative Research Council as required by SDCL § 1-26-13; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has been advised that SDCL § 1-26-13 requires that within thirty (30) days of submission of a Petition, the Commission shall either "deny the petition in writing (stating its reasons for the denials) or shall initiate rule-making proceedings in accordance with SDCL 1-26-4."; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has been advised and is of the opinion that a hearing on the Petition is neither statutorily required nor necessary; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has reviewed and carefully considered the requirements and procedures set out in SDCL §1-26-13 and the contents of the Petition, including the reasons advanced by Petitioner in support of extending the East River deer season and allowing active military personnel the allowance to purchase an any deer license; and

WHEREAS, The Commission decided to end all deer hunting on January 1 beginning with the 2018 deer hunting season due to concerns expressed by the public over the potential stress of pressuring deer during the winter and concern over the potential of harvesting a mature buck which may have already shed its antlers; and

WHEREAS, Modifying the end date as petitioned would result in the East River deer season ending as late as January 9 (example = 2022), and

WHEREAS, The East River late season antlerless dates were reinstated by the Commission in 2018 for hunting opportunity but was structured purposely so it did not overlap the holidays with the justification of landowners not having to deal with activity associated with the deer hunting season; and

WHEREAS, If a change is merited for the East River deer season, the Commission consider a similar structure for the West River deer season for consistency purposes and at this time there is limited interest in utilizing those dates in the western part of the state; and

WHEREAS, The Commission and Department respects and appreciates the service of our military personnel and believe that the purchase of an antlerless license to hunt during the antlerless only dates is warranted and currently available.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Commission does hereby deny the Petition for the reasons hereinabove stated in this Resolution, which said Resolution as adopted by the Commission shall constitute the Commission's written denial of the Petition and its reasons therefore.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Petition, a record of the Commission's discussions concerning same, and this Resolution be made a part of the Minutes of the Commission meeting at which this Resolution is adopted, and further, that the Department be and it is hereby authorized and directed in compliance with SDCL §1-26-13 to serve a copy of an extract of that portion of the Commission minutes which pertain to the Commission's discussion of the Petition and its adoption of this Resolution, including a copy of the Resolution, on all members of the Interim Rules Review Committee and Director of the Legislative Research Council with copies also to be provided to the Petitioner, David Iverson of Baltic, South Dakota.

**Appendix B**  
RESOLUTION 19-14

WHEREAS, Steve Baumberger of Sioux Falls, South Dakota, submitted a Petition to the Game, Fish and Parks Commission (Commission) dated March 7, 2019, requesting that the Game, Fish and Parks Commission amend ARSD § 41:07:03:03 (Daily, possession and length limit restrictions on special management waters) – proposing to prohibit the harvest of smallmouth bass between 14 and 18 inches in length (protective slot limit) and allow at most one smallmouth bass 18 inches or longer in the daily limit on the waters of the Missouri River for the reasons more fully set out in the petition (hereinafter referred to as “the Petition”); and

WHEREAS, all members of the Commission have been furnished with and have reviewed a copy of the Petition; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has been advised that a copy of the Petition has been served on all members of the Interim Rules Review Committee and Director of the Legislative Research Council as required by SDCL § 1-26-13; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has been advised that SDCL § 1-26-13 requires that within thirty (30) days of submission of a Petition, the Commission shall either “deny the petition in writing (stating its reasons for the denials) or shall initiate rule-making proceedings in accordance with SDCL 1-26-4.”; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has been advised and is of the opinion that a hearing on the Petition is neither statutorily required nor necessary; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has reviewed and carefully considered the requirements and procedures set out in SDCL §1-26-13 and the contents of the Petition, including the reasons advanced by Petitioner in support of altering the daily possession and length limits on the waters of the Missouri River; and

WHEREAS, the professional opinion of South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks (Department) is that current smallmouth bass harvest levels are not detrimental to smallmouth bass populations in Missouri River reservoirs, and

WHEREAS, smallmouth bass surveys show that current smallmouth bass population trends have been improving over the last 10 years within Missouri River reservoirs without such a protective slot limit, and

WHEREAS, smallmouth bass surveys show fish growth rates in some reservoirs (particularly in Lake Sharpe) do not support the justification to enact a protective slot limit as fish rarely exceed the upper bounds of the proposed slot limit, and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Commission does hereby deny the Petition for the reasons hereinabove stated in this Resolution, which said Resolution as adopted by the Commission shall constitute the Commission’s written denial of the Petition and its reasons therefore.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Petition, a record of the Commission’s discussions concerning same, and this Resolution be made a part of the Minutes of the Commission meeting at which this Resolution is adopted, and further, that the Department be and it is hereby authorized and directed in compliance with SDCL §1-26-13 to serve a copy of an extract of that portion of the Commission minutes which pertain to the Commission’s discussion of the Petition and its adoption of this Resolution, including a copy of the Resolution, on all members of the Interim Rules Review Committee and Director of the Legislative Research Council with copies also to be provided to the Petitioner, Steve Baumberger of Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

**Appendix C**  
RESOLUTION 19-15

WHEREAS, Steve Baumberger of Sioux Falls, South Dakota, submitted a Petition to the Game, Fish and Parks Commission (Commission) dated March 7, 2019, requesting that the Game, Fish and Parks Commission amend ARSD § 41:07:03:01 (Fish Limits-Inland Waters), ARSD § 41:07:03:02 (Fish Limits-South Dakota Minnesota Boundary Waters), ARSD § 41:07:03:02.01 (Fish Limits-South Dakota-Nebraska Boundary Waters) & ARSD § 41:07:03:02.02 (Fish Limits- South Dakota-Iowa Boundary Waters) – proposing to establish a statewide daily limit for largemouth and smallmouth bass (hereafter referred to as “black bass”), in combination, of four fish and a statewide possession limit of eight fish for the reasons more fully set out in the petition (hereinafter referred to as “the Petition”); and

WHEREAS, all members of the Commission have been furnished with and have reviewed a copy of the Petition; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has been advised that a copy of the Petition has been served on all members of the Interim Rules Review Committee and Director of the Legislative Research Council as required by SDCL § 1-26-13; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has been advised that SDCL § 1-26-13 requires that within thirty (30) days of submission of a Petition, the Commission shall either “deny the petition in writing (stating its reasons for the denials) or shall initiate rule-making proceedings in accordance with SDCL 1-26-4.”; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has been advised and is of the opinion that a hearing on the Petition is neither statutorily required nor necessary; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has reviewed and carefully considered the requirements and procedures set out in SDCL §1-26-13 and the contents of the Petition, including the reasons advanced by Petitioner in support of establishing state-wide daily and possession limits for black bass; and

WHEREAS, changing daily and possession limits statewide would include border waters and fisheries management of waters shared with neighboring states requires significant advance planning and coordination; and

WHEREAS, the professional opinion of South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks (Department) is that current black bass harvest levels are not detrimental to bass populations in South Dakota, and

WHEREAS, Department angler harvest surveys typically show low harvest of black bass and a low percentage of anglers harvesting a limit of five bass on waters where they are abundant; and

WHEREAS, because of low angler harvest of black bass and the low percentage of anglers harvesting a five-fish daily limit, a decrease in the daily limit from five fish to four fish would result in limited change in overall black bass harvest.

WHEREAS, the Department monitors black bass population dynamics and if declines in population quality occur that can be attributed to angler harvest, more restrictive regulations can be proposed.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Commission does hereby deny the Petition for the reasons hereinabove stated in this Resolution, which said Resolution as adopted by the Commission shall constitute the Commission’s written denial of the Petition and its reasons therefore.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Petition, a record of the Commission’s discussions concerning same, and this Resolution be made a part of the Minutes of the Commission meeting at which this Resolution is adopted, and further, that the Department be and it is hereby authorized and directed in compliance with SDCL §1-26-13 to serve a copy of an extract of that portion of the Commission minutes which pertain to the Commission’s discussion of the Petition and its adoption of this Resolution, including a copy of the Resolution, on all members of the Interim Rules Review Committee and Director of the Legislative Research Council with copies also to be provided to the Petitioner, Steve Baumberger of Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

## Appendix D

### Deer Hunting Seasons – Hunting Unit License & Access Permit Allocations

#### EAST RIVER DEER 2019-2010

Unit #	Unit Name	Resident Licenses									License Totals				
		AnyD	AtID	AD+AtID	2 AtID	AnyW	AtW	AtW	A/W+AtW	2 AtW	RES	RES	RES	RES	
		01	03	08	09	11	13	13-Private	18	19	1-tag	2-tag	Licenses	Tags	
01A	Minnehaha	450	200									650	0	650	650
03A	Brown	1,000	1,000									2,000	0	2,000	2,000
04A	Beadle					500	200					700	0	700	700
05A	Codington	250	100									350	0	350	350
06A	Brookings	450	100									550	0	550	550
07A	Yankton	300										300	0	300	300
07B	Yankton		75									75	0	75	75
08A	Davison					200						200	0	200	200
10A	Aurora					300	200					500	0	500	500
12A	Bon Homme	250										250	0	250	250
12B	Bon Homme		50									50	0	50	50
13A	Brule	100						100	800			200	800	1,000	1,800
13L	Brule	20										20	0	20	20
14A	Buffalo	100							250			100	250	350	600
16A	Campbell	30				400	150					580	0	580	580
17A	Charles Mix	100				200	100					400	0	400	400
18A	Clark	600	100									700	0	700	700
19A	Clay	200	100									300	0	300	300
22A	Day	600	100									700	0	700	700
23A	Deuel	400	100									500	0	500	500
25A	Douglas					250	100					350	0	350	350
26A	Edmunds	700	600									1,300	0	1,300	1,300
28A	Faulk	600	600									1,200	0	1,200	1,200
29A	Grant	300										300	0	300	300
32A	Hamlin	600	100									700	0	700	700
33A	Hand	20						300	450	100		320	550	870	1,420
34A	Hanson					200						200	0	200	200
36A	Hughes	175				250		100				525	0	525	525
37A	Hutchinson					150						150	0	150	150
38A	Hyde	20						100	500	100		120	600	720	1,320
40A	Jerauld					250	250		100			500	100	600	700
42A	Kingsbury	500	100									600	0	600	600
43A	Lake	300	100									400	0	400	400
44A	Lincoln	200	100									300	0	300	300
46A	McCook	350	200									550	0	550	550
47A	McPherson	500	500									1,000	0	1,000	1,000
48A	Marshall	500	100									600	0	600	600
51A	Miner	400	350									750	0	750	750
52A	Moody	350	200									550	0	550	550
54A	Potter	150					400		500			550	500	1,050	1,550
55A	Roberts	500	100									600	0	600	600
56A	Sanborn					350	200					550	0	550	550
57A	Spink	900	400									1,300	0	1,300	1,300
59A	Sully	100				250						350	0	350	350
59B	Sully	20				300	50					370	0	370	370
61A	Turner	100										100	0	100	100
62A	Union	300	100									400	0	400	400
63A	Walworth	50										750	0	750	750
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12,485</b>	<b>5,475</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,000</b>	<b>1,950</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>2,600</b>	<b>200</b>		<b>24,510</b>	<b>2,800</b>	<b>27,310</b>	<b>30,110</b>
Unit #	Unit Name	AnyD	AtID	AD+AtID	2 AtID	AnyW	AtW	AtW	A/W+AtW	2 AtW	RES	RES	RES	RES	
		01	03	08	09	11	13	13-Private	18	19	1-tag	2-tag	Licenses	Tags	



BLACK HILLS DEER 2019-2020

Unit	Resident Licenses			Nonresident Licenses			License Totals							
	Any Deer	Any WT	Antlerless WT	Any Deer	Any WT	Antlerless WT	RES	RES	RES	RES	NR	NR	NR	NR
	01	11	13	01	11	13	1-tag	2-tag	Lic	Tags	1-tag	2-tag	Lic	Tags
BD1			1,000	0	0	80	1,000	0	1,000	1,000	80	0	80	80
BD2			100	0	0	8	100	0	100	100	8	0	8	8
BH1	200	3,500		16	280	0	3,700	0	3,700	3,700	296	0	296	296
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>3,500</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>4,800</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,800</b>	<b>4,800</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>384</b>
Unit	Any Deer	Any WT	Antlerless WT	Any Deer	Any WT	Antlerless WT	RES	RES	RES	RES	NR	NR	NR	NR
	01	11	13	01	11	13	1-tag	2-tag	Lic	Tags	1-tag	2-tag	Lic	Tags
	<b>RES and NR:</b>						<b>5,184</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,184</b>	<b>5,184</b>				

REFUGE DEER 209-2020

Unit	Resident Licenses			Nonresident Licenses			License Totals							
	Any D	Any Atl D	2 Any Atl D	Any D	Any Atl D	2 Any Atl D	RES	RES	RES	RES	NR	NR	NR	NR
	01	03	09	01	03	09	1-tag	2-tag	Lic	Tags	1-tag	2-tag	Lic	Tags
<b>Lacreek Refuge</b>														
RFD-LC1	10	0	0	1	0	0	10	0	10	10	1	0	1	1
RFD-LC2	10	0	0	1	0	0	10	0	10	10	1	0	1	1
<b>Sand Lake Refuge</b>														
RFD-SL1	20	0	0	2	0	0	20	0	20	20	2	0	2	2
RFD-SL2	20	0	0	2	0	0	20	0	20	20	2	0	2	2
RFD-SL3	20	0	0	2	0	0	20	0	20	20	2	0	2	2
RFD-SL4	0	25	0	0	2	0	25	0	25	25	2	0	2	2
RFD-SL5	20	0	0	2	0	0	20	0	20	20	2	0	2	2
<b>Waubay Refuge</b>														
RFD-WA1	10	0	0	1	0	0	10	0	10	10	1	0	1	1
RFD-WA2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RFD-WA3	10	0	0	1	0	0	10	0	10	10	1	0	1	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>
Unit	Any D	Any Atl D	2 Any Atl D	Any D	Any Atl D	2 Any Atl D	RES	RES	RES	RES	NR	NR	NR	NR
	01	03	09	01	03	09	1-tag	2-tag	Lic	Tags	1-tag	2-tag	Lic	Tags
	<b>RES and NR:</b>						<b>159</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>159</b>				

CUSTER STATE PARK DEER 2019-2020

Unit	Resident Licenses		
	Any Deer	Any Whitetail	Antlerless Whitetail
	01	11	13
CUD-1	5	33	0
CUD-2	0	0	50
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>50</b>

CUSTER STATE PARK DEER

2017-18 VS 2019-20 COMPARISON

Unit	2017-2018 Resident Licenses	2019-2020 Resident Licenses	# Change	% Change	2017-2018 Resident Tags	2019-2020 Resident Tags	# Change	% Change
CUD-1	34	38	4	12%	34	38	4	12%
CUD-2	30	50	20	67%	30	50	20	67%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>38%</b>

MUZZLELOADER DEER 2019-2020

	Resident	
	Any Deer Licenses	Any Deer Tags
Statewide	1,000	1,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,000</b>

MUZZLELOADER DEER 2017-18 VS 2019-20 COMPARISON

	Resident	
	Any Deer Licenses	Any Deer Tags
2017-2018 Statewide	1,000	1,000
2019-2020 Statewide	1,000	1,000

ACCESS PERMITS 2019-2020

Designated Area	Number of Access Permits		
	Any Deer	Antlerless Whitetail Deer	Total
Adams Homestead and Nature Preserve	5	30	35
Good Earth State Park	5	0	5

ACCESS PERMITS 2017-18 VS 2019-20 COMPARISON

Designated Area	Number of Access Permits		
	Any Deer	Antlerless Whitetail Deer	Total
2017-2018 Adams Homestead and Nature Preserve	5	25	30
2019-2020 Adams Homestead and Nature Preserve	5	30	35
2017-2018 Good Earth State Park	5	0	5
2019-2020 Good Earth State Park	5	0	5



Public Hearing Minutes of the Game, Fish and Parks Commission  
April 4, 2019

The Public Hearing Officer Scott Simpson began the public hearing at 2:00 p.m. MT at GFP Outdoor Campus West in Rapid City, South Dakota. Commissioners Travis Bies, Jon Locken, Russell Olson, Douglas Sharp, and Robert Whitmyre were present and Commissioners Gary Jensen, Mary Anne Boyd, Scott Phillips participated via conference call. Simpson indicated written comments were provided to the Commissioners prior to this time and will be reflected in the Public Hearing Minutes. Simpson then invited the public to come forward with oral testimony.

**Use of Parks and Public Lands**

No verbal comments received.

**Park License and Trail Use Passes**

No verbal or written comments received.

**George S. Mickelson Trail User Service Fees**

No verbal or written comments received.

**Bighorn Sheep Hunting Season**

No verbal or written comments received.

**Custer State Park Antlerless Elk Hunting Season**

No verbal or written comments received.

**Authorization to Hunt or Access State Park and Recreation Areas**

No verbal or written comments received.

**Hunt for Habitat Licenses**

No verbal comments received.

**Trapping Prohibitions**

No verbal comments received.

**Nest Predator Bounty Restrictions**

Mark DeVries, SD Stockgrowers Belvidere, SD said the last 20 years it has been his privilege to serve on various group with the people in this room. The goal is how to get people involved and this is a great start. DeVries has trapped and taken his sons out this will help. You appreciate habitat especially in the winter time as it shows you what habitat means to the animals. He feels this will also help develop relationships with landowners. A young person may only get three raccoons and knows they are doing their part to help the pheasants. This will make them better outdoorsmen and sportsmen and appreciate the outdoors.

Larry Bowden, Western SD Fur Harvesters, Hot Springs, SD said his organization is involved in trapper education as they teach the ethics on setting traps and are pleased to see this is a Gov's initiative. Last year they put on 3 seminars and were overwhelmed. There are young people in particular who do not have family involved and want to learn. Recently met with GFP staff about this program and

received presentation on trapper education and discussed items of interest and concern. We do not always agree, but GFP staff has been good to work with and they are very excited about the trapper education piece of this program. We are ready to help with the education piece of this program if needed. He stressed there is a responsibility with trapping as you are obligated to check your traps and treat animals humanly.

John Hopple, president of SD Trappers Association, Black Hawk, SD said not all members agree with this, but they do all agree this is good for kids and education of trapping and fully support it. The first session was full and the kids were soaking up all the education given to them. This program is already working and is getting kids in the outdoors even if they do not continue to trap.

Steve Frooman, Rapid City, SD said he is confused as to the reason of the bounty program. If trapping dies out he doesn't understand why that would be a bad thing. Thinks the bounty program as proposed doesn't do a good job of serving the stated purposes. Rapid City is good raccoon habitat and why does trapping coons in this area and spending \$10 per tail to help nesting area which is not in the city. We do not spend money to incentivize people to hunt and fish so why for trapping.

Jamie Al-Haj, Rapid City, SD spoke in opposition of the bounty program She said if this is a reason for opening this bounty program why statewide. Pheasants have been in decline since the 1960;s nationwide beginning with the change in modernized farming practices. These issues as well as trying to improve habitat are already being worked on and there is no scientific data to support this so why establish a program for the eradication of animals

May Wickers, Hot Springs, SD said she was upset to hear we could end up the same as other states with bounty programs. Grew up in a hunting family and loves the outdoors. Does not want to encourage our kids to be killers instead need to learn to love and value animals. When you take out a small predator you get an imbalance then you have rodents that cause problems. It's all a circle and each animal is dependent on the others.

Laural Bidwell, Rapid City, SD said she opposes the bounty program which was designed for east river only and support pheasants which is a nonnative species. Then we expanded the program and said it was to get the people outdoors. We already enjoy the outdoor for biking and trails and the wilderness. We do not need to kill off these species in the black hills. The economy is different across the state and people who visit the black hills want to see the animals. How will you ensure these traps are monitored? We talk about humane killing and trapping an animal and leaving it alive to die is not humanly. Would like clarification if this is traps only and not snares so how do you make sure this happens. What documentation do we as the public use to educate ourselves.

Julie Anderson, Rapid City, SD would like to comment on Second Century habitat initiative. Opposes the bounty program because animals will be killed and young animals orphaned to die so pheasants can thrive. Facts support these initiatives are ineffective, cruel, and have no scientific validation. Feels there should have been a public comment period for this program so she can condemn this war on wildlife.

Terry Mayes, Rapid City, SD South Dakota Wildlife Federation, support the letter submitted by John Cooper. Support the efforts of GFP and Governor in this initiative. There was not a public forum on this issue and nearly a million dollars was spent so we disagree with this and there was not enough involvement on the front in to support this.

See attached public comments submitted prior to the public hearing  
The public Hearing concluded at 2:36 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kelly R Hepler". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "K" and "H".

Kelly R. Hepler, Department Secretary

# Public Comments

## Hunt for Habitat Licenses

---

**Robert Eddy**

**Spearfish SD**

**reddy@rushmore.com**

**Comment:**

I encourage the commission to approve the Hunt for Habitat proposal with a few exceptions. I would encourage these tags to be a Deer/Antelope/Turkey/Waterfowl/Small Game licence or Buffalo only. Elk, Sheep and Goat should be off the table. Those tags should be for SD residents drawn in the competitive process. Keep South Dakotas wildlife, it is not for sale!

---

**Charles Courtney**

**Humboldt SD**

**cwc.tex@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

awesome

---

**John Fanning**

**Norfolk NE**

**johan869@live.com**

**Comment:**

I would like the opportunity to be able to draw any sex tags for deer, elk and antelope.

---

**Ryan Leimkuhl**

**Aberdeen SD**

**ryan.leimkuhl@abbusiness.com**

**Comment:**

If we are going to allow out of state then the fee should be a lot higher ,I hunt a lot of out of state the fees are not the big issues ,access and game are

---

**Chuck Clayton**

**Huron SD**

**clayton@hur.midco.net**

**Comment:**

I have no problem with the concept, except that it will be the first time non-residents are able to hunt elk in SD, when you have overwhelming demand for those tags from residents. If you check the regulations for most other states, there is a non-refundable application fee of some type, plus you still have to pay for the tags. I would think a tag for 3 big game animals, including an elk, should bring at least what other states are paying, and that would be well over \$1,000. I would say that if this is open to non-residents, it should be higher. Residents are not going to pay the money for the tags. The high rolling non-residents are happy to pay the \$20, and that would be where we would get the most income.

---

**Mark Smedsrud**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Maksmedsrud**

**Comment:**

Commission

I strongly oppose the idea of selling raffle tickets to support habitat. I don't believe raffling a coveted tag is the best choice option in helping habitat. I would much rather see a habitat stamp introduced like other states. It will be applicable to any license including trapping. Raffles are not a consistent source of income and a habitat stamp would be more consistent tied to all hunting and trapping licenses. I believe it could be tied to fishing as it would allow more access to ramps and better stocking opportunities.

---

**Gary French**

**Cavour SD**

**garyfrench56@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

There should be no non resident super tags allowed for a non resident when there are several resident hunters that have been trying for years to draw a elk tag either rifle or archery this would be a slap in the face to your resident hunters that have supported hunting in this state for years why does the GFP want to keep trying to change the way of our state hunting it seems like they want out of state hunters more than the resident hunters

---

**Jarred Burleson**

**Lead SD**

**Jburleson13@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I have always thought this would be good way to raise money for gfp without having to raise resident license fees.

---

**Arlan Smedsrud**

**Chancellor SD**

**smedsrudarlan@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

As residents of this state we are privileged to have enough elk, sheep, Mt goat, bison and deer to allow the resident hunter a opportunity to harvest one of these big game animals. I'm TOTALLY opposed to more nonresident hunters. They already over run our state every year with pheasant season. I'm tired of a Winnebago full of hunters and dogs helping me hunt a 80 acre piece of land. They ruined that hunting, they will do the same with the super tag. Just call it the super rich.

---

**Kent Siemonsma**

**Humboldt SD**

**ksiemonsma@goldenwest.net**

**Comment:**

Another way to take more of our money for just a chance. If you want habitat for wildlife you need to start with the farmer, no more drain tile, no more breaking up pasture or sodded ground, tearing out shelterbelts and so on

---

**Scott Gamo**

**Cheyenne WY**

**gamowolk@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Solid idea on the SuperTag hunts. We do that here in Wyoming and they are well received. Provides an opportunity (albeit small) for non-residents and adds revenue for the department.

---

**Larry Menning**

**Chamberlain SD**

**lmenning@midstatesd.net**

**Comment:**

An elk license for a South Dakota hunter is highly desirable but very difficult to obtain. Even the loss of a chance at one of these opportunities to a non-resident is unacceptable to me.

---

**Larry Nemec**

**Pierre SD**

**Comment:**

Encourage young people to apply by making the licenses equally affordable to everyone, not just the wealthy person. Limit the number of chances to ten per applicant. Also, make the application available by sending payment to or stopping at the game & fish office, and not only online. A lot of hunters don't have computer knowledge.

# Nest Predator Bounty

---

**Spencer Poel**

**Aberdeen SD**

**tracker-13@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I fully support a bounty on pheasant predators and extending the trapping season on public grounds

---

**Kevin Sirovy**

**Valley Springs SD**

**ksirovy@alliancecom.net**

**Comment:**

Have no problem with trapping, have a real problem in hunting areas using dogs that have snares without notification.

---

**Sandy Pederson**

**Vermillion SD**

**sandypederson@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

We need more habitat for nesting species. not fewer predator species. I also "own" public lands, and I am against this. I am for more CRP land and buffer strips and other ways to augment the habitat for our state's wildlife...all wildlife.

---

**Tim Lund**

**Madison SD**

**tlundlabs@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Bounty is a good start

---

**Kyle Dietz**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Kylemdietz@aol.com**

**Comment:**

I am a hunter and outdoorsman. As an outdoorsman, I understand that healthy ecosystems are balanced ecosystems. I urge the decision makers base their decision on sound research and the advice of experts in this field of study. You will be more convincing to the public and gain better understanding if the support from such research and experts is visible. Here is a link on information specifically on this topic from pheasants forever. <https://www.pheasantsforever.org/Habitat/Pheasant-Facts/Effects-of-Predators.aspx>  
Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment. I hope I get a reply that is specific to my concerns.

---

**Pat Nogelmeier**  
**Florence SD**  
**deepatn@itctel.com**

**Comment:**

Excellent idea. Will state and federal lands be open? Walk-in areas with landowner permission? Skunk Tails need to be vacuum sealed? :-)

---

**Jon Sorensen**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**sorensen5000@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

As a SD trapper i see alot of small animals that i release because it does me no good to harvest them because of the low cost and high grading of the pelts. And so the animals get released with very little harm and head back out to destroy more nest and what ever else they can chew on. Giving me a reason to help harvest more of the smaller animals as well as the adults will only help improve the nesting grounds as well as diseases caused by these animals in our off season. Nobody wants to see them destroyed all together. But with prices for fur and the large amount of animal activist against us, our trapper numbers have shrunk considerably and will continue to shrink as the population of fur like raccoons ,skunks etc bloom even more. I have many Farmers begging me to trap there property year around but with nothing to counter the cost of gas and other supplies i cant. Thanks

---

**Stephen Craycroft**  
**Gettysburg SD**  
**huntfish2010@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Given the reduction of CRP program participation in the state, pheasant and duck nesting habitat is being significantly reduced throughout the state. The immediate result of reduced nesting habitat is that nest predators become much more efficient at finding and destroying eggs/nests. While increasing available nesting habitat would be far superior to this program, trapping nest predators can be a valuable part of reducing nest predation, and to increase public involvement and awareness of this issue.

Recommend adding feral cats to the list of species eligible for the bounty!

---

**Tacy Paul**  
**Spearfish SD**  
**tacykaraganpaul@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

To kill an animal that is using it's natural instincts to survive so hunters can kill their prey instead is morally wrong and unethical. I wish S.D. would catch up to the 21st century and try to conserve our precious wildlife. So sad that is always boils down to financial gain.



---

**Brad Cox**  
**Lennox SD**  
**brad-1961@live.com**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Suzanne Hodges**  
**Sacramento CA**  
**antiguasue@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

This is war on wildlife and throwing the ecological balance of nature off. Is there not a better use of South Dakota's Time and money rather than attacking the environment???

---

**Sue Hayes**  
**Deadwood SD**  
**Shayespeaches@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Trapping is a barbaric activity. I hate having to worry about my dogs getting accidently trapped when I'm taking them out in the woods to hike. Let nature take its course. The birds will continue to survive. This all boils down to money only.

---

**Jim Stephens**  
**Pierre SD**  
**ashlee.commpharm@mncomm.com**  
**m**

**Comment:**

Having grown up in the Day-Clark County area in the prime years 50s and 60s of pheasant I am very much in favor of a bounty system and it certainly did work then, and contributed to the large pheasant population-coupled with great habitat from the Soil Bank Program. My father was a fox and mink trapper as well as being a fur buyer. In the spring we would dig out fox dens, and it was simply amazing the number of pheasant carcasses you would find in a fox den. Interestingly-8 of 10 pheasants found would be hens, as they tend to sit tighter and are more easily caught by predators, such as fox, raccoon and skunks. The bounty was \$4.00-which was a lot of money in 1955, and I can remember many trips to the County Treasures Office, to collect the bounty. As far as the concern that people would collect a road killed skunk, and turn it in for a bounty-I do not see that as an issue. Someone would do that once, and decide it was a very unpleasant experience, and certainly not worth \$10.00. I realize there is an element of society that is against taking a life of any animal. I appreciate Governor Noem's understanding of the predator issue, and think it is a great plan.

Jim Stephens  
1013 West Second  
Pierre, SD 57501

---

**John Lems**

**Canton SD**

**johnl@johnsonfeedinc.com**

**Comment:**

strongly oppose because of date i would strongly support if started in november when furs are prime

---

**Kerry Bowers**

**Pierre SD**

**kerrypierr@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I oppose this legislation as there is no legitimate wildlife control issue here. Weather is #1 in the causes of annual fluctuations in pheasant and grouse numbers with habitat loss running a close second. This program is only about one thing... money.

There is little to no justification for the State promoted trapping and killing of these other animals in order to protect these birds.

---

**Terri Jepsen**

**Pierrepierre SD**

**terjepsen@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

How could you have a program like this? It is so selfish and disgusting! These animals have the right to live too! What I see is that it's all about money and killing! You have guns and want to heartlessly kill something! I know what your motive is in having this program and that is because some of these animals eat pheasant eggs. Do we have a lack of pheasants in this state? The answer is No! You make enough money each year during pheasant hunting season so why are you looking to wipe out a whole population of raccoons, skunks, opossums, badgers and red foxes? The answer is : greed and it's all about killing! Heartlessly taking animals lives for money and sport!

---

**Bob Hepp**

**Hartford SD**

**Bobhepp@ yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

This is such a bunch of BS, what biologist would think of damaging the eco system for a game bird, spending money on traps is not the answer. instead SDGFP should be increasing habitat..

---

**Renee Leftlethand**  
**Freeman SD**  
**rollykoal@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Unnecessary to do year round and trapping is cruel and dangerous to other animals and people .. totally disagree and I live on a small farm

---

**Nicky Busutil**  
**Milbank SD**  
**pishnsapph@aim.com**

**Comment:**

This is a senseless proposal, with no regard for the welfare of South Dakota's natural ecosystem. If you want pheasants to flourish so badly, lower the limit for hunters and implement higher fines for poachers and those who hunt over the limit. Enough raccoons, skunks, etc. are killed by vehicles every year; we do not need to increase their deaths.

---

**Patricia Jenkins**  
**Brandon SD**  
**dpjenkins@alliancecom. net**

**Comment:**

LEAVE OUR WILD LIFE ALONE. EVERY TIME WE TURN AROUND SOMEONE IS DESTROYING OUR WORLD! ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! Set up Pheasant Farms with the \$400,000, raise the birds for hunters if its such a big money maker! Dogs and other animals will end up in these traps!

---

**Darcy Bracken-Marxen**  
**Hermosa SD**  
**Darcy@whitetailridgesd.com**

**Comment:**

There are other ways. This bill is barbaric and continues to erode South Dakota's reputation. In terms of animal cruelty, we are one of the worst, if perhaps THE worst. I work hard for a living and oppose any use of my tax contributions to a program that disrespects life.

---

**Lorri May**  
**Madison SD**  
**Lynnyts@iw.net**

**Comment:**

All animals are put on Earth for a purpose. I don't believe in killing skunks, red foxes, opossums, etc. because they may be pests. Find ways to work around them rather than murdering them.

Thank you.

---

**Leah Kelly**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Leahkellylmt@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Animal cruelty and barbaric torture methods don't belong in a civilized society. Ban trapping altogether and let nature prosper rather than your wallets.

---

**Suzanne Hodges**

**Sacramento CA**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Peggy Mann**

**Aberdeen SD**

**mann\_5m@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Trapping is inhumane, disgusting and barbaric. Trapping should be banned. Anybody with a soul cannot enjoy knowing that a animal is suffering and succumbing to a slow horrible death in a trap. Pure greed. Continually disrupting and destroying the ecosystem will eventually have dire consequences for all.

---

**Larry Menning**

**Chamberlain SD**

**lmenning@midstatesd.net**

**Comment:**

Numerous wildlife biologists I respect tell me that bounty programs simply do not work. I believe them. They are costly, like the trap give away was, and are ineffective.

---

**Barry Betts**

**Oacoma SD**

**Comment:**

Science (even your own GFP research in the 1970's) proves that bountys do not work! Use the money to support habitat including planting food plots on all Game Production Areas in the state!!

---

**Robert Stapelberg**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**rdstapel@rap.midco.net**

**Comment:**

Why do you feel that it's necessary to kill off all the animals except for pheasants, deer and elk just so the hunters have more of them to kill? If that's the only way for South Dakota to raise funds them maybe we should raise taxes and stop killing the other occupants on this planet.

---

**Louise Mcgannon**  
**Mitchell SD**  
**l.mcgannon@ymail.com**

**Comment:**

This is wrong every way you look at it. Number 1, pheasants are not native to South Dakota but you want to kill native animals for hunters.

Number 2. All animals serve a purpose as part of the ecosystem, of all organizations you should understand this.

---

**David Hagen**  
**Aberdeen SD**  
**davehagen1@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

To whom it may concern,

I'm writing to inform you that I am opposed to the Bounty Program that Gov. Noem has mandated.

Here are a few reasons I am opposed:

1. Financial Loss

Gov. Daugaard's South Dakota Habitat Work Group from 2014 stated that bounties had limited positive effect with high financial costs. page 20 Please read the full report, you could learn a thing or two.

The state will spend over \$900,000 just on traps, 5,500 X 3 X\$55 as well as the dollars that will go toward the bounty of each predator. I find this a very ineffective way of using sportsman's money and you should as well.

2. Unsportsmanlike

Trapping animals that are about to give birth or have already done so, leaving their young to fend for themselves. Unsportsman

Cutting just the tail off and leaving the animal, we have a wanton waste law that all sportsman are to abide by. Unsportsman

This is how the state wants to introduce our next generation to trapping? Our Heritage and Tradition of trapping deserves better than this, wouldn't you agree?

Please don't get me wrong, I have no problem trapping or killing animals, to be honest, I enjoy it.

### 3. Bounties don't work

If bounties worked, we would have continued the bounties that had been implemented in the past.

If bounties worked, every state would have them. States that have had bounties in the past have eliminated them, just like South Dakota.

There are 3 predators that weren't on Gov. Noem's list: mink, coyote, and feral cats

Mink are related to the skunk, they eat eggs and birds.

Coyote are related to the fox, they eat eggs and birds.

Feral cats, South Dakota's most damaging predator. Please read the article by Tim Ray GFP Wildlife Damage Specialist. Aberdeen American News Sept. 7, 2018

I've had the privilege of hunting, fishing, and trapping in this great state for over 40 years. I will hunt from the early Canadian goose season to the end of spring goose season. In between these seasons, I hunt ducks, geese, pheasants, archery and rifle deer and raccoons with hounds. The one constant to seeing large amounts of wildlife is HABITAT. When HABITAT is good, hunting opportunities increase. In the future, please put our money towards HABITAT and not waste it on bounties.

Don't forget, Gov. Noem works for the state. She is an elected official, that means she works for me, you, and the personal that work for the GFP. The GFP officials and others that oppose the bounty program should be allowed to share their expertise without backlash from the Governor.

Will I take part in the Bounty Program? Yes I will. However, I will not start until the latter part of the summer, this will at least give the young a fighting chance to survive.

If the state is stupid enough to pay me to do this, I will take part. Maybe we should have a bounty on stupidity, something to think about.

Dave Hagen  
918 Ash Lane  
Aberdeen, SD  
605 216 3363

---

**Annette Hof**

**Crooks SD**

**annette\_hof@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I don't think it's right to go out and just kill these innocent animals and make money off them.

They deserve a better life than this, they haven't done anything to us, so why go and just kill them.

Is someone planning to make a fur coat out of the animals' fur, the fur belongs and looks better on the animals, not on humans, fur coats and all should be banned anyways.

Please don't kill innocent helpless animals they haven't done anything to us, let them have a life that they deserve.

You know something, with all the animals being killed, they all going to be extinct very soon and that's very sad, this world is so full of hate for the animals????

Please have a heart and don't kill the animals, especially for money.

Life means more than money

Thank you for your time

---

**Randee Huber**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**cat490@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Killing indigenous animals in their own environment in order to protect pheasants, a non-native species, is cruel and short sighted. Even GFP says it won't affect pheasant numbers. It really is not necessary to kill everything in sight all the time. This idea is the worst thing I've ever heard. Does anyone in SD have an respect whatsoever for anything other than money?

---

**David Jenkins**  
**Brandon SD**  
**djenkins@alliancecom.net**

**Comment:**

Take the money and set up State operated Pheasant Farms to increase the Pheasant Population. I Don't want my dogs in the traps!

---

**Julie Hansen**  
**Freeman SD**  
**juliehh1956@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Pls do NOT go through with this cruel new program. There are ALREADY plenty of pheasants in S. Dak. The small predators are few enough in number; and spread so thinly in the state that this plan is NOT WORTH the butchery and devastation that it will cause. These animals have a use in the ecosystem; and a God-given right to exist too. Thank you.

---

**Beth Millard**  
**Hot Springs SD**  
**Sunydaze@live.com**

**Comment:**

Bounty kill is a horrible idea!!! Set up pheasant hatcheries.. natural nest predators can be safe you make money with pheasant hatcheries.. hunters happy, money made, predators safe and doing what they naturally are made to do..

---

**Gwen Erickson**  
**Watertown SD**

**Comment:**

People will over kill. They will not stop. Better idea is have more conservation work for Pheasant. Many animals and young died with this snowstorm. Not the amount of predators figured out. Much less.

---

**Jan Shevik**  
**Charlotte NC**  
**jshevik@carolina.rr.com**

**Comment:**

NO BOUNTY ON WILDLIFE.What barbaric and dangerous practice. It's arcaic barbarism, South Dakota can do better than murder for money>

---

**Bonita Radtke**  
**Redfield SD**  
**bonita.radtke@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the proposed year-round bounty on our native predators, especially based their (perceived) effect on the nesting of an exotic, introduced species, the pheasant. We have quite a few pheasant hunters in the family, but cannot see any sense to decimating native wildlife species over NON-NATIVE birds. Either the pheasants can survive the South Dakota ecosystem--including native wildlife--or we as a state have no business protecting and regulating them. Frankly, the biggest problem for pheasants is diminishing habitat. This bounty is an attempt to blame wildlife for the fact humans want pheasants without providing enough shelter belts and grasslands to support a healthy population of the birds. Provide enough habitat and the predation of our native species will not be a factor in the survival of pheasant hunting in South Dakota.

---

**Florence Duran**  
**Box Elder SD**  
**tduran01@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Stop the "Nest Predator Bounty Program.

---

**John Marxen**  
**Hermosa SD**  
**john@whitetailridgesd.com**

**Comment:**

I own/operate a B&B in the Black Hills. A majority of my guests visit this state for the wildlife. As for myself, I do not agree with the killing of animals for profit or sport. This may help boost hunters into our state for the purpose of hunting pheasant but, will it also hurt in the fact that other wildlife is being decimated.  
Thank you.



---

**Christine Muse**

**Custer SD**

**c21chris@gwtc.net**

**Comment:**

This is a ridiculous proposal that will have detrimental consequences on the wildlife in this state. I am totally opposed to this.

---

**Dave Braun**

**Pierre SD**

**trackertarga2002@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I am adamantly opposed to the proposed bounty program. Each of these creatures were placed on this earth for a specific purpose and deserve to be treated better than merely having someone kill them for their \$10 tail. This is inhumane and ridiculous.

---

**Bob Thielen**

**Volga SD**

**vthie@itctel.com**

**Comment:**

The pheasants population needs the help, with the little cover left. During severe weather I have fed pheasants on my long driveway. 5/6 years ago there would be 80 to 90 birds, now 2 or 3. Just no cover any more with all of the CRP being plowed up. Thank you for trying to help them!

---

**Heather Spaich**

**Lehigh KS**

**heathercletis22477@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Why can't people just leave poor animals alone. People make the choice to kill and endanger animals. Animals are just trying to survive. While we keep pushing and shoving them out of their habitats. Killing them for vanity and greed. It's things like thua that make me sad to be a part of the human race. We need to start caring more and quit being so greedy and vane.

---

**Jo Kephart**

**Vermillion SD**

**jkephart412@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

This is a cruel and misguided plan, which I vehemently oppose. Please protect our wildlife. They are one of the things that make our state great.

---

**Teresa Gunst**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**teresalg@midco.net**

**Comment:**

The initiative is cruel and should not be allowed.

---

**Yvonne Lange**  
**Groton SD**  
**martha51986@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Jane Eagle**  
**Graton CA**  
**sedna101@aol.com**

**Comment:**

PLEASE stop this egregiously cruel and misguided plan! A "Nest Predator Bounty Program," in which state residents will receive \$10 for turning in a tail of a raccoon, striped skunk, opossum, badger or red fox that they have killed. IS PURE EVIL, ANTI-SCIENCE AND ANTI-GOD. The state already launched a related scheme in which they are providing free cage traps to South Dakota residents to trap and kill those wildlife species. THIS IS OBSCENE.

It's all part of Governor Kristi Noem's "Second Century Initiative," which purports to encourage the killing of those "nest predator" species to increase numbers of game birds like pheasants for hunters. But GFP has admitted that this program has little chance of increasing pheasant numbers, and is really intended to recruit new people to hunting, fishing, and trapping in the state. THIS IS EVIL ON EVERY LEVEL.

---

**Eden Slate**  
**Armour SD**  
**Edenslate@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I am against "Nest Predator Bounty Program"

It's all part of Governor Kristi Noem's "Second Century Initiative," which purports to encourage the killing of those "nest predator" species to increase numbers of game birds like pheasants for hunters. Even GFP has admitted that this program has little chance of increasing pheasant numbers, and is really intended to recruit new people to hunting, fishing, and trapping in the state.

Stop this egregiously cruel and misguided plan!

---

**Richard Getting**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Richardgetting@sio.midco.net**

**Comment:**

Stop killing indigenous animals to protect the pheasant.

---

**Larry Fredrickson**

**Chamberlain SD**

**larryjan@midstatesd.net**

**Comment:**

I was a former pheasant/furbearer Research biologist for Game, Fish and Parks. And the study I did on organized landowner sportsmen harvest by trapping and it's effect on pheasant population (1970-1975) did not reveal a significant increase in the pheasant population and was quoted incorrectly by Keith Fisk (March 5, the Dailey Republic) as a positive result. Since the difference was not significant it could have been a random result. No scientific data I know of shows that predator bounties ever resulted in a benefit to game birds. Besides the harvest time was in the fall for fur value in my study ( a different situation).

All the predator prey study results from Carl Trautman and myself showed that you needed a very intense control effort using all means including poison (banned in 1972) and had to reduce fox, raccoon, badger and skunk population by 80 to 90 percent to get the pheasant increase. The remaining predators under a bounty removal system could still do great damage to the pheasant population.

There is no way enough predators could be taken by live trapping alone to reduce them enough to increase pheasants. You would only be taking off the reproductive surplus. Therefore this is a waste of sportsmen's money (mine included).

Instead I mentioned in several newspaper article the money should be spent on a state run CRP program. The Federal CRP program never will result in enough money to double our pheasant population since it is also distributed to many other states. We need to have a statewide goal of 1.5 million acres in dense nesting cover. We now have 2.47 BPM and could then go to 7.9 (as in 2007) birds per mile. Using bounties again is like re-inventing the wheel. We all went through that before in the 50's 60's and 70's.

---

**Marta Olson-Rangitsch**

**Rapid City SD**

**marta@rushmore.com**

**Comment:**

The bounty program Governor Noem is proposing is irrelevant responsible. By asking trappers to turn in tails she potentially promoting horrendous trapping practices. We know the heavy toad bounty hunting has historically had in our state —nearly driving our bison to extinction and removal of top predators has led to the many of the over population issues we current face. Please do not go forward with this policy.

---

**Eva Bareis**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**eva1365@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Please rethink this. If it is necessary to reduce the numbers of these animals, please find another method. A simple goggle search will show how these bounties bring out the lunatics who kill hundreds of animals. That does nothing to promote sensible conservation and a compassionate method of wildlife management. It also emboldens those who take pleasure in killing and aren't doing it ethically in the interest of nesting bird populations. We have evolved better than this. It is NOT the way to get more people interested in hunting, certainly not a good example for our youth (says this teacher and mother.). Thank you.

---

**Doug Cook**  
**Hartford SD**  
**dougcook@goldenwest.net**

**Comment:**

Putting a price on the lives of sentient beings for the purpose of attracting hunters to come to our state to kill other sentient beings is wrong on so many levels. "Come to South Dakota and kill the beautiful animals we have been blessed with.". Is money more important to us than our humanity?

---

**Jan Humphrey**  
**Hill City SD**  
**plazykranch@hughes.net**

**Comment:**

I vehemently OPPOSE this. Trapping our wildlife in this matter for money is abhorrent . I will harass any trapper found in my area until they remove their traps. My dog was already caught in a leg trap and that is absolutely unacceptable.

---

**Kristi Petersen**  
**Hot Springs SD**

**Comment:**

This would be totally detrimental to our natural scheme her in South Dakota! All of these predators are beneficial to us with their primary foods being mice, rats, snakes and insects. These animals also take only what they need to eat to survive. Free running dogs and feral cats from farms probably destroy more pheasant and water fowl nests than any of the natural predators do. Also, pheasants are not a native species. They also are farmed and chicks distributed throughout the state every spring. Do not put a bounty on the wild life we need to save a minuscule number of birds we do not. Thank you.

---

**Katy Stulc**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**plagmkaa@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Improve pheasant habitats, not kill other beneficial animals to our ecosystem such as opossums, foxes, etc. With the increase in tick borne illnesses, opossums are especially beneficial to our area. Please do not allow this program to come to fruiti

---

**Lucy Barr**  
**Plymouth MN**  
**organizeme777@aol.com**

**Comment:**

Stop this egregiously cruel and misguided plan! The SDGFP Commission will consider adopting Governor Noem's "Nest Predator Bounty Program" proposal at a public hearing on April 4, 2019. What's wrong with you - pretty soon all the animals will be gone and none will be left - who made you all G-d

---

**Janette Mcintyre**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**jkmcintyre408020@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Jennifer Cramer**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**jenbruns@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

These animals are crucial to our eco system. Opossums are our marsupial that eat ticks and other pests.

---

**Dianna Torson**  
**Brookings SD**  
**Torsond@itctel.com**

**Comment:**

We need to protect wildlife diversity.

---

**Kenneth Coyle**

**Yankton SD**

**shipmate2003@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

This is a great idea. Coyotes and coons are very plentiful and reak havoc on nesting ducks and pheasants. Where I am on Yankton County the coyotes are thick as hell. Coons all over. Bounty is a great idea. Finally a Governor with common sense.

---

**Chandra Mengel**

**Rapid City SD**

**Chandramengel@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Tammy Jungen**

**Watertown SD**

**tjungen@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Wildlife management professionals across the U.S. have long acknowledged the ineffectiveness of bounties and predator control, including South Dakota's own Habitat Work Group in its 2014 report to Governor Daugaard: "Under a bounty system, predator control would not be targeted enough to be effective. Additionally, bounty systems in other states have been ineffective because the origin of the predators cannot be verified. Predators from other states could easily be imported for a bounty, which would be counterproductive."

The "Nest Predator Bounty Program" has no science-based wildlife management objective and is encouraging citizens to kill these native wildlife species for the sole purpose of obtaining a cash reward. This is a slap in the face to South Dakota's hunting tradition of sportsmanship, fair chase, and respect for wildlife and their environment.

To date no sound, science-based evidence has been presented to suggest that the species targeted by this "Nest Predator Bounty Program"—raccoons, striped skunks, opossums, badgers or red foxes—are adversely impacting pheasant populations.

There is no scientific justification for the random removal of the targeted species, who each play their own unique and important role in South Dakota's ecosystem. In particular, opossums are a tremendous benefit to any area they inhabit, helping to control unwanted, harmful garden pests. Their diet includes snails, mice, rats, and insects such as cockroaches, crickets, beetles, and—in large numbers—disease-carrying ticks.

Trapping is cruel and an ineffective method of wildlife conflict management. Trapped animals can languish and die slowly from shock, dehydration, starvation, or exposure to the elements. Those who survive long enough for the trapper to return may be killed by drowning, chest compression, strangulation, shooting, or any other method. Trapping does nothing to resolve the underlying problem in wildlife conflicts, and does not effectively control wildlife populations; in fact, it can actually stimulate population increases of some animals as they compensate for reductions in their numbers from trapping. Live trapping is only ever justified in those rare cases where it demonstrably benefits animals or provides necessary benefits to ecological systems.

The slaughter of these native species is a wrongheaded approach that ultimately will not help pheasants and other game birds, whose numbers are affected by weather and the availability of suitable habitat. Ignoring that by offering free traps to kill them, and a gruesome \$10-per-tail bounty, is an embarrassment to South Dakota and an affront to modern, science-based wildlife management principles.

If GFP wants more game birds for hunters, it must focus on improving their habitat, not randomly killing other species that play an equally important role in that habitat. And the Capital Journal in Pierre agrees; in January, its editorial board opposed the proposed bounty program, adding that if the state wants to advance pheasant hunting opportunities, it must "...focus on habitat, primarily grasslands and wetlands, work with landowners to secure those habitat(s) through incentives, provide hunter access through a strong walk-in program and raise suitable funding to get it done."

---

**Dan Varns**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Comment:**

Trapping is cruel and an ineffective method of wildlife conflict management. Trapped animals can languish and die slowly from shock, dehydration, starvation, or exposure to the elements. Trapping does nothing to resolve the underlying problem in wildlife conflicts.

---

**Randy Ristesund**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**rristes@aol.com**

**Comment:**

no need for blood money being paid by the state, most pheasants are raised in cavity then let loose to be killed for the fun of it, I am sure the Governor will still get plenty of blood money for providing and promoting the blood lust she has already got rich off of

---

**Scott Bakker**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Funk8nguy@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Melissa Dassinger**

**Rapid City SD**

**missydass@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

The animal right phanatics who want to end all animal ownership and animal interaction will tell you this law is not good, but as someone who has seen what uncontrolled animal populations can do this is necessary and a part of the American way of life.

I support trapping and the harvesting of natural food and fiber for human use.  
Please send a loud message to animal rights they they are not welcome in a South Dakota.

---

**Jan Lefthand**

**Freeman SD**

**janlefhand65@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Traps ate cruel and barbaric, no animal should be tortured, inhumane

---

**Kimberly Hanzlik**

**Pierre SD**

**k\_a\_hanzlik@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

This whole idea is horrific and barbaric. If you adopt this disgusting program you're going to have everyone hunting down these poor creatures just to make a quick buck. The trapping and killing of these creatures is inhumane and should not be encouraged. I'm embarrassed to be born in raised in a state where we think something like this is ok. Please consider not adapting this policy into action. Thank you.



---

**Terry Newman**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**tnewman@vastbb.net**

**Comment:**

Please do not proceed with this horrendous plan. Show South Dakota to be the wildlife respecting and caring state it truly is. Do not succumb to this cruel and backwards plan. The will of the majority should not be usurped by a small and barbaric few.

---

**Rachel Kopp**  
**Sioux Falls SD**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Deeann Liesinger**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**Dliesing@icloud.com**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Bobbi Jo Horsted**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**bobbijo.horsted@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Patty Jenkins**  
**Brandon SD**  
**dpjenkins@alliancecom.net**

**Comment:**

Spend the half million dollars in costs to raise pheasants on private or State Game Farms.

---

**Brenda Verdon**  
**Willow Lake SD**  
**verdon2@msn.com**

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the bounty program being considered. Why would we want to kill everything when they all have their own purpose in life. This is just cruel and seeing an animal caught in a trap is terrible cruel. I have taught my children and now my grandchildren to respect the wildlife and this is just another example of how out of hand our society is. Please consider not allowing this

---

**Kelsee Bessey**  
**Pierre SD**  
**Gaylethealligator@outlook.com**

**Comment:**

Animal suffering like whats proposed is cruel and barbaric.

---

**Jason Hurd**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Fatgizmo@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

??Wildlife management professionals across the U.S. have long acknowledged the ineffectiveness of bounties and predator control, including South Dakota's own Habitat Work Group in its 2014 report to Governor Daugaard: "Under a bounty system, predator control would not be targeted enough to be effective. Additionally, bounty systems in other states have been ineffective because the origin of the predators cannot be verified. Predators from other states could easily be imported for a bounty, which would be counterproductive."

??The "Nest Predator Bounty Program" has no science-based wildlife management objective and is encouraging citizens to kill these native wildlife species for the sole purpose of obtaining a cash reward. This is a slap in the face to South Dakota's hunting tradition of sportsmanship, fair chase, and respect for wildlife and their environment.

??To date no sound, science-based evidence has been presented to suggest that the species targeted by this "Nest Predator Bounty Program"—raccoons, striped skunks, opossums, badgers or red foxes—are adversely impacting pheasant populations.

??There is no scientific justification for the random removal of the targeted species, who each play their own unique and important role in South Dakota's ecosystem. In particular, opossums are a tremendous benefit to any area they inhabit, helping to control unwanted, harmful garden pests. Their diet includes snails, mice, rats, and insects such as cockroaches, crickets, beetles, and—in large numbers—disease-carrying ticks.

??Trapping is cruel and an ineffective method of wildlife conflict management. Trapped animals can languish and die slowly from shock, dehydration, starvation, or exposure to the elements. Those who survive long enough for the trapper to return may be killed by drowning, chest compression, strangulation, shooting, or any other method. Trapping does nothing to resolve the underlying problem in wildlife conflicts, and does not effectively control wildlife populations; in fact, it can actually stimulate population increases of some animals as they compensate for reductions in their numbers from trapping. Live trapping is only ever justified in those rare cases where it demonstrably benefits animals or provides necessary benefits to ecological systems.

??The slaughter of these native species is a wrongheaded approach that ultimately will not help pheasants and other game birds, whose numbers are affected by weather and the availability of suitable habitat. Ignoring that by offering free traps to kill them, and a gruesome \$10-per-tail bounty, is an embarrassment to South Dakota and an affront to modern, science-based wildlife management principles.

??If GFP wants more game birds for hunters, it must focus on improving their habitat, not randomly killing other species that play an equally important role in that habitat. And the Capital Journal in Pierre agrees; in January, its editorial board opposed the proposed bounty program, adding that if the state wants to advance pheasant hunting opportunities, it must "...focus on habitat, primarily grasslands and wetlands, work with landowners to secure those habitat(s) through incentives, provide hunter access through a strong walk-in program and raise suitable funding to get it done."

---

**Gwyneth Fastnacht**  
**Wessington Springs SD**  
**Grdeanwitte@k12.sd.us**

**Comment:**

Not based on science and research  
Won't have intended effect

Out of state predators can be brought in to our state for bounty payment  
Animals can last several days in pain, this is torturous, bounty is one thing but it needs to be implemented in a respectful humane manner. Allowing animals to suffer is not acceptable.  
So science proves that the bounty program will improve pheasant population long term.  
Animals on bounty list are native species. Pheasants are not native.

Once again, a proposal that appeals to a few, not based in science but will be favorable a political position for governor and legislators.  
Please find a better approach.

---

**Jamie Vanhoorn**  
**Milbank SD**  
**jamielynn57252@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

How is this at all humane!?abuse and torture against wildlife animals..abuse and torture is illegal wildlife should be included..ALL animals wildlife and domestic have feelings they all feel pain they all get scared. What kind of a person are you really mentally if you can torture an animal of any kind for the pure joy of it and for the cash reward. Trapping is cruel inefficient and is not hunting! These animals will die slow and painfully after going into shock from being dehydrated starved stressed out etc..just to have a homicidal so called hunter return to torture and kill this beautiful animal if it is still alive! Wildlife animals feel pain and fear just as any other animal or human. This is horrible! Torture, kill, collect money for lives taken horribly to save pheasants to bring in hunters for more money to kill the pheasants..this is inhumane Ludacris with a side of being a psychotic sociopath!! Shamefull to this governor! Very dissapointed this far..i really thought she was more human more heart..this saddens me please say NO to this!!!

---

**Mary Potter**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**potters2@sio.midco.net**

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose this measure. There are many reasons for this, but my foremost one is that it is so inhumane. Leg traps are checked only every two or three days and an animal can be there, alive and suffering, and are then killed by the bounty hunter in a probably non-humane way. This is no way to treat those we share our world with. And killing these animals is not an effective method of encouraging more game birds. These creatures do so much more good than the perceived harm. The South Dakota Humane Society has a lengthy and detailed listing of why this measure is not a good idea. I strongly oppose this measure and I urge you to vote against this measure.

---

**Sue Hayes**

**Deadwood SD**

**Shayespeaches@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I greatly oppose this proposal to trap other wildlife to increase pheasant hunting. Where are the statistics that support this proposal? This seems to be for money considerations only and there is no proof that this theory will even work. SD should support ALL wildlife in this state.

---

**Gregory Palmer**

**Nemo SD**

**jajpalesb@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Initiate the Soil Bank Program again! Our govonor looks for the easiest way out any situation. Doesn't mean she knows what she's doing!!

---

**Shayla Smejkal**

**Rapid City SD**

**shayla.ann@outlook.com**

**Comment:**

I'm a studying Environmental Biologist. When I get my bachelor's degree, I want to work for the SD parks to help better the environment and protect the wildlife. The bounty program will greatly disrupt the balance of nature. Trapping is a disgrace and very inhumane.

---

**Sheena Thomas**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Sheenamthomas@outlook.com**

**Comment:**

There are better ways of preserving pheasants and their habitats than this nonsensical bounty program.

---

**Steven Frooman**

**Rapid City SD**

**sfrooman@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

According to the GFP's posted numbers for 2017 Pheasant Economics, pheasant hunting is trivial in many parts of the state. Yet, this bounty program would allow payment for tails taken from anywhere in the state. That strikes me as a serious flaw with this proposed program, and if any bounty program is instituted it should contain a restriction not merely that the predator be harvested in South Dakota but that it be harvested in the specific parts of South Dakota where pheasant hunting actually matters and could actually be endangered by nest predators. Ideally, the program would also be funded solely from those parts of the state.

Because let's face it: why should a tail taken in Custer County (92 pheasant hunters, <\$0.1 million economic impact) or Lawrence County (53 pheasant hunters, <\$0.1 million economic impact) be eligible for a bounty? There's no meaningful pheasant hunting in those places, so killing furbearers to encourage it is just wanton destruction of game. For that matter, under the program as proposed people could claim bounties on urban animals from downtown Rapid City or Sioux Falls. How would that be anything but a waste of money, since mere geography means animals in those cities are not and never will be threats to game birds' nests?

I don't think a predator bounty program's a good way to enhance pheasant hunting - as I understand it, a shortage of suitable pheasant habitat is the only threat to pheasant hunting. Well, that and the cost of getting access to that habitat. Honestly, I only moved to South Dakota a few years ago and have never hunted pheasant (and probably never will, too small to be worth the effort and expense) so I don't particularly care about preserving pheasant hunting. But a lot of people do care, and think a nest predator bounty's a way to do it. Fine, try a bounty program. But structure it in a way that minimizes the likelihood of wasting tax money or license money paying bounties on animals that were in no position to endanger any pheasants in the first place. That's money that could be put to use fighting CWD, or improving elk or deer habitat, or buying out the private owners of closed fishing waters, or dozens of other useful things instead of getting wasted on roadkill from Rapid.

---

**Kim Heupel**

**Aberdeen SD**

**Kimberly\_asu@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Do not allow this

---

**Peggy Barg**

**Garretson SD**

**pegbarg@alliancecom.net**

**Comment:**

It is cruel & unnecessary!

---

**Julie Falor**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**Julzzlf@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Carrie Painter**  
**Canton SD**  
**huskers0522@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Darci Adams**  
**Hartford SD**  
**dadams@humanesociety.org**

**Comment:**

The Humane Society of the United States opposes the proposed “Nest Predator Bounty Program,” as well as its related scheme to provide free traps for the capture and killing of those species. Offering a bounty that encourages South Dakotans to kill raccoons, striped skunks, opossums, badgers and red foxes for the purported objective of increasing game bird numbers is not backed by science-based wildlife management principles, and is a slap in the face to South Dakota’s hunting tradition of sportsmanship, fair chase, and respect for wildlife and their environment. Effective wildlife management includes setting appropriate seasons to protect mothers and their dependent young, restricting the number of licenses, and restricting bag limits. By permitting mass slaughter of native species and neglecting these tenets, the offer of bounties fosters the very opposite.

Wildlife management professionals across the U.S. have long acknowledged the ineffectiveness of bounties and predator control. In a July 2016 meeting, the Pennsylvania Game Commission stated, “After decades of using predator control (such as paying bounties) with no effect, and the emergency of wildlife management as a science, the agency finally accepted the reality that predator control does not work.”

(<https://archive.triblive.com/sports/outdoors/habitat-not-predators-seen-as-key-to-wildlife-populations/>) And in a recent management plan, the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission pointed out, “Bounties and harvest incentive programs are prone to corruption, expensive, do not increase harvest, and do not target problem animals.”

([https://www.ncwildlife.org/Portals/0/Learning/documents/Species/Coyote%20Management%20Plan\\_FINAL\\_030118.pdf](https://www.ncwildlife.org/Portals/0/Learning/documents/Species/Coyote%20Management%20Plan_FINAL_030118.pdf)) South Dakota’s own Habitat Work Group shared that sentiment in its 2014 report to Governor Dargaard, saying, “Under a bounty system, predator control would not be targeted enough to be effective. Additionally, bounty systems in other states have been ineffective because the origin of the predators cannot be verified. Predators from other states could easily be imported for a bounty, which would be counterproductive.” (<https://habitat.sd.gov/resources/habitatsummitinfo/docs/PHWG%20Final%20Report.pdf>)

What’s more, to date no sound, science-based evidence has been presented to suggest that the species targeted by this “Nest Predator Bounty Program”—raccoons, striped skunks, opossums, badgers or red foxes—are adversely impacting pheasant populations. This is likely because the persistence of those bird species is determined by weather and the availability of suitable habitat, and not by the random removal of other species who each play their own unique and important role in South Dakota’s ecosystem. In particular, opossums are a tremendous benefit to any area they inhabit, helping to control unwanted, harmful garden pests. Their diet includes snails, mice, rats, and insects such as cockroaches, crickets, beetles, and—in large numbers—disease-carrying ticks.

Additionally, trapping is cruel and an ineffective method of wildlife conflict management. Trapped animals can languish and die slowly from shock, dehydration, starvation, or exposure to the elements. Those who survive long enough for the trapper to return may be killed by drowning, chest compression, strangulation, shooting, or any other method. Trapping does nothing to resolve the underlying problem in wildlife conflicts, and does not effectively control wildlife populations; in fact, it can actually stimulate population increases of some animals as they compensate for reductions in their numbers from trapping. Live trapping is only ever justified in those rare cases where it demonstrably benefits animals or provides necessary benefits to ecological systems. The proposed “Nest Predator Bounty Program” is by no means such a case.

In January 2019, the Capital Journal editorial board spoke in opposition to the proposed bounty program, adding that if the state wants to advance pheasant hunting opportunities, it must “...focus on habitat, primarily grasslands and wetlands, work with landowners to secure those habitat(s) through incentives, provide hunter access through a strong walk-in program and raise suitable funding to get it done.” We agree. If Game, Fish & Parks wants more game birds for hunters, it must focus on improving their habitat, not randomly killing other species that play an equally important role in that habitat.

For these reasons, we ask that you withdraw the proposal for the “Nest Predator Bounty Program.”

Darci Adams  
South Dakota State Director  
The Humane Society of the United States  
PO Box 733  
Hartford SD 57033



---

**David Goronja**  
**Howard SD**  
**dlgoronjajr1@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Dave Pauli**  
**Billings MT**  
**wildquests@aol.com**

**Comment:**

I am a consulting wildlife damage control professional and have worked with South Dakota Animal Control professionals on wildlife issues for two decades. This proposal to offer bounties for meso predators is not good science, good management or good in any way. Please do not consider this ill advised counter productive program.

---

**Megan Daniels**  
**Aberdeen SD**  
**Megandaniels80@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

So cruel...please please do not do this

---

**Donna Hudson**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**donnaohana@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Richard Kimmel**  
**Sturgis SD**  
**lowriderghost@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

There is No need for this nonsense! One of the few remaining joys of residing in this state... as yes a person Not of great means or monetary assets... is the ability to observe Not harm the native wildlife.... and if at all possible ~ help them survive yet another day... anyway I can. Nuff' said.

---

**Kerms Cox**

**Custer SD**

**kermarae@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

This is insane. Words do not express my distaste of this proposal. There is always a ebb and flow in nature. Let nature do what nature does. It will not destroy all the pheasants. This proposal is ONLY in the name of making money. Disgusting.

---

**Donna Palmlund**

**De Smet SD**

**dpalmlund@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Why put a bounty on possums? They do a lot more good than harm with all the ticks and other insects they get rid of. So what if they eat a few pheasant eggs? Reducing our risk of Lyme Disease is worth it. This is not very well thought out at all. If the state wants to increase game bird population, look into bringing back better CRP incentives!

---

**Wayne Beck**

**Westport SD**

**wayne.a.beck@nrctv.com**

**Comment:**

I have a lot of coons and skunks around my land. And this will be a good program to build our pheasant population up once again.

---

**Cynthia Herndon**

**Rapid City SD**

**Comment:**

'Trapping is cruel and an ineffective method of wildlife conflict management. Trapped animals can languish and die slowly from shock, dehydration, starvation, or exposure to the elements. Those who survive long enough for the trapper to return may be killed by drowning, chest compression, strangulation, shooting or any other method. Trapping does nothing to resolve the underlying problem in wildlife conflicts, and does not effectively control wildlife populations; in fact, it can actually stimulate population increases of some animals as they compensate for reductions in their numbers from trapping. Live trapping is only ever justified in those RARE cases where it demonstrably benefits animals or provides necessary benefits to ecological systems.

---

**Letha Lewandowski**

**Webster SD**

**Comment:**

I am strongly opposed to the new nest predator bounty program. There is a place for every species in our ecosystem, which I am sure you learn when you are receiving your education. So why are you all so determined to play God and pick and choose which animals should live. This is wrong! Also, there is no way you should extend trapping on public land an right of ways. I though public land was for all the public! When I am out on public land with my dog, why do we feel threatened with traps and snares? I really think you should re-think what you are thinking of doing. Hopefully, someone will have the common sense to realize public lands are for all.

---

**Henry Roghair**

**Okaton SD**

**hgrseeds@gwtc.net**

**Comment:**

I have a BS degree in Wildlife and Fisheries Science and have farmed, hunted, trapped and fished in Jones County, SD all of my life.

South Dakota had a bounty system in place when I started hunting and trapping. I never remember seeing that it did any appreciable amount of good.

I am opposed to reinstating a new bounty system in the State.

I understand that reducing predator population helps game birds, but I think that a bounty system would be a poor, but expensive way to try to accomplish it.

---

**Kt Willer**

**Tigard OR**

**ktwiller@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Programs like this are so ineffective. South Dakota should be better than this. More than anything else, kill-trapping is unspeakably cruel. Please be forward-thinking, your tourist dollars may depend on it!

## Other

---

**Travis Donelan**

**Garretson SD**

**Comment:**

dumb it down for the casual hunter. 4 draws is to many. we all know the purpose is for more money from out of state and more special buck licenses. convince people the additional revenue is going to a good cause. most serious hunters donate \$10 a year for 30+ years on licenses they will never draw(big horn, mountain goat, custer elk) don't ruin deer hunting PLEASE. it doesn't have to be a rich mans sport!

PS-a lot of residents are upset with the young man who shot the world record sheep in SD. he might have been very very lucky or he might have benefited from a rigged drawing. I have no opinion on the matter.

---

**Dan Stapleton**

**Wentworth SD**

**danstapleton@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

The number of NR hunters in the past few years has caused more pressure on several of our Public Lands as the NR Archery Hunters are camping and tenting on some of our best habitat areas to include draws, ridges, and timber lines. We have to start controlling these numbers if we want to continue growing trophy deer in South Dakota.

---

**Dan Stapleton**

**Wentworth SD**

**danstapleton@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

We must raise the fees in order to lower NR Hunters from overcrowding our lands and to stay in competition with other surrounding states. We must also do this in order to lower the NR success rates, as I have personally witnessed many NR hunters killing young Mule Deer less than 2 years old. In order to preserve the Deer Quality we have built over the years in SD, we must control the limit of young deer being harvested. As I have visited with several NR Hunters after seeing many young Mule Bucks, two and three pointers hanging in trees at their camp sites, they have stated that these young deer are considered nice size deer in their States. We need to move quickly on this problem and control the amount of Permits to NR Hunters.

---

**Robert Rogers**

**Dallas PA**

**bob8655@frontiernet.net**

**Comment:**

I have been privileged to Archery hunt on South Dakota public land for over 10 years. I can count on one hand the number of times I have run into another hunter. If I find someone in the area, I find another area to hunt, it's that simple. I believe some have an agenda and are overstating the Nonresident hunters impact on hunting in South Dakota.

---

**Robert Rogers**

**Dallas PA**

**bob8655@frontiernet.net**

**Comment:**

The current system of issuing Archery permits appears functioning as a useful management tool. I trust the SD GF&P experts. Those who propose otherwise may be pushing their own selfish agendas.

---

**Robert Rogers**

**Dallas PA**

**bob8655@frontiernet.net**

**Comment:**

I believe the current system is a useful tool to manage the state's resource. This system is evaluated by highly educated biologist and the Conservation Officers in the field. I do not feel separating Whitetail/Mule Deer permits would have a significant impact, except financially.

---

**Robert Rogers**

**Dallas PA**

**bob8655@frontiernet.net**

**Comment:**

I have archery hunted Antelope on public land in South Dakota. I can honestly say I have never run into another hunter, resident or nonresident. If there is an issue in one area that could be addressed, but to limit a low number of nonresident Antelope Archery Licenses would be a disproportionate reaction.

---

**Chris Gukeisen**

**Pierre SD**

**chris.gukeisen@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

support Archery Deer Hunting on Public Lands

---

**Chris Gukeisen**

**Pierre SD**

**chris.gukeisen@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Nonresident Archery Mule Deer Permits I strongly support this, and agree with the reasoning 100%!

---

**Chris Gukeisen**

**Pierre SD**

**chris.gukeisen@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

support Nonresident Whitetail Deer Permits

---

**Chris Gukeisen**

**Pierre SD**

**chris.gukeisen@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Strongly support Nonresident Big Game Fee Increases. As other states get more expensive, word it getting out to go to SD for mule deer. I believe we will soon see over crowding worse than it currently already is in some areas.

---

**Chris Gukeisen**

**Pierre SD**

**chris.gukeisen@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

support Nonresident Archery Antelope Permits

---

**Perry Peterson**

**White Lake SD**

**Comment:**

Deer License Allocation Plan I oppose the plan, this needs to be dropped as the support for it is almost nothing.

---

**Brennan Hauk**

**Rapid City SD**

**bhauk@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Allowing the auction tag to be used in the Badlands unit will be horrible optics for GFP. There is already a perception (rightly or wrongl) that it is a canned hunt.

This is a true betrayal of the North American Model of Wildlife Management.

There is a reason this unit was not included in the previous year's auction tag hunt area.

Just because the state sees a world record taken and now wants to cash in, that's a horrible way to manage wildlife.

I strongly oppose this expansion of the auction tag units allowed.

I am a member of RMEF, MDF, BHA and DU. Most folks at the MDF booth at the Sports Show in Rapid City were opposed to this change.

---

**Jon Albers**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**albersjon@live.com**

**Comment:**

support Propose Change to rule 41:06:01:17 by SDBI. I completely support this change for all of the said reasons in the proposal.

---

**Jon Albers**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**albersjon@live.com**

**Comment:**

We need to get this under control.

---

**Jon Albers**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**albersjon@live.com**

**Comment:**

Why is out of state success rate so much better. Are they better hunters? More are ready to take any deer to justify traveling expenses. We need to get a handle on this to preserve some trophy opportunities

---

**Jon Albers**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**albersjon@live.com**

**Comment:**

Change to rule 41:06:02:03

---

**Jon Albers**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**albersjon@Live.com**

**Comment:**

Any funds raised by a special tag for Big Horn Sheep or any other species should go directly back to supporting that species. I appreciate the Governors enthusiasm for Pheasant hunting and am pleased we have a pro-hunting leader however, we have many species to hunt in South Dakota and only supporting pheasant hunting may be counter intuitive to the success of the others.

---

**Wyatt Skelton**

**Bryant SD**

**wyattskelton@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose any deviation of ear marked for sheep management only funds generated from the auctioned bighorn sheep tag. That tag was brought about to solely fund sheep management. Also oppose funds from any "super" tag being used for "other" purposes than for the management of the species of the tag. Thank you.

---

**Chancey Odell**

**Camp Crook SD**

**chanceyodell@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Due to the increased popularity of archery hunting, increased efficiency of archery equipment, and limited access to private lands, it is time to limit archery hunting, before South Dakota finds itself in a situation like Minnesota and Wisconsin. It would be nice to have 2018 data, but knowing that more deer were harvested in 35L with archery equipment than with rifle equipment in 2017 is all the research that should be needed. Given the increase in pressure seen with the early opener, the potential of increased recreation if and when Keystone XL construction begins, and limited fire suppression, Medical, and law enforcement presence in close proximity to public land concentrations, we have a definite recipe for disaster, if hunting pressure in these areas is not limited.

---

**Chancey Odell**

**Camp Crook SD**

**chanceyodell@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

While I applaud SDBI for taking action, I don't believe this proposal goes far enough. The limited nature of public land mule deer opportunity in SD means a few areas see a vast majority of the pressure, namely the southern Black Hills, Harding, Northern Perkins, Eastern Pennington, Northern Butte, Northern Meade, and Lyman. These areas have seen an increase in resident hunters almost on par with non residents. While I personally hate to see this loss in opportunity, biologically and politically, it is time to take action, before it's too late. While I realize it is highly unlikely, I would like to see some kind of preference (for all big game licenses) given to residents of a unit. As more people apply for highly coveted licenses, young residents of those areas are going to be precluded from those opportunities, and this lose interest in hunting. This comes at a time when recruitment and retainment in hunting and fishing are becoming more and more difficult.

---

**Jeff Barnes**

**Boone IA**

**jeffrey.barnes@dnr.iowa.gov**

**Comment:**



First I'd like to introduce myself. My name is Jeff Barnes, and I'm a Recreational Safety Officer with the Iowa Dept of Natural Resources. My primary duties include our Hunter Ed program and investigating hunting related shooting incidents.

I apologize, but I didn't receive notice of your meeting until today. I understand this is within the 72 hours prior to your meeting, but I'm hoping you have the time to review the following information.

I wanted to touch on the elimination of rifles during the spring turkey season as a way to increase the safety of hunters, while continuing to allow the practice of fanning turkeys, or using a turkey fan to sneak up on another turkey.

The following is the link to a video that was made by Brian Flowers, with the Missouri Dept of Conservation, a few years back when the practice of turkey fanning started to gain popularity (2014 or 2015). It gives a firsthand look at what the practice of fanning looks like, and makes it plain to see why it creates such a dangerous situation for hunters out in the field. If the link doesn't work, it may need to be copied and pasted.

<https://vimeo.com/106120849>

Our Hunter Ed Instructors spend a lot of time talking to their students about ways to stay safe out in the hunting fields, and the fanning method of hunting turkeys goes directly against the message they preach. Turkey hunting is a sport designed to trick the turkey into coming to your calls, which can lead to people actually calling to each other. To make yourself look and sound identical to a strutting turkey while sneaking up on a turkey is an extremely dangerous tactic.

I also spent a little time over the weekend going through the Hunting incident Clearinghouse on the International Hunter Education Association-USA website to see what was actually happening during the spring turkey season on a nationwide basis. I was able to gather information to reflect shooting related and safety incidents that have occurred over the last 15 years. I feel it provides a fairly accurate representation of where the dangers primarily lie during the spring season.

Over the last 15 years, there have been 508 incidents entered into the Clearinghouse. Of those 508 incidents, 491 involved the use of a shotgun, only 15 involved a rifle of any kind, 1 with a bow, and 1 with a crossbow. Of the 15 rifle incidents, 10 of those were either self-inflicted or accidental discharge, which left 5 as "failed to identify target" over the last 15 years. I should note South Dakota has never had a reported incident involving a rifle in the spring turkey season. 393 of the 491 shotgun incidents were the result of someone being shot by another hunter either mistaking them as a turkey, or being further downrange of an actual turkey. The remaining shotgun incidents were accidental discharges of one form or another. Fanning accounted for two of the incidents in 2015, and most of the incidents haven't been entered for the last couple years, so there's likely a few more than reported here.

Based on the incident numbers, the elimination of rifles to hunt turkeys would do very little to increase the safety of hunters in the field. Based on the fact that rifles are most often equipped with a scope, I would argue that they could actually increase safety simply because they provide a magnified and much clearer view of the target.

I would encourage the decision to eliminate rifles to be reconsidered. It not only provides a method of take for people with mobility issues, but there are a large number of responsible folks who truly enjoy hunting with a rifle who would likely not buy licenses if that method were removed.

Please let me know if anyone has any issues or questions.

Respectfully, Jeff Barnes  
515-290-4907

---

**Wes Wingen**

**Whitewood SD**

**Wrwingen@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I personally witness the large influx of out of state archery hunters in the slim buttes each year, and can attest to the impact it has on the overall quality of the hunt. It is discouraging to say the least. I support limiting these licenses for non-residents and I support increasing the fees as well.

---

**Wes Wingen**

**Whitewood SD**

**Wrwingen@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

support Archery Deer Hunting on Public Lands

---

**Wes Wingen**

**Whitewood SD**

**Wrwingen@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

support Nonresident Whitetail Deer Permits

---

**Chancey Odell**

**Camp Crook SD**

**chanceyodell@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I am in favor of increasing nonresident fees to levels consistent with other western states, but only if resident fees are decreased to a level similar to other western states.

---

**Wes Wingen**

**Whitewood SD**

**Wrwingen@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

support Nonresident Big Game Fee Increases

---

**Wes Wingen**

**Whitewood SD**

**Wrwingen@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

support Nonresident Archery Antelope Permits

---

**Chancey Odell**

**Camp Crook SD**

**chanceyodell@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I do not see this as a big of an issue as archery deer permits, but am in favor of limiting nonresident permits, and considering limiting resident permits, if pressure and success rates increase, or if populations decrease.

---

**Chancey Odell**

**Camp Crook SD**

**chanceyodell@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

While alternative funding sources for habitat improvement are a noble cause, I am not sure selling outdoor opportunities that many people wait years for to the highest bidder is the best route. Turning hunting into a sport only for the wealthy may very well end hunting in America. I am especially opposed to using funds raised from a very specialized, native species (that is one of the hardest for the common man to get the opportunity to hunt) to promote habitat for an introduced, often invasive species, simply because of it's impact on the states economy. If anything, it should be the other way around. Funds raised from pheasant hunting should be used to promote specialized, native species.

---

**Scott Loecker**

**Mitchell SD**

**sloecker@mitchelltelecom.net**

**Comment:**

I don't oppose opening more areas to hunt for the Governors tag but I do oppose any money raised by the tag to be spent on anything other than sheep. The tag was originally allocated to raise funds for that purpose and should not be changed.

---

**Ed Hiller**

**Arlington SD**

**Comment:**

I do not see a need to change what we have, but when you change it the special buck tags should be in the same draw as the east river and west river

---

**Tom Riddle**

**Mitchell SD**

**Riddleandsons@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

This is not something that majority of sportsman want, this commission needs to listen, thank you

---

**Jerrud Kruse**

**Ranona SD**

**Comment:**

I don't support a change to are deer tag draw system and I don't know a single resident of South Dakota who does support the new proposal. It's not fair to every resident of South Dakota!

---

**Kent Siemonsma**

**Humboldt SD**

**ksiemonsma@goldenwest.net**

**Comment:**

Sounds like another joke from gf&p & the big money people that are telling them what they want them to do  
CANT YOU LEAVE ANYTHING ALONE INSTEAD OF COMPLICATING THINGS

---

**Kent Siemonsma**

**Humboldt SD**

**ksiemonsma@goldenwest.net**

**Comment:**

This habitat problem isn't too hard to figure out. It starts with the FARMER. They tile everything they can, break up pasture and mow every bit of grass they can. Evidently governor NOEM wants everybody else to take care of what the grain farmer has caused.

---

**Sharon Blais**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**sharonb479@msn.com**

**Comment:**

Please just leave our wild life animals alone. It is nature and each animal is here for a reason.

---

**Ivan Maya**

**Niagara Falls ON**

**alexandermaya79@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

How can the government allow all this cruelty and destruction of our environment??? We need new laws the can ban all kinds of hunting activities that are leading to the destruction of the environment. Be more conscious of the situation, we only have

---

**Chad Savey**

**Harrisburg SD**

**saveyhunter@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

First, I am very excited that Kristi is pro hunting and is trying to get the ball rolling to improve hunting in SD. I commend the idea of harvesting predators, but until we have habitat to support our pheasants/deer, this is going to do very little good. Habitat is the #1 part of this equation and until you have that, everything else you try will barely make an impact/dent on solving the problem.

With habitat, how are we going to get landowners to want to put their ground into switchgrass? With the new CRP program, ya, they increased the acres, but I heard payments are going to suck compared to what they were. What is the incentive to want to get people to sign up now? Are we thinking of supplementing that payment so it is appealing to landowners? Doesn't MN require all farmers to plant switchgrass buffer strips along waterways? This would help with water quality and habitat. I'm super excited that this conversation is rolling, but we need to be focusing on habitat, habitat, habitat!!!!!!!

---

## Resident Nonresident

---

**Dan Stapleton**

**Wentworth SD**

**danstapleton@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

As stated in earlier issues, I believe raising the fees for NR Hunters and the purchase of a habitat stamp will help slow down the pressure for hunters and hopefully raise more monies for habitat.

---

**Robert Rogers**

**Dallas PA**

**bob8655@frontiernet.net**

**Comment:**

I do not have a "Much higher disposable income" than resident hunters, but if the Commission feels this would assist South Dakota Game, Fish, & Parks accomplish their mission, than I am more than ready to do my part. I love the State of South Dakota and will pay my part to preserve the resource and hunting opportunities, if fairly implemented.

# Special Buck Licenses

---

**Kelly Koistinen**

**Spearfish SD**

**kkoistinen@fs.fed.us**

**Comment:**

"The proposal calls for an allocation of 4 percent of the total resident West River deer licenses that includes an any whitetail deer tag from the previous year or 500 for each for resident and nonresident hunters; whichever is greater." What exactly does this mean? These proposals are made up so quickly and so ridiculously, that they aren't even understandable! Stop making these ridiculous proposals! Enough! Stop trying to mess with the tradition of Deer hunting in this State! Enough is Enough! Why are you taking away from the total number of deer tags available and making them available in another stupid possible drawing? Quit taking away available tags from the Residents and offering them up in some nonsense drawing! Leave the system alone!!!! This commission is Still Way out of Control on the proposals. Why are you constantly trying to improve on a system that WAS perfectly fine? Before you started trying to manipulate the application system back in 2016, everything was working fine without the intrusion of this Commission! Look what you've begun! Every time I turn around you are trying to stack the deck of the license system. LEAVE IT ALONE! Do not take tags away from the residents and try and give them to someone with more money to contribute. If you take away 500 tags away from the West River Deer Hunting season, then you are stacking the deck!! You will be taking away deer licenses from the residents! Don't even think about doing this. It is taking away the rights of the citizens of this State for the sake of money! Where are you people coming up with these stupid proposals? Greed in the South Dakota Game Fish and Parks!! That will make a great headline for the Rapid City Journal, you can bet on that! Do not take away licenses from the West River Deer season and set them aside, you're manipulating the system again, just like you tried with the License Allocation crap!

---

**Jim Zirbel**

**Aberdeen SD**

**jim@zirbelfamily.com**

**Comment:**

This new tag has the appearance of something to satisfy the Non-resident or residents that don't want to participate with the new lottery system. The problem is that we keep pulling these type options from the general pool and the average Joe that can't afford the high price Special Tags has less opportunity to get a tag. I am strongly opposed to this option. It seems like your just trying to satisfy a group that is unhappy with the new system.

---

**Justin Allen**  
**Pierre SD**

**Comment:**

I'm opposed to the proposal to increase the whitetail only special buck permits for NR and/or resident hunters. I'm taken back that this proposal was brought forward to GFP by a special interest group and proposed by GFP without going thru the public petition process yet at the same time NR bow hunting issues are forced to be petition and then tabled. It seems like a double standard. In one breath you preach you're listening to the hunters by addressing NR deer pressure but in the next breath you are increasing special buck permits which obviously do no favor to the majority of folks that are against the commercialization of deer hunting in SD. What has happened to the transparency GFP used to pride itself in?

Justin

---

## Use of Parks and Public Lands

---

**Jeffrey Lerud**  
**Mobridge SD**  
**coloradojeff\_2000@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

The Commission also proposed repealing a rule that prohibits uncased .22 rimfire firearms in the state parks, opening up the opportunity for hunters to pursue small game during legal hunting seasons. You are doing a great job and most items I totally agree with, but opening or in any way allowing firearms, even 22, is asking for accidents. I am 71 and I ask you to reconsider. Thanks

---

**Tanner Starr**  
**Watertown SD**  
**tannerstarr18@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I am sure there is a reason that this law is currently in the books. However, it seems this law has no purpose. Small game hunting is allowed after October 1st in state parks but this law prevents me from using my firearm of choice, a .22 rimfire rifle. As an avid squirrel and rabbit hunter I would appreciate this law being abolished.

# Public Comments

## Hunt for Habitat Licenses

---

**Robert Eddy**

**Rapid City SD**

**REDDY@RUSHMORE.COM**

**Comment:**

Please oppose the proposal to allow an elk on this super tag licence. These tags are difficult enough for hunter to get, and some never will receive one. I encourage the replacement with a turkey, small game, and waterfowl licences.

---

**Dana Rogers**

**Hill City SD**

**dana.rogers.1@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Commissioners and Staff,  
I support the proposal to allow up to ONE NR to draw one of the coveted "Hunt for Habitat" permits for Elk, Deer and Antelope. I think the price difference in the lottery fees is desirable to both Residents and NRs. One permit isn't going to hurt anything and will raise substantial monies for funding habitat. Many states do this and it's a great idea to allow another voluntary tax to provide another chance to draw these permits while enhancing funds for habitat. Please vote to approve.

Thank You



---

**Center Of The Nation Sportsman's  
Club Center Of The Nation  
Sportsman's Club**

**Belle Fourche SD**

**cnsc.email@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Dear Game, Fish And Parks Commission,

We as the Center of the Nation Sportsman's Club of Belle Fourche, SD are very concerned about the proposal for bighorn sheep it was not specific where the sheep tags would be available. We are against the selling of one of South Dakota's most sought after tags being sold to the extreme rich our wildlife means more than that to us. But, if there has to be an auction tag it CAN TO NOT BE AVAILABLE IN THE BADLANDS UNIT. Those sheep licenses in the badlands unit HAVE to be available only to South Dakota residents and never available to the mega rich who have already shot many many sheep. There are plenty of other places available across North America for the rich to buy a sheep tag and hunt a world class sheep. This is South Dakotan's only place and opportunity to hunt world class sheep and it needs to stay only available to South Dakotan's.

Again we the Center of the Nation's Sportsman's club are against an auction tag being available to anyone but South Dakotan's in the Badlands unit.

Rick Walton  
President

---

## Nest Predator Bounty

---

**Jon Sorensen**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**sorensen5000@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

" Participants may submit up to \$590 worth of tails per household."

You can keep your Bounty Program!!! And your cheap Live traps! Ill spend my money in another state from now on to trap! You make a program and then come up with all the rules after people have spent hundred on equipment and traps for this program and no you limit them to were they cant even re-coop the cost. Badly planned and badly organized as 99% of every program done in South Dakota for wildlife! Lost all my approval and Support of anything for GFP from here out!

---

**May Wichers**

**Hot Springs SD**

**maywichers@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Our wildlife, especially predators have enough problems surviving without this additional stress. In the past this has caused extinctions! The red fox has only 50 left in East! According to the Audubon Society! I want my foxes hear where I live in the black hills. I want all of the small predators alive. No. No to getting our children involved too as killers.

---

**Darci Willemsen**

**Hartford SD**

**darciwadams@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Please do not implement this nest predator bounty. Trapping is cruel & inhumane. It is a part of our history, not something we should perpetuate in any form.

---

**Darci Willemsen**

**Hartford SD**

**darciwadams@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Please do not implement this nest predator bounty. Trapping is cruel & inhumane. It is a part of our history, not something we should perpetuate in any form.

---

**Cory Ferguson**

**Rapid City SD**

**cory@blackhillsstockshow.com**

**Comment:**

- Wildlife management professionals across the U.S. have long acknowledged the ineffectiveness of bounties and predator control. This just seems like it is a 'snap' judgement without really diving into what the true problems are with declining pheasant populations.
- The "Nest Predator Bounty Program" has no science-based wildlife management objective and is encouraging citizens to kill these native wildlife species for the sole purpose of obtaining a cash reward. This is a slap in the face to South Dakota's hunting tradition of sportsmanship, fair chase, and respect for wildlife and their environment.
- To date no sound, science-based evidence has been presented to suggest that the species targeted by this "Nest Predator Bounty Program"—raccoons, striped skunks, opossums, badgers or red foxes—are adversely impacting pheasant populations.
- There is no scientific justification for the random removal of the targeted species, who each play their own unique and important role in South Dakota's ecosystem. In particular, opossums are a tremendous benefit to any area they inhabit, helping to control unwanted, harmful garden pests. Their diet includes snails, mice, rats, and insects such as cockroaches, crickets, beetles, and—in large numbers—disease-carrying ticks.
- Trapping is not the answer to wildlife conflict management. Trapping does nothing to resolve the underlying problem in wildlife conflicts, and does not effectively control wildlife populations. Live trapping is only ever justified in those rare cases where it demonstrably benefits animals or provides necessary benefits to ecological systems.
- The slaughter of these native species is a wrongheaded approach that ultimately will not help pheasants and other game birds, whose numbers are affected by weather and the availability of suitable habitat. Ignoring that by offering free traps to kill them, and a gruesome \$10-per-tail bounty, is an embarrassment to South Dakota and an affront to modern, science-based wildlife management principles.
- If GFP wants more game birds for hunters, it must focus on improving their habitat, not randomly killing other species that play an equally important role in that habitat. Habitat establishment and improvement is the only long-term solution that should be considered.

---

**Kathy Holm**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Kholm50@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

This is wrong. To set a bounty on animals, is appalling. We need to go forward in history, not backwards. I have a hard time comprehending this is even being considered.

---

**Dana Rogers**

**Hill City SD**

**dana.rogers.1@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Commissioners and Staff,

While I am in favor of encouraging more people to trap predators of all types or harvest them effectively as any game species, I am concerned about where this "bounty" program funding will come from.

Unless something has been devised that I'm not aware of, the funds will mostly come from the GF&Ps wildlife coffers. Thus, some other projects will suffer and lose funding.

As this is billed as part of the 2nd Century habitat initiative primarily for pheasants, why not encourage funding sources from those commercial interests that actually benefit financially from pheasant hunting. Hunters are always carrying the water where wildlife is concerned.

Given the strong economic impacts and loud voices from commercial interests and chambers of commerce types, ask them to help foot the bill for a change. I realize that isn't in your purview. So I have to voice my support for predator harvest, specifically during the spring nesting and fawning season. But on the funding side I am opposed in that I feel the funds could be far better utilized elsewhere.

Thank You

---

**Patricia Cressy**

**Pierre SD**

**cressypatricia174@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Bounty Policy oppose

---

**Kerma Cox**

**Custer SD**

**kermarae@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

This is wrong on every level. Trying to assume you are smarter than Mother Nature. And it's all in the name of the almighty dollar. Have you people absolutely no respect for animals? Do you think they have no feelings/pain? This is cruel and inhumane. Whoever supports this should be ashamed of themselves. Our governor has a lot on her agenda I do not support, but this idea is probably the lowest of the low.

---

**Trista Klebsch**  
**Redfield SD**  
**Tristarhene@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Tara Brady**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**Tarav13@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

This is an unnecessary cruelty to these animals. We should be a state that leads by example of human treatment of animals.

---

**Peggy Ellingson**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**peg4tzus@msn.com**

**Comment:**

This proposal is an encroachment of wildlife in this State. Trapping, ineffective hunting, poisoning is only harming animals not intended - even animals eating carcasses of animals killed is hurting the eco-system. Say NO!

---

**Andrea Helwig**  
**Watertown SD**  
**annieleebens@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I am against putting a bounty on SD wildlife!

---

**Beth Millard**  
**Hot Springs SD**  
**Sunydaze@live.com**

**Comment:**

Please don't make us regret voting you in...  
There is another solution that would protect pheasant egg predators that are doing what they do naturally.. and keep the hunters happy at the same time!!!

---

**Katherine Brown**

**Black Hawk SD**

**underthemidnightblue@hotmail.com**  
**m**

**Comment:**

The only reason we put a bounty on natural predators is to make more deer and grouse and pheasant available for hunters to shoot. Why not bring some other sources of income to state?

---

**Louise Mcgannon**

**Mitchell SD**

**l.mcgannon@ymail.com**

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the Nest Predator Bounty Program.

I have listened to people talk about how we need to kill migratory geese because they have destroyed the tundra. I witnessed last weekend these geese being hunted and killed. It is man that has disrupted the ecosystem, not geese, not coyotes. Man & man alone.

It is time to stand up for wildlife and let them run nature.

---

**Todd Stahl**

**Canton SD**

**Comment:**

There aren't many foxes in this area, but I would guess that opossum and raccoon outnumber pheasants in this part of the state. I am a hunter, and we do need to have some type of population control for these type of predators.

---

**Theresa Giannavola**

**Aberdeen. SD**

**treeg1999@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Wildlife management professionals across the U.S. have long acknowledged the ineffectiveness of bounties and predator control, including South Dakota's own Habitat Work Group in its 2014 report to Governor Dugaard: "Under a bounty system, predator control would not be targeted enough to be effective. Additionally, bounty systems in other states have been ineffective because the origin of the predators cannot be verified. Predators from other states could easily be imported for a bounty, which would be counterproductive."

The "Nest Predator Bounty Program" has no science-based wildlife management objective and is encouraging citizens to kill these native wildlife species for the sole purpose of obtaining a cash reward. This is a slap in the face to South Dakota's hunting tradition of sportsmanship, fair chase, and respect for wildlife and their environment.

To date no sound, science-based evidence has been presented to suggest that the species targeted by this "Nest Predator Bounty Program"—raccoons, striped skunks, opossums, badgers or red foxes—are adversely impacting pheasant populations.

There is no scientific justification for the random removal of the targeted species, who each play their own unique and important role in South Dakota's ecosystem. In particular, opossums are a tremendous benefit to any area they inhabit, helping to control unwanted, harmful garden pests. Their diet includes snails, mice, rats, and insects such as cockroaches, crickets, beetles, and—in large numbers—disease-carrying ticks.

Trapping is cruel, barbaric and an ineffective method of wildlife conflict management. Trapped animals can languish and die slowly from shock, dehydration, starvation, or exposure to the elements. Those who survive long enough for the trapper to return may be killed by drowning, chest compression, strangulation, shooting, or any other method. Trapping does nothing to resolve the underlying problem in wildlife conflicts, and does not effectively control wildlife populations; in fact, it can actually stimulate population increases of some animals as they compensate for reductions in their numbers from trapping. Live trapping is only ever justified in those rare cases where it demonstrably benefits animals or provides necessary benefits to ecological systems.

The slaughter of these native species is a wrongheaded approach that ultimately will not help pheasants and other game birds, whose numbers are affected by weather and the availability of suitable habitat. Ignoring that by offering free traps to kill them, and a gruesome \$10-per-tail bounty, is an embarrassment to South Dakota and an affront to modern, science-based wildlife management principles.

If GFP wants more game birds for hunters, it must focus on improving their habitat, not randomly killing other species that play an equally important role in that habitat. And the Capital Journal in Pierre agrees; in January, its editorial board opposed the proposed bounty program, adding that if the state wants to advance pheasant hunting opportunities, it must "...focus on habitat, primarily grasslands and wetlands, work with landowners to secure those habitat(s) through incentives, provide hunter access through a strong walk-in program and raise suitable funding to get it done."

---

**Julie Ward**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Julieward@sio.midco.net**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Teresa Hicks**

**Rapid City SD**

**teresahicks75@outlook.com**

**Comment:**

This proposed bounty program is such a terrible idea. This will not help the pheasant population. Habitat needs to be improved for that and killing everything that moves will not help anything. And to offer a bounty of \$10 for killing wildlife is terrible. There should be no bounty on any creatures life. The Governor talks about getting more young people involved in the sport of hunting. Well this isn't hunting, this is killing for the sake of killing and that is all you are teaching the youth of today with this program. And the idea of traps anywhere makes my blood boil. They should be outlawed everywhere as they only bring pain and misery to any animal caught in it and SD does not regulate trappers near enough in the first place. Just wait until someone's kid steps in a trap placed on public land not to mention how many dogs will also suffer. South Dakota and our Governor need to wake up! This is not how things should be done.

---

**Rodney Mendel**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Rodneymendel@outlook.com**

**Comment:**

support

---

**Jan Holmes**

**Leaterville SD**

**Sdjh1221@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Trapping is barbaric, cruel, and harms all kinds of animals. Cats and dogs get trapped as well. Animals left in traps for days have been known to gnaw their own feet off to escape the horrific and torturous traps. This has to stop.

---

**Rebecca Goeden**

**Canistota SD**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Barbara St. Clair**

**Brookings SD**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Stephanie Samavarchian**  
**Rapid City SD**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Linda Perkins**  
**Mitchell SD**  
**lperky7@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

please say NO to Noem's Nest Predator Bounty Program" its cruel, inhumane and unethical

---

**Margaret Sohn**  
**Gainesville FL**  
**samargo@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Patricia Jenkins**  
**Brandon SD**  
**dpjenkins@alliancecom.net**

**Comment:**

Spend the money on Pheasant Farms to increase the Pheasant Population. Leave these poor animals alone. Nothing but traps for our dogs to get caught in.

---

**Jamie Al-Haj**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**jamie@msisd.com**

**Comment:**

Pheasants have been on the decline since the 1960's. The introduction of contemporary farming practices, fertilizer and herbicide use, mowing roadside ditches, draining wetlands, death by auto and farm machinery accidents, hunting, and climate variations coincide with the timeline of this decline. These are the issues that need to be addressed in order for the once plentiful ring-necked pheasant to revive. There is no scientific data to support that by decimating native wildlife species, we would improve the pheasant population. The role that native wildlife species play in maintaining a healthy diversified ecosystem, far outweighs any benefit that could be had by their elimination. Opossums help in tick eradication, foxes decrease the rodent population, raccoons ingest insects and contribute to seed distribution, etc. As a state, I hope South Dakota will be able to recognize the greater long term impact and not be so short sighted, that in the years ahead we will say "How could we have been so irresponsible!"



---

**Dean Parker**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**dean.parker.77@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I am writing in opposition of the proposed "Nest Predator Bounty Program", along with providing free traps for the trapping of those species.

This program is not backed by science-based wildlife management principles. If GFP wants more game birds for hunters, it must focus on improving their habitat, not killing native species that play an important role in that habitat.

---

**Sara Parker**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**sara@sdfact.org**

**Comment:**

I am writing in opposition of the proposed "Nest Predator Bounty Program", along with providing free traps for the trapping of those species.

Not only is trapping an ineffective method of wildlife conflict management, but it is a cruel way for any animal to die – including dogs and other non-targeted animals that will get caught in these traps.

Wildlife management professionals across the U.S. have long acknowledged the ineffectiveness of bounties and predator control, including South Dakota's own Habitat Work Group in its 2014 report to Governor Daugaard.

To my knowledge, no science-based evidence has been presented to suggest that the species targeted by this "Nest Predator Bounty Program" (opossums, raccoons, skunks, badgers or red fox) are negatively impacting pheasant populations. Furthermore, each native species plays an important role in our ecosystem. In particular, opossums are a great benefit to any area they inhabit. Their diet includes snails, mice, rats, and insects such as cockroaches, crickets, beetles and disease-carrying ticks.

This program is simply not backed by science-based wildlife management principles. If GFP wants more game birds for hunters, please focus on improving their habitat - not killing indigenous species that play an important role in that habitat.

---

**Paula Pillatzki**

**Labolt SD**

**ppillatzki@sstel.net**

**Comment:**

I thought we were better than this.

---

**Kim Tysdal**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**kmtysdal@rap.midco.net**

**Comment:**

I highly oppose trapping of any animal. Why are we placing more concern on pheasants, not a native South Dakota bird, over native wildlife. I would say we need to improve habitat, put more land back in CRP. Pheasant hunting has become nothing but a rich mans sport in this state.

---

**Greg Nordstrom**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**Sdsnow181@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Predator control is a must along with habitat management. This would give people another opportunity to hunt and enjoy the great outdoors.

---

**Shari Kosel**  
**Lead SD**  
**shari@sdfact.org**

**Comment:**

"The greatness of a nation can be judged by the way its animals are treated." Mahatma Gandhi

All animals serve a purpose and are an important element to our ecosystem. Randomly trapping is cruel, barbaric and unnecessary.

It's time to "think outside the trap" and find humane ways to solve these issues.

It's time to try compassion instead of tradition.

---

**Shari Kosel**

**Lead SD**

**info@sdfact.org**

**Comment:**

On behalf of the SD FACT (South Dakotans Fighting Animal Cruelty Together) board of directors and advocates, we strongly oppose the reckless Nest Predator Bounty Program.

Every animal has its role to play in an ecosystem. Here's why these varmints are so important.

**Raccoon**

Raccoons are highly intelligent. Raccoons are scavengers and therefore are an important part of cleaning up carrion. They also dine on many other species we consider pests when numbers get out of control, including snakes, frogs, lizards and rats.

**Striped skunk**

First, skunks do an amazing job at helping to keep insect populations in check, insects like grasshoppers, beetles, crickets and wasps. Skunks are one of the best examples of how an animal we really want to avoid is actually one we want to keep around.

**Badger**

Scientists call the badger a sentinel species, one that provides clues about the health of its ecosystem. One of the more curious badger facts is that a large part of their diet is earthworms and are excellent hunters of earth-dwelling prey including rabbits, groundhogs, ground squirrels, mice and snakes.

**Opossum**

The reality is, opossums are incredibly useful, and typically misunderstood. Ticks, particularly the black-legged ticks like deer ticks that are responsible for the spread of Lyme disease, appear to be a top item on the opossum's menu. Just one opossum eats, on average, 5,000 ticks each year.

**Red fox**

These varmints have a helpful side for farmers and ranchers. Like their larger canid cousin the coyote, red foxes are wonderful at keeping rodent populations down. They hunt chipmunks, rats, mice, voles and all sorts of other small rodents that can become more of a pest to humans than the foxes themselves. They also eat carrion and like other supposed varmints on this list, are part of an important cleanup crew for their ecosystem.

Trapped animals can languish and die slowly from shock, dehydration, starvation and exposure to the elements. Each year, traps in the United States injure and kill millions of "nontarget" animals. Because of this cruel and unnecessary practice and the importance of the animals involved, SD FACT strongly opposes the Nest Predator Bounty program and urges the commission to consider all aspects of the ecosystem.

South Dakotans Fighting Animal Cruelty Together

Shari Kosel, Chair

Sara Parker, Vice-Chair

Joe Kosel, board member/attorney

PO Box 847, Lead SD 57754

---

**Joe Kosel**

**Lead SD**

**Joekosel@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

These programs are ineffectual, the money expended is desperately needed for other more necessary programs, land use is a better priority for this issue, it is harmful to the ecosystem and is unnecessarily cruel.

---

**Ann Leah Naber**

**Meckling SD**

**annleanaber@outlook.com**

**Comment:**

If South Dakota's own study on habitat in 2014 already declared this bounty system ineffective, why are we readdressing this again?

We have only lost more habitat (an actual issue with pheasant population) for all of our wildlife in the past 5 years.

Will there be money for wildlife rehabilitating to care for the orphan babies? Or will entire wildlife families be allowed to be massacred?

Momma and babies wiped out for a few dollars? Really? How will this possibly be good for tourism? This is the people we want to be?

On a side note but still relevant, I have raised chickens for 9 years. Domesticated dogs have far and away been the top cause of premature chicken death. Could domesticated dogs at large have such an effect on pheasants trying to raise their families?

The wildlife targeted by this bounty program are not trash animals. They serve a valuable purpose in our ecosystem and deserve to be respected not exploited politically.

---

## Nest Predator Bounty Program

---

**Jan Humphrey**

**Hill City SD**

**plazykranch@hughes.net**

**Comment:**

I am completely OPPOSED to Kristie Noems decision to allow trapping in The Black Hills.

The wildlife is just one of the wonderful aspects of the region. If I find trapper in my area I will harass them to leave the area. We have already had our dog get in a leg trap which is totally unacceptable. And don't threaten me to follow the law when you are considering the killing of innocent animals that are indigenous to the area.

---

**Tom Steffensen**

**Brookings SD**

**completeplumbingtom@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Okay, so I open an email at 2 today that said we could apply for the live trap program. There was no time restraint at that time so I just plan to do it later. I get home at 10 tonight to apply and look at emails and see that it's closed. I do not think this is right to all of the sudden change this to a limited access. I feel I have the right to the three free traps like others will be receiving.

---

**Richard Jensen**

**Minneapolis MN**

**RJensen@fwhtlaw.com**

**Comment:**

I am writing concerning your misguided bounty program that you have recently implemented. When I first heard of it, I assumed that it was a joke. The program is particularly frustrating with respect to red fox. The population of that species is a fraction of what it used to be. If there were going to be a bounty, it should be on the biggest predator that is taking over eastern South Dakota – coyotes. Although I am not a wildlife specialist, it is my understanding that coyotes are forcing red fox out. Indeed, it has been several years since I have even seen a fox in South Dakota, and I have seen coyotes frequently. As someone who grew up hunting and trapping in South Dakota, still owns land in South Dakota, and enjoys returning to South Dakota to hunt pheasants and ducks, I am extremely frustrated with the bounty program. I thought I would convey my frustration to you. Thank you.

---

**Dennis Brandenburg**

**Pierre SD**

**Comment:**

I think you need to insure that each individual that receives traps uses them and that the PETA members are not given traps to destroy them and prevent them from being used. I suggest each person that receives a trap must turn in a minimum number of tails or they must return the traps to the state. I also think the state should put their name on the trap so they are cannot be re-sold only re-gifted.

# Other

---

**Dana Rogers**

**Hill City SD**

**dana.rogers.1@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

As the formal petitioner for the South Dakota Bowhunters, I wanted to thank you for allowing us to submit our petitions and provide testimony.

We received a lot of wonderful encouragement and feedback from across the state, some commissioners and from many in the audience that day. Based upon comments from a few commissioners, I certainly hope something will be done soon.

I also have to confess to being disappointed in the decision to keep our petitions in the UP/DOWN category while taking and allowing an outfitters group to submit a "proposal" to double WR special buck permits.

It's tough to find the words to explain to residents how statistical evidence of NR harvest data and pressure can be voted down while a commercial interest selling public trust wildlife to "clients" is allowed forward.

I realize much can change in the next few months, I remain hopeful that the commission and department will act in the interests of our resident citizens and sportsmen.

Thank You

---

**Clay & Donell Pederson**

**Morristown SD**

**theshootist93@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

How come there isn't anything planned in the North Western part of SD again. The closest ones are around 200 miles away for most of us around here. What's interesting is in ND, uniy 3F2 has cases of CWD and has restrictions. This is primarily Sioux County, which is right along the SD border of Corson County, but no meetings schedule. Closest is Aberdeen or Pierre, 150 -200 miles away. Maybe it's because of the weather, maybe not. Also again I see these important meetings are again scheduled right in the heart of calving seasons for most landowners and probably can't be attended by most of us. Just some thoughts as I've seen these kind of meetings in the past being held, even have voiced my concerns of the lack of meetings in this part of the area and the times held are always in conflict of busy times for ag producers and landowners.

---

**Ross Swedeen**

**Rapid City SD**

**reswedeen@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

The waves keep coming in. I bet you all feel like a boxer in the ring that cant get to their feet! To start with, I fully understand where this is truly coming from. However, that doesn't necessarily mean its right. I could go on and on with the reasons, but you know them all already. My main conflict with this whole process is the lack of consideration of the public's opinion. I find that extremely discouraging to be honest with you. This deal has horrible optics. I think the worst consequence of omitting public opinion on this topic just may be the potential of losing the trust and integrity, that I believe the SDGFP had gained with how the deer license allocation has been handled the last two years. All lost with one person's decision and 48 hours. Talk about opposite ends of the spectrum in regards to public opinion considered on the two different topics! This perfectly illustrates the pitfalls of how governmental bureaucracies can work sometimes. I will not be able to make it to the meeting. However, I will be listening anxiously. It's going to be a good one. Thank you all for dedication to such thankless positions. Thankless positions that I'm sure will be that much more thankless after the next couple of days. I truly wish you the best of luck with all your decisions tomorrow.

---

**Darren Pekas**

**Rapid City SD**

**pekasdarren00@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I know I am eighteen years old and not part of the youth seasons anymore. But my question is why don't we try something new for the youth seasons for deer season? I love hunting, fishing, and I enjoy being outdoors with my my family, friends, dogs. But totally be honest with me? This is my opinion? They should have a two seasons for South Dakota Resident and Nonresident Youth Buck season for the whole month of November for ages 14-18. Like for example, for first year applicants- are guaranteed a statewide South Dakota Youth Any Deer license. Same time as West River, East River, and Black Hills hunting season but include a whole month of November. Then, for second-fourth year applicants are still guaranteed a any deer tag, But have to pick a one unit either the Black Hills units, West River units, East River Units like for example, if youth apply for a West River tag like 11B, South of Bennett County, excluding Lacreek National Wildlife Refuge. That's where they chose to hunt for the youth deer season. Or if they pick the Black Hills fire protection units, and hunt all over the National Forest units. That's what they pick as a unit. or same thing with a East River tag. And they can have a apprentice deer tags for one any antlerless deer from ages 12-18, or has not had a tag for 10 years from 18 years or older. There should be a deadline in July for two seasons for residents and nonresidents youth buck seasons. but not on apprentice deer tag, they should stay the same season, unlimited licenses for residents and nonresidents, and no deadline. The Nonresident youth buck season, first year applicants, first year applicants are guaranteed for any deer license but have to pick there unit either Black Hills, West River, East River. Just like the second- fourth year applicants. And the ages should be 14-18. For the nonresident second- fourth year applicants, will result a drawing by lottery. I hope this helps for better hunting traditions and enjoy of South Dakota's outdoors. Thank you for your time and please reply or call me on my cell phone from (605) 290-5354 I wish they could do better but I care about wildlife and the outdoors.

---

**Scott Longville**  
**Lake Preston SD**  
**scott@descoarc.com**

**Comment:**

I would like to see S.D. do away with the icehouse removal date. I think it an unneeded law since the ones that know the ice conditions are the ice fisherman. Making them remove their shacks by the calendar and not ice conditions makes us miss time on the ice. I can't run out to the lake for two hours after work if I have to go home to get the shack and set it up. We all know every year is different. This is why I would like to see you repeal this law and let the ones that know the ice conditions and own the shacks take care of themselves .

---

**Heather Spaich**  
**Lehigh KS**  
**heathercletis22477@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

No! Just NO! Quit killing innocent animals! They have a right to live just as much as we do! Things like this make me ashamed to be human. Humans suck! Alot, if not most, are greedy, vain, heartless, uncaring creatures. Things like this. Proves it. Don't be human

## Special Buck Licenses

---

**Robert Eddy**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**REDDY@RUSHMORE.COM**

**Comment:**

Please oppose the proposal to increase the Special Buck licence numbers. This will substantially increase the number of non-resident hunters and decrease the limited amount of land available to resident hunters.



---

**Dana Rogers**

**Hill City SD**

**dana.rogers.1@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Esteemed Commissioners and GFP Staff,

I am vehemently opposed to the proposal to increase (double) the number of NR and Resident special buck permits WR. This proposal was openly submitted by an outfitters group to sell the public trust wildlife to "clients". I'm not opposed to a landowner doing as they see fit with their property but I am very much opposed to enabling the further commercialization of our citizens public trust wildlife resources. There are currently PLENTY of draw opportunities for NR hunters who wish to draw a permit and hire an outfitter. We have the current UNLIMITED NR archery permits; 500 NR special buck permits as well as the 8% allocation WR and in the Black Hills for NRs to apply for and draw. A further doubling of these Special Buck permits will only further solidify the monetary value of game animals and serve to keep resident hunters from accessing areas to help harvest these surplus animals where needed. Please vote NO and keep the numbers where they are currently for Special Buck.

Thank You for your time!

---

**Branden West**

**Philip SD**

**tbwest@gwtc.net**

**Comment:**

support

---

**Cody Weyer**

**Howes SD**

**cdhunts@gwtc.net**

**Comment:**

support