

---

**Gerald Bobzin**  
**Hill City SD**  
**bobzinklan@msn.com**

**Comment:**

I want the tag system to stay the same. But if you are going to change it don't put Custer state park, and muzzleloader in the new system.

---

**Daron Peterson**  
**Humboldt SD**

**Comment:**

I would like to see you leave it the same as it's always been

---

**Phillip Eide**  
**Centerville SD**  
**phillip.eide@iw.net**

**Comment:**

i just don't understand the benefit of changing the current system.

---

**Joel Reil**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**1fuzzie54@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

You are loosening residents because the cost versus the wages paid in South Dakota!!! Maybe all we need is nonresident tages make the game an fish happy! What a bunch of BS on your new proposals on tags for South Dakotans. Bad bad bad

---

**Todd Dathe**  
**Brandon SD**  
**Todddathe99@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I believe the fairest way to allocate the licenses is to create a system where everyone has to pick the license they would most like to have as their first choice. The current system results in some people getting several of their first choices and others getting none. Making the first drawing a true first choice drawing ensures that each hunter can target the season that is most important to them. Yes this will result in change for some, however, in order to make the system more fair there will have to be change. I view the changes to the elk draw as positive for the same reasons. Hunting should be something that is open to all not just the few who have the most influence. Please try to consider the average person that has limited financial resources in your decisions

---

**Dalton McNutt**  
**Doland SD**

**Comment:**

Still have no idea why we are trying to fix a system that isn't broken? Okay the lottery like everyone else! I feel habitat is a bigger focus than this yet you do nothing about it. What a joke, I'll be hunting in other states

---

**Kevin Forrester**  
**Sturgis SD**  
**k4ester@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

The original proposed changes actually provided opportunity for youth hunters to draw a Black Hills buck license because hunters would have to prioritize their first draw preference. The changes now proposed still allow for application for their favorite East/West River Deer and still be in on BH Deer draw. Based on the published draw statistics the only thing this proposal does is make youth preference points free. It will not change the timeline to actually draw a license. I know my kids have soured to hunting because the only license they can get are antlerless.

---

**Brian Frybarger**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**bafman59@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

This proposal offers plenty of opportunities for hunters to obtain tags while preventing certain parties from stock piling tags, either for themselves or to "pass along" (sell) to their friends, guests, etc.

This should ensure tags are actually being used by ethical hunters, not for those seeking to profit from deer licenses.

To determine success of this program, implement a mandatory post-season reporting system on deer taken, day hunted, locations, and so on.

---

**Terry Mixell**  
**Brandon SD**  
**mix007@alliancecom.net**

**Comment:**

I support this proposal however I was in favor of the first proposal limiting a person to their first choice. Since that was shot down I feel this is a good compromise but again reduces a persons chance of getting their first and preferred choice. Thank you for your time.

---

**Bruce Evans**

**Rapid City SD**

**BSE36@HOTMAIL.COM**

**Comment:**

It sure looks like more fortunate individuals who have access to private land want to be able to apply for East or West River and Hills Deer are dictating policy. Initially you were going to require a person to choose one deer application in the first drawing, that would be more fair to public land hunters who rely on the Hills as their main deer hunt. Once again those of us who live in the Hills area and had traditional deer camps with friends and family for years will again be forced to take a back seat to hunters who aren't willing to give up their East or West River tag for a chance to hunt the Hills.

---

**Steven Ahrendt**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**rosemariea@sio.midco.net**

**Comment:**

I believe your original proposal to limit hunters to one tag on the first draw is the correct approach, if in fact, your goal is to get more hunters an opportunity to deer hunt. The comments (objections) you posted would be the selfish, me first ones one would expect. Hunting tradition is not based on how many tags one draws, but on one's ability to hunt. Your proposal is not complicated and if it can't be understood by an individual, then maybe they are too dumb to have a rifle in their hands. As a Hunt Safe Instructor, we often hear that the opportunity to hunt is not available for a variety of reasons. Preference points are great but they aren't the same as drawing a tag. Don't compromise – there is no reason too.

---

**Doug Sippel**

**Groton SD**

**douglas.sippel.68@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

There is nothing wrong with the way it is. Everyone has the same chance for getting a tag. You are penalizing the the hunters who like to hunt different seasons by not letting them at least have chance of getting an any deer tag in each season. I don't mind shooting does but I at least want a chance at a buck tag. If this goes through my kids and I will only send in for two tags instead of four each. We will also quit buying preferences. If people are whining about not getting their favorite tag then maybe they need to expand their ways of hunting deer and enjoy other ways of pursuing.

---

**Adam Golay**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**adamgolay@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Even though letting people still hunt both east river & west river in the same year for bucks is better than the original proposal it still is not better than what we already have. We have a system that works that never needed to be fixed in the first place. It was never broken. Hunters need to take advantage of the preference point system that South Dakota has to offer if they want to draw their preferred deer license. I still to this day have yet to meet 1 person that is in favor of changing the deer license structure that we already have. I know people that hunt 1 season per year & they don't even want it changed because they might want to hunt 3 or more seasons at some point. My concern at this point is that this new proposal will affect my ability to buy preference points for west river the same year that I draw a west river special buck & vise versa if I draw a special buck WR then I won't be able to buy a preference point for west river deer that same year. I would like to know if I can still do this as I can on the current allocation where you can hunt all 6 seasons. I am all for GFP making money but this might threaten their preference point system & bring in less money for preference points as I buy them a lot & so do all my hunting family & friends.

---

**Randy Campbell**  
**Flandreau SD**

**Comment:**

If this has worked fine for as long as I've been applying. Why is there a need to change. Everybody has the same chance of drawing a license as I do.

---

**Jarrett Perry**  
**Rapid City SD**

**Comment:**

support

---

**David Dolan**  
**Hermosa SD**  
**ddreferee@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Now that you are allowing a hunter to apply for 2 deer applications I can support that. I for the first time in many years did not draw any tags. I was disappointed but I enjoy hunting with my son and friends both east and west river. Not drawing this year is part of the process. I encourage you to allow the current compromise.

---

**Tyler Henderson**

**Marvin SD**

**tyh1@msn.com**

**Comment:**

I do not support the measure, the majority are not in favor of change, why does this need to be pushed through. No changes are required, the system works.

---

**Nathan Fossell**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**fosselln@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

As I look at this, I like it a lot more. I would like to see muzzleloader excluded from this as it is a different weapon of choice. I'd also like Custer removed as it is a quite unique ecosystem. Other than that, I appreciate you working with us

---

**Michael Hughes**

**Mound City KS**

**michael\_h\_66103@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I am a non resident hunter and have hunted west river deer season for over 20 years and i have seen tag draws become more and more limited. I would like to see more tags available and possibly elk tags included.

---

**Doug Alvine**

**Watertown SD**

**dougalvine@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

By changing the proposal to allowing hunters to put down 2 deer seasons as a first choice, you might as well leave the deer allocation process the way it was. West River Deer is the most competitive season with East River Deer, so now hunters will put down both as a first choice, which will not help hunters get one or the other, which is what we have now. I mainly hunt East River and get a license every 2-3 years. I thought by hunters having to choose one season as their first choice, it might help me get a license more often. With the compromise, I don't think it will help much at all and makes it a wasted effort. Stick with picking one as a first choice, not two. Thanks.

---

**Butch Funke**

**Brandon SD**

**b.funke51@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

As a landowner and wildlife advocate, I feel we are being left out and not represented in our State. Our current Governor (Noem) has not given any thought toward land owners and what we give to wild life in our state! ....also being a one party (republican) State. We have lost all Democratic government in SD! ....it is a one party rule....

---

**Aric Craven**

**Winner SD**

**ariccraven@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Original option was a much better option. Make people choose between an east river tag and the west river tag for their primary choice. The new option again East River hunters can have their cake and eat it too. Need to make the East river and west river seasons the same time. Then one does not get to go to West River shoot whatever runs in front of them then go back to East River and trophy hunt. Just like you put it in your own words people want to come out to West River and enjoy then also go back to East River and do it again. I have a 12-year-old daughter that didn't even draw West River tag on her first deer season last year because there wasn't enough tags, this isn't right and if there was a few less east river hunters Double dipping I'm sure she would've drawn one just fine.

---

**Bryan Parks**

**Rapid City SD**

**bnparks@rap.midco.net**

**Comment:**

East river deer tags should also be subject to the same amount of out of state licences as west river and black hills.

If the draw dates were the same for all of the mentioned seasons (which they now will be) AND if all of the season dates were the same for all of the mentioned seasons, this entire back and forth about licence allocation would probably be self regulating.

---

**Jared Pearson**

**Summerset SD**

**docjcpearson@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I don't feel the system needs to be changed. There are plenty of opportunities to obtain licenses in SD.

---

**Larry Gadbois**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**LGAD361859@AOL.COM**

**Comment:**

My family and I have been hunting deer in South Dakota for the past 60 years. We have enjoyed the application system throughout the years. Please do not change the drawing system. Why change something that is not broken? thank you for listening to us hunters.

---

**Paul Van Bockern**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**Pvb@midco.net**

**Comment:**

It's a good compromise. A way to advocate for young hunters, gives more resident hunter an opportunity to draw a tag yet does allow for a reasonable number of nonresident tags.

---

**David Hodina**  
**Rapid City, Sd SD**  
**hodinadc@rap.midco.net**

**Comment:**

I hunt the black hills only. People that hunt only one season still have to share the tags with local prairie hunters. I thought this new system was to help everyone get their first choice. Now it is choices.

---

**Jeff Carlton**  
**Hill City SD**  
**Wildcatroad@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Deer tag changes: I don't think you ever explained why changes in the old system was necessary.

---

**Shawn Pliska**  
**Sioux Falls SD**

**Comment:**

The current deer allotment for tags in place is fair, it gives everybody the same opportunity to choose what they want to do. At no time has sportsmen and or women of South Dakota want this proposal in any form it has been shown. 86% opposed this proposal from the last commission meeting in January. Any lost opportunities are detrimental to the people of South Dakota.

There is no compromise as far as I am concerned on this proposal. The majority should always rule how any issues are resolved that concern the public.

Please stop pushing this onto us. Put your focus on something else, like Predator control.

What we all want is to leave something behind, we want to keep South Dakota traditions the same for hunters now and future generations.

Thank you for your time.

---

**Josh Hagemann**  
**Mission Hill SD**  
**jghagemann@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Dear Members of the Commission,

I still disagree that a change needs to be made. I also disagree with the way the "research" was conducted and presented.

I also understand that the Commission is dead-set on making a change. You want to cater to the few people that were upset that they couldn't draw their one favorite tag every year.

That being said, I believe the latest iteration of the deer licensing proposal is a fair and true attempt at compromise.

The only change I would make is to let nonresidents apply for additional tags (beyond the 8%) in the 4th draw. I've never had a problem with nonresidents getting a chance to hunt, especially when they are getting a chance at tags that are clearly not in high demand.

Thank you,

Josh Hagemann

---

**Alan Gibson**

**Dulac LA**

**Ajgibson@charter.net**

**Comment:**

To my knowledge South Dakota has more private land than public and one factor I see missing in the new proposal for nonresidents would require a nonresident to obtain a signature of a land owner as to apply in draws . I have seen an increase in out of state guides having clients get licenses and landowner's .nonresident family and friends being unable to draw cuasing landowners to end up with no hunters and out of state quides offering landowners less than fair values to hunt deer on the resident landowners lands.

Without the resident landowners participation there would be less deer and thus less opportunity for all hunters resident and nonresident . Any questions please feel free to contact me . Thanks for allowing my comments.  
Alan Gibson

---

**John Meyen**

**Rosholt SD**

**rosholtinsurance@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

First leave the deer license drawings as they are. The current system works, and let's see what effect cubing has before you change anything else. Also the youth don't need free preference points and they can wait until they are old enough to apply. We already do too much for them. Do you really think they'll keep hunting after they have to play by the same rules as the adults? I doubt it! I have some friends from Michigan that said their state has done this and all it does is ruin hunting for the adults and once the youth have to play by the adult rules, they quit hunting. Raise your nonresident license fees.

---

**David Miller**

**Ovid SD**

**Dlmiller5@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I am a mon resident hunter. I believe you are making it harder for me to hunt and vist your state. I have hunted the perkins county srea for yesrs and I'm afraid you are deny me that opportunity with your changes

---

**Christopher Baldwin**  
**Belvidere SD**  
**sdbeeguy@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I attended the South Dakota Stockgrowers meeting in Rapid City last Fall. I heard the presentation given by GFP reps. I felt that was a fair plan.

I feel now like the Commission has caved to the influence of the most advantaged segment of the deer hunting population. Many hunters with less time and resources, can not take the time and money to travel to other parts of the state to hunt different seasons.

Myself as an example. I hunt West River deer only. I have four different WRD Units within 10 miles of my home. In the past, I have gotten a tag in the first WRD drawing, then applied for a second tag in the third drawing, again WRD. My family will eat two deer a year.

I understand that under the latest plan, I could still do the same in the fourth drawing. My objection is: I thought the idea or goal of changing the draw procedure was to give people who were not drawing tags regularly in their preferred unit/season a better chance to draw. I am all for that. But what I see now, is a more advantaged (rich) person can obtain 3 licenses in 3 different seasons through the third drawing, while a local less advantaged, locally hunting, person can only obtain one. Fair?

The advantaged person is taking license opportunity away from others. How is this fair? Again, I thought the GFP plan I heard last Fall was fair. The subsequent ones, no.  
Thanks for the opportunity to express myself.

---

**Steve Greenfield**  
**Watertown SD**  
**s\_j\_green2002@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

You had a solid plan that would have helped thousands of hunters get deer tags more often, but for some reason you caved to the vocal minority of hunters. I was hoping to have a chance to get a tag more than every 2nd or 3rd year. By allowing hunters to apply for both east and west river deer in the first draw you destroyed any benefit of the new system. The point was to get more people one tag and less people several tags. I do not approve of the "compromise" and feel it is barely different than the current draw system.

---

**Brooks Gehring**  
**Bozeman MT**  
**bkg132@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I am most proud to say I grew up in South Dakota, but your opportunities for non resident east river deer rifle hunting are pathetic.

I have been a Montana resident for 35 years and would love to come back to the farm to hunt deer with family members, but the opportunities are ZERO.

How about putting up 1-5% of any given deer license available to nonresidents. Let us buy preference points. Charge a substantial amount for the coveted nonresident license if you must (that's what MT, WY, and CO do). Make some substantial extra revenue for the state with a minimal sacrifice to residents. At least consider making it available to former residents with family still residing in SD (sponsor type set up like AK).

Pheasants may be king in SD (and yes, I do come back to hunt pheasants), but I strongly believe you are losing easy revenue and denying potential awesome family time for those of us with ties to South Dakota.

---

**Daniel Scherer**

**Rapid City SD**

**DANIEL.H.SCHERER@GMAIL.COM**

**Comment:**

I preferred the version prior to the most recent amendments, yet still believe this to be better than the allocation method that has been in place.

---

**Brent Reilly**

**Hartford SD**

**brent.reilly@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I'll start on a positive note; I truly LOVE the recommendation to enhance the odds of our young hunters to draw deer tags sooner. This is fantastic and something all SD deer hunters can rally around. That said, I find it troubling based on the timing that it was clearly added as a sweetener to get this proposal in an attempt to push it through the legislative review process. This enhancement can be added at any point and does not need to be attached to this radical change to the deer draw.

This is yet another example of what has become the key issue in the eyes of many sportsmen and sportswomen which is a lack of trust and confidence in GF&P leadership and the GF&P commission. Here we are again, with the commission forcing through a change to the deer tag process. The fate of this change seems to have been long ago decided by the GF&P leadership and now in the face of immense public opposition you have turned to desperate tactics. Listening to the meetings, the commission talks openly about massaging the name of the proposal to "deer tag process" because it's less authoritarian sounding than "deer tag allocation". Absolutely bizarre, call it whatever you want, it is what it is. These are nothing more than Washington, DC style pork barrel politics, whatever it takes to get it passed.

**Unaddressed Items**

- The commission members should disclose during the Conflict of Interest discussion what deer seasons they and their family have applied for or hunted in the past two seasons. If the commissioners and those closest to them will benefit from the proposed changes by improving their draw odds it obviously should be disclosed. To my knowledge no such disclosures have taken place.
- It appears from a webpage and video for River View Lodge that Commissioner Phillips has a commercial deer hunting business on what is stated to be a 20,000 acre ranch near New Underwood, SD. The website also states they get \$6,000 for any deer hunts versus \$3,900 for whitetail only hunts. By the GF&P's own data, the proposed changes to the draw process would improve a client's odds of drawing an any deer tag. Has this conflict been disclosed? Do any of the other commissioners own or benefit from commercial deer hunting operations? Has the GF&P studied the impact the proposal will have on growing commercial deer hunting in SD? What safeguards can be put in place to prevent transferable licensing down the road? When you get to the core of these changes and who is pushing so hard for them that is the next logical step. I first saw this rough framework for the tag drawing process in SD about 5 years ago in a 30 minute You Tube video. The presenter was a deer hunting outfitter in SD and WY. Interesting how we got from there to here. Can the commission explain to the state's deer hunters how this is apparently a random coincidence?
- Positions on the GF&P Commission are appointed which cutting to the chase means you need to be a sizable political donor and/or politically well-connected to be asked on the commission by the Governor. I could be wrong but it doesn't appear there is a random working class type person on the commission but rather it is filled with large landowners, CEO's, attorneys and others that tend not to reflect the masses. I'm not naïve; it's the nature of Governor appointed commissions. However, when these types of coincidences with ties to commercial deer hunting come to light, especially given that this topic has faced significant public push-back; add in the fact that the conflict of interest disclosures have been weak or non-existent it doesn't lead SD deer hunters to have a lot of confidence in the process given we have zero recourse.
- Has the commission considered putting the same restrictions on landowners as it does on non-landowners by limiting them to one tag including the own land tags? There is nothing in this proposal to keep a land owner from getting an ER and/or WR own land tag but still being able to apply for 1st draw 1st choice muzzleloader in

the regular draw. Surely this isn't the intent of the commission...is it? If unaddressed that is a large portion of the tags that won't go to new, unique hunters which has been sold as the reason for this change.

- How many of the commissioners and their family members are landowners or benefit annually from the land operator exemption to apply for landowner preference? One curious thing about the entire process is that any changes to the landowner advantages have gone unaddressed. I believe firmly in landowner rights but the current set-up is over the top in favor of landowners in their ability to double dip via the regular draw and having access to own land deer tags. One has to question why and I think it has a lot to do with the make-up of the commission given it's disproportionately made up of folks from areas more likely to be biased toward landowners.

- Why don't you get the unbiased input from all SD deer hunters on the exact proposal by way of a hunter survey now given this topic is front and center. Make the survey questions fair and not leading and see what the hunters have to say. These can be done quickly if you only wanted to listen to the feedback. If the GF&P is so confident in its proposal and that it only negatively impacts about 30% of deer hunters why doesn't it do a survey now addressing the exact issue in its final form? The GF&P claims that a vocal minority is raising a fuss, prove it instead of relying on 2010 and 2014 survey questions that marginally relate to the final proposal.

- Did the commission consider sun setting these changes to end after 3 years? There is a written statement that the commission will continually address any needed changes but the commission will continue to turn over in this period of time. The commission has probably learned how hard it is change something once it is in place.

#### Predictions Based on Proposal Passing

- Dramatic increase in commercialized deer hunting in SD. There will be more outfitter type hunts but also the exclusive hunting rights on more land will be leased up.

- A strong majority of the muzzleloader tags will go to landowners who will also get an own land rifle tag to hunt the exact same ground. I strongly suspect this is where the vast majority of the muzzleloader tags will go unless addressed as most non-landowner hunters will first try to pull the rifle tag and if unsuccessful switch to muzzleloader for their 2nd choice but the tags will be gone.

- Loss of quality Walk-In Program land that the state leases because individual hunting groups will pay more for exclusive access to it. This will further stress the public hunting opportunities available which will lead to less quality public hunting and more regular folks leaving hunting.

- The GF&P will continue to ignore the increasing numbers of non-resident archery deer hunters that come in and pressure the quality public hunting areas before the rifle seasons. Once the commercialized deer hunting operations get established it will pull even more non-resident archery hunters in. The GF&P can't shut it off or slow it down because they will need the tag money due to lower preference point revenue.

- There will be even more manipulation of sham share cropping arrangements so hunters can gain advantages in the landowner draw processes.

- Humans are smart and they will adapt their license application preferences which will throw off all the GF&P's projections. The new unique hunter projections will prove to be overstated and even the people now supporting the change will become increasingly frustrated. Then no one is happy.

- The ultimate losers are two-fold. The regular, non-landowning SD deer hunter that has hunted for years with family and friends in multiple SD deer seasons. The second loser is the small SD towns and Black Hills towns that make some decent money from out of town SD deer hunters every November. With these changes, there will be a bias for current multi-season hunters to hunt the season closer to home and not make that cross-state trip and all the spending that goes with it.

I believe the GF&P and the commission should reconsider this issue. I'm not saying the deer draw can't be improved, it probably can and some great ideas have come up in the process. But I believe it's wrong with a change this big to not have all stakeholders have to give something up, it's all coming from multi-season deer hunters. The way the entire process has played out I believe the decision was long ago decided and the public meetings etc. are simply check the box procedural issues. The only check and balance for the voters is the legislative review process and thankfully some of them had the nerve to question why the hunting public is so against this yet the GF&P leadership seems so intent in trying to pound this through.

One commissioner has brought up numerous times a young hunter that came up to them and said it's not fair some guy gets 3 buck tags and I didn't get one. My first thought is that is a very precocious teenager to be focused and studying the deer draw tables like they apparently are, wow! Second, using the GF&P's own data 256 hunters drew 3 buck tags in 2017, this is ~ 0.5% of deer hunters and one would need A LOT of built up preference points to draw that many buck tags. Fact - no hunters are drawing 3 buck tags year after year in the first draw as is being insinuated and only folks that hunt less demanded units draw even 2 buck tags with any consistency. Perhaps I'm missing it but I don't see the outrage in this situation. Fact is I'm not aware of any state where residents are guaranteed to draw a high demand firearm buck tag every year in their preferred hunting unit.

If the change is adopted, there will be many children now that are part of deer hunting groups that will fall apart that won't be deer hunting moving forward. There will also be young hunters in split families that will get to pick their "preferred" deer tag which for them means picking between hunting with mom's side or dad's side of the family. Who in this process has been a voice for them?

It would be refreshing if the GF&P leadership would spend its time focusing on important issues that unite deer hunters instead trying to fix something that isn't broken. The biggest threats to hunter participation aren't the current draw system but rather the continuing decline in quality access as farms and ranches continue to get bigger in much of our state. Also, what is being looked at with CWD as that noose continues to tighten around our state from our neighbors and the SW corner of our state which threatens all deer hunting? Point being, we have real issues to address that are going to require the help and unification of all stake holders in the deer hunting equation. The leadership of the GF&P should be focused on how to pull deer hunters together instead of tearing us apart. Instead of doing that, the commission has again repackaged the proposal and my guess is will attempt to lean on new members of the legislative review process now that we have some new legislators in Pierre and attempt to handle it that way.

---

**Mike Dosch**

**Wolsey SD**

**mbdosch@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Leave the way deer applicants are submitted alone, this has worked for years the way it has been working , why ruin something that has worked for all these years...

---

**Jason Fischer**

**Cottonwood MN**

**Jasonfischer@charter.net**

**Comment:**

I think it is absolutely insane to allow a person to draw several tags from one area before allowing a person who wants one to not get it. I have a son that has been applying for a nonresident west river deer drag for two years. He has not been drawn but we hunt with people in our group that are non residents that hold 7 deer tags. One anydeer and 6 whitetail any deer tags. My son cannot even get a any whitetail tag. This is insane. I understand you want to protect your residents but really. I also had 4 other non residents in our group that did not get a tag. I have hunted in 8 states and no one does anything like this.

---

**Richard King**

**Oak Hill VA**

**rking@wbbinc.com**

**Comment:**

Your "compromised approach" remains unfair to non-residents, and South Dakota is forgoing a lot of revenue for the department and the local economies.

Did you mean to say "COMPROMISED" ("accept standards that are lower than desirable") ) or "COMPROMISE" ("an agreement that is reached by both sided making concessions") APPROACH.? "Compromise" seems most correct"

---

**Marty Muchow**

**Aberdeen Proving Ground MD**

**marty.l.muchow.mil@mail.mil**

**Comment:**

As a SD resident on active duty in the Army, I was concerned under the previously proposed draw structure I would only be eligible for 1 tag. I support the current proposal as it will give me the opportunity to continue to be issued tags for both East and West River deer.

---

**Marlys Hanten**

**Hartford SD**

**marlyshanten@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I like the compromise allowing 2 licenses. One of my largest concerns are something that gfp has no control over. It is: there are numerous hunters that apply for any deer tags year & again whom don't shoot a mule deer. So why do they apply for Any Deer? I want the mule deer and can't get any deer tags.

---

## Other

---

**Leslie Larson**

**Miller SD**

**annceilia93@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

So many of these areas have absolutely no true habitat that will attract pheasants. So there should be criteria that the farmer has to produce to qualify before it is accepted!!!! No pheasants no pay!!!

---

**William Podoll**

**Aberdeen SD**

**Comment:**

There is no need to make changes every year. Personally I can't keep up with them. Just because one group hollowed you people seem to jump.

---

**David Prater**  
**Lexington KY**  
**dprater@email.uky.edu**

**Comment:**

I am 76 years old and have hunted SD since 1969. My son now joins me to hunt pheasants each year. I really appreciate your concern for conservation and efforts to maintain all wildlife populations. In over 40 years of hunting, this was first year to be able to duck hunt. Hope you can improve those chances for out of state hunters annually.

Thanks  
DP

---

**Jon Colw**  
**Lake City MN**  
**Jonkathcole@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Please consider allowing nonresident duck hunters to choose 2-7 day periods to hunt within their zone. It is not practical to have to hunt 10 straight days. Or allow 2-5 day periods similar to your pheasant season. Thank you

---

**Don Tooley**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**ferret54@outlook.com**

**Comment:**

I called GFP to let you know I saw a deer with a broken leg. I was told they would just leave the deer alone. (suffering, and hobbling on 3 legs) If you wanna kill deer so bad.. Please put this miserable animal out of it's suffering.

---

**Bob Koscak**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**bobbyk@rap.midco.net**

**Comment:**

Immediately STOP the tripling of preference points that you initiated last year! You are trying by this latest action to help young hunters into the game by giving them early preference points, thereby acknowledging and trying to correct your past decision. Do what's right; get rid of the tripling of existing preference points! You can still give young hunters these extra points you are proposing, although it does nothing for new hunters who are a bit older. Be fair to them too; STOP THE TRIPLING!

---

**William Reiser**  
**Wagner SD**  
**areiser@hcinet.net**

**Comment:**

on the revenue aspect, why do I have to pay an agent fee when I purchase my license on my home computer.

---

**Justin Murphy**  
**Lyons SD**  
**justintmurphy@outlook.com**

**Comment:**

I strongly support the Super Tag proposal. These tags can generate a good amount of revenue for habitat. Habitat is lacking and continues to disappear from the landscape. Getting out ahead of this issue will make huge impacts for future generations of sportsmen in South Dakota. As a resident of this great state I enjoy the many opportunities available to me. Like it or not those same opportunities should be available to nonresidents as well (obviously in moderation). I enjoy being able to elk hunt the western states and one day hope to hunt Alaska. If nonresident opportunities weren't available I would never get to enjoy those hunts.

My personal thoughts on how to work the Super Tags.

1. Open to both resident and nonresident for all tags available
2. Tags offered: Elk, Bison, Deer, Antelope, Turkey
3. \$10 per entry with unlimited entries. Same price for everyone
4. Do not offer a Super Tag bundle. Raffle the tags separately
5. Closely monitor how the raised revenue is being spent
6. Raffle the tags early in the year so people can properly plan there fall

Justin Murphy  
Lyons, SD

---

**Louie Genzler**  
**Aberdeen SD**  
**louiegenzler@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Why do disabled Vets have to be 100% disabilities to get free camping at State Parks in SD, starting at 10% would be good?

---

**Kevin Forrester**

**Sturgis SD**

**k4ester@BlackHillsTrails.org**

**Comment:**

RTP Motorized/Non-motorized monies being spent for Snowmobile Trail Groomers when non-motorized uses are specifically excluded from use. Research through the Federal Highway Administration has shown that the SD GFP who is the administrator of the SD Recreation Trails Program have awarded themselves significant amounts over multiple years to purchase groomers for the Snowmobile Trail System. The funds came from the allocation set aside for Motorized and Non-motorized combined. Since the groomers are for the Snowmobile Trail System and Non-motorized users are excluded from using the system the award of funds for mixed use is questionable at best.

---

**Don Cain**

**Arlington SD**

**dc57212@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Just received the "GFP News: Game, Fish and Parks Fisheries Plans" and was shocked and very disappointed to see where you have taken it upon yourselves without any contact with me, to reclassify my privately owned farm to a "Managed Fishery" with "Public Fishing Access". I'm referring to your new "Highway 81 Northeast" pond as you call it.

This also is known as Brookings County, Bangor Township, Section 30-110-52 based on my tax records.

Your web site lists it as a "Managed Fishery" When did this take place without me knowing about it?

Your web site lists it as "Public Fishing Access".

How is that possible without crossing over private land which is also known as trespassing, in order to gain access.

Is this your new way of working with landowners?

---

**Angela Dixon**

**Poplarville MS**

**angelafd61@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Can you tell me when WLF&G is going to make PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE FOR THERE actions when KILLING ANIMALS THAT THEY SHOULDN'T? Such as the Female greywolf killed on 01/09/2019. There guns SHOULD be taken away, permits revoked/lifetime & a hefty fine. Th Gaming MUST DO something. She was to far out. If he COULDN'T SEE DON'T KILL.

---

**Lee Cooper**  
**Council Bluffs IA**  
**cbcoopers@cox.net**

**Comment:**

I see that you are removing the past restrictions on bass on Roy Lake. I believe this is a very poor decision. My bass club has come to Roy and region every year since 2002. I have also had my sibling and spouses up there 5/6 times for a week. Roy is the only lake my club agrees to come to every year. We drive the 5-6 hours because of the quality of the fish there. We can go else where to fish numbers, but Roy has been a great lake for the quality of the fish we catch. I believe this change will harm the that quality. Bass fishermen believe in catch and release. We are also aware that many of the walleye fishermen there see them as trash fish and will keep many of them. Tourists will keep and eat many also and the size of the average fish will shrink. If that happens, then Roy becomes just another lake, pretty , but 5-6 hours away . I believe the amount of money coming to area will severely decline, as I have talked to several bass men who generally agree. We see it as a chance for a trophy smallmouth, or at least a number of really good fish. I would regret not coming to the Roy Lake area. I enjoy it a lot, but my funds are limited. I'll go where the club goes.

---

**Jim Ivers**

**Crooks SD**

**a.herefishyfishies@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Please note that I have well over 15 years experience spearfishing in fresh and salt water while freediving and using scuba. Please note that freedive spearfishing is considered one of the worlds most dangerous sports due to something called shallow water blackout. Despite this, it is very rewarding and challenging to confront fish on their own terms without a lot of bulky equipment.

Per current SD regulations, the spear must be rigidly attached to what is known as a 'gun line' on the speargun, not to exceed 20 feet in length. Despite the ease with which someone can reel in a large walleye from the boat, some fish, especially large carp, are far more powerful than a diver underwater. Trust my experience on this, a large fish not 'stoned' by a head or spine shot is fully capable of pulling the diver down at will. A freediver is therefore left with the choice of following the fish down, or letting go/losing a \$600 or \$700 speargun. At depth, the pressure in the diver's lungs magnifies the available oxygen. At 33 feet, there is double the available oxygen. Thus the diver feels comfortable hanging onto the speargun for too long. As the diver surfaces, oxygen levels in the lungs drop precipitously and the diver can black out near or at the surface. This results in almost certain death, even if a buddy is available. This happens all the time on the coast where spearfishing is common. On scuba, spearing a fish late in the dive that drags the diver down can result in excess nitrogen built up in the blood. Upon surfacing without sufficient air left in the scuba tank to decompress, the nitrogen fizzes like in a soda can, the blood forms clots around the bubbles, and significant joint and neurological damage occurs (the 'bends'). Some of our lakes here are two or three hundred feet deep (by actual depthfinder measurement). A diver dragged deep can easily become disoriented, and cannot read the depth gauge or compass easily holding a speargun. Another issue is that scuba divers use a 'buoyancy compensator' (BC) filled with air to achieve neutral buoyancy at depth. If dragged down by a fish, the air in the BC becomes compressed, the diver becomes negatively buoyant, and starts to sink rapidly. Trying to fight a fish, determine the depth, and adjust buoyancy under these conditions is very difficult even for experienced divers. Thus the diver cannot determine the maximum depth nor control the ascent rate. Both of these are required to prevent the bends.

I am not really sure why the 20' gun line restriction is in place. If you fire a bullet into the water, it will only go a couple feet before sinking to the bottom. If you fire a speargun from common equipment used, 20' is farther than the effective lethal range. You should try it sometime. Go to some body of water and fire a speargun at a target with a 20' gun line and see what the penetration is. Thus I don't consider a fixed gun line to be a safety device, more like a device destined to kill a diver.

If you are worried about a speargun being fired in the air, the recoil is substantially more than a rifle due to the mass of the spear, and can severely injure the spearfisher. My guess is the spear would break the gunline anyway. Finally, archery gear is allowed and has far more range in air than any speargun.

Therefore worldwide there are two common solutions to the problem. Gun lines are still used, but instead of being rigidly attached to the speargun, they are attached to a spear mounted reel or breakaway float line. Thus after the fish is speared, the diver can return to the surface safely and 'play' the fish as in rod and reel fishing. A floatline is safer than a reel BTW, and also serves to mark the diver's location.

Therefore I consider the 20' fixed gun line rule to be far more hazardous than any imagined danger of a spear going across a reservoir and hitting a swimmer.

Therefore I would like to suggest modifying the rules to require a 20' max gun line, but to allow a reel or breakaway float line to be used for safely retrieving the fish.

---

**James Pease**

**Bend OR**

**pease.jim@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

As a frequent non-resident bird hunter in S.D. I would prefer season licenses in place of your short term ones. Seven days is not helpful to non residents who plan a longer stay. And trying to figure out dates is a pain. So how about a reasonable price for a season bird license?

---

## Resident Nonresident

---

**Steve Cherkas**

**Edgemont SD**

**sacherkas@msn.com**

**Comment:**

As a resident landowner (233 acres) in fall river county I would like to see the ability for my family (son, daughters, nephews, nieces, brother in law, etc) from other states to be able to come hunt my land only (not hunt unit in general) where they do not have to go thru a draw. Similar to how the landowner resident deer license where it is cheaper than full hunt unit access.

---

**James Kinser**

**Denver CO**

**jkinseriii@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

If you want non resident input, then email out surveys that solicit non resident opinions. We aren't going to drive to SD for a meeting. My input is that SD is no longer worth driving to for pheasant hunting. Licenses are too expensive, the merchants gouge us knowing it's pheasant hunting bringing us there, the hunting limits are too low and the quality of hunting has been mediocre at best for the last 10 years. I won't be back.

---

**Charles Crowell**

**Conway Springs KS**

**ccrowell@txtav.com**

**Comment:**

My family have been coming to South Dakota to pheasant hunt for at least 20 years and after last year we have decided we will not longer return. The people are rude and do not want hunters there and we haven't had much luck the last few years with getting many birds so we have decided to hunt in Nebraska. We hunted there this year on our way back from south Dakota and had much better luck, the people were friendly and helpful and the license's were cheaper. I am taking the time to write you this so maybe you will understand that yes the state wants out of state hunters to come up and spend money and hunt but the residents do not want us there and we as a family are tired of traveling to south Dakota and spending a lot of money for few birds and deal with rude unfriendly people. The residents/farmers are not buying into wanting hunters in their state and until you can change that I fear you will lose more hunters. Thanks for your time and happy hunting. Chuck

---

**Joe Gonzalez**

**Easton PA**

**joeg@thechildrenshome.org**

**Comment:**

I wanted to comment prior to the upcoming hearings involving the opportunities for non-resident hunters. I have memories of hunting your beautiful, well managed state on a few occasions. I have an active application to hunt deer this fall as I write this commentary. My thoughts are as follows: I am hopeful that you decide to allow a certain number of non resident hunters to pursue big game as you have had in the past years. I have noticed that the bulk of the deer permits allocated are for resident hunters and rightfully so. That being said, I have cherished the opportunity to hunt S.D. and certainly do not mind waiting my turn to be drawn. I do realize the revenue that out of state hunters bring in, the folks that rely on that income yet recognize your need for some balance for all involved. I am hopeful that the results of your hearings will still include some options for old, N. R. hunters like me to pursue deer in your fine state. I look forward to that trip every two/three years and really at this stage do not want to go elsewhere. Also, I would hope that you discuss a crossbow season and that impact for both resident and nonresident hunters as it would generate income, allow more options and provide varied management results of the deer herd (depends who you talk to) and possibilities afield. Thank you for allowing me to voice my thoughts. I have never done this sort of thing before anywhere but wanted you to know how important your decisions made from these hearings will be on nonresident hunters as well. Thank you, Joe G.

---

**Nicholas Hluchy**

**Baton Rouge LA**

**Nicholas.Hluchy@brrehab.com**

**Comment:**

I would like to offer input on the topic of Resident/Nonresident opportunities. I was born and raised in South Dakota and following graduate school, opportunity led me away from South Dakota. I return regularly to visit family and friends and routinely make it a point to either hunt or fish. Since I have been away, I have been able to experience some things other states have been doing to encourage a lifetime of continued support outdoor activities. I would suggest that the Commission consider discussing lifetime licenses and/or native son/daughter options. Both encourage greater participation in the outdoors and would increase the opportunity for men and women to visit South Dakota for outdoor activities.

Thank you for your time and I appreciate the opportunity to offer input

---

**Bob Anderson**

**Bismarck ND**

**andersonbob504@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I read with great interest the minutes of the past meeting and as a former resident, who pheasant hunts in the Pierre area and fishes in the Mobridge area, I would like to offer the following for your consideration.

Comparing non-resident fishing vs. non-resident is difficult at best because you can park a camper or tent, use a 14' Lund and fish 80% of the lakes in eastern South Dakota. The fishing license is annual with lake access being unlimited. The resource is managed by the GF&P, with landowner participation at a minimum.

Non-residents using a "commercial hunting" guide service or game farm are not the cause of the heartburn & and hard feelings experienced by the residents. This is caused when the residents must compete with non-residents using public shooting areas, walk-in's & road ditches. Back in the 70 and 80's, people from Sioux Falls & Rapid City were considered non-residents by the locals when they hunted at Winner & Presho. Times have changed.

I would suggest the following:

1. Have an option available for non-residents for three 3-day hunts vs the current two 5-day hunts. This would allow the multiple trips with young hunters.
2. The SD GF&P will need to take an active role in providing food plots and in some cases (releasing pheasants) in the public shooting/walk in areas as the guide services are presently providing their clients. This needs to be done thru out the season.
3. The guide service/game farm will become a dying business model due to the IRS not allowing entertainment expenses to be deducted by businesses in 2018. Companies will not host client events or weekends where the costs are \$1500/customer. This will affect local motels, restaurants, convenience stores and bars. Future sales tax income will be noticeable.
4. There are several middle & high school students joining trap/shooting clubs within the school system (I would market this group as the next generation of hunters) both out of state & local.

The South Dakota department of GF&P has a reputation of being fair to sportsman, but I am not sure this is the case with US Fish & Wildlife service. Commercial goose hunting along the Missouri River is almost non-existent compared to previous years due to some of the rules by the Fish & Wildlife.

The same is true with the wildlife refuges such as the Sand Lake Refuge where hunting would improve if a management "burn program" was instituted. This would result in improved relationships with adjoining landowners.

Good luck with your decision making, there are instances where some problems do not have a fix when you need to have someone (landowners & residents) sacrifice to benefit (non-residents & out of towners).

---

**Milton Eisiminger**

**Pensacola FL**

**jimeisiminger@sio.midco.net**

**Comment:**

Was a resident of SD 1983-2017.

Would like to continue to hunt/fish in the state.

Would like to see habitat preservation emphasized rather than further marginalization of non-resident sportsmen.

---

**Chris Erickson**  
**White Bear Lake MN**  
**zcamp3@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Background... For years the SD non-resident hunting requirements have been, "...The small game lines or youth small game license is valid for two periods of five consecutive days..."

The Issue... I totally understand and accept the thought that the state of SD would like to limit out of state hunting for 10 days which I accept... Yet, for out of state residents like myself that would like to hunt SD three times or more the requirement to purchase a second license for \$130 +/- is a deterrent and in some cases will limit the number of visits that out of state residents will make to SD...

My proposal... My recommendation would be for the state of SD to continue the 10 day day limitation for out of state hunters, BUT let them choose the 10 days in which they want to hunt. It could be for 10 Saturdays, a 5, 3 and 2 day period or for an 8 day and a 2 day period... It doesn't really matter it simply is 10 for a total of 10 days....

The Cost... The current system is set up for 2 five periods, yet I have to believe that that cost of simply changing the programming of the license system would be minimal... A simple pick list from a calendar in which you select 10 days shouldn't be that hard...

The Benefit... With less of a deterrent, I believe SD will have more hunters, more \$\$ spent on gas, groceries, hotels, restaurants, etc... SD is well aware of the huge economic impact of hunting, why not try to eliminate the deterrent as a result of the 2 five day license periods..

If this is an issue in which any of the state legislative or Commission would like to take up, I think it would be greatly beneficial... Additionally, I believe the waterfowl license is for one 10 day period.... This is also certainly something worth exploring...

Thanks for bring this to the attention of the applicable commission and or legislative members...

---

**Kevin Taft**  
**Port Orchard WA**  
**k\_taft@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Hello, I have been on both sides of the Resident/ Nonresident licensing requirements in South Dakota. I grew up in SD and graduated from Custer High School in 1996, I joined the Navy that same year. I did enjoy the benefits being an Active duty service member gave me being able to acquire hunting and fishing licenses. However I retired in 2016, and lost all of those benefits. I now purchase my non resident small game licence to hunt pheasants. I would like there to be some sort of program for retired veterans, or disabled vets. I have 60% disability. Montana has a program called "Come Home to Hunt" where they give Vets that were once residents of the state resident pricing so they will come back and hunt. I would like to see SD do something similar. I would like to be able to hunt some big game. I had 4 points in the elk draw that I lost. Can SD come up with a Program for Vets that enlisted from SD and retired else where to be able to Come back and hunt for resident prices? Thank you.

---

**Justin Faris**  
**Cincinnati OH**  
**Justinfaris05@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I love that you guys are trying to invigorate the hunting community. It's so important to carry on traditions. One thing that concerns me is that I was born in South Dakota and my family has kept land in Lyman county for over 100 years. I grew up running around that land and have hunted since I can barely remember. There is nothing in place to give someone like myself a edge over a traditional non resident. Every year I am in a draw that gives me less than a 50 % chance to hunt on my own families land. I would love to see this addressed so I can share my love of hunting with my 11 yr old as he grows up, on the land that has been a part of our family for so long. Thanks for taking the time to read this.

---

**Ryan Campbell**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**rkcampbell90@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

As you gather this February to discuss how to allocate our state resources to out of state hunters, I would encourage you to think about what the goal is in regards to big game in South Dakota. With such a limited resource and your stated goal of getting more South Dakotans either into hunting or back into hunting I don't understand why we allow any out of state hunters to obtain a big game hunting license. I am old enough to remember the good old days, when we had plenty of deer and could get a tag for east river, west river and the black hills almost every year. You could buy your black hills deer at the local gas station. Now, it takes several years to get a tag to hunt deer in this state for many units. I have 3 young kids that like to hunt, but like most of us, they want the chance to hunt bucks with their dads, uncles and grand dad. There should be NO out of state big game licenses until the 4th round of drawing so South Dakotans have the chance to get tags before out of staters. Protect our hunting tradition in South Dakota!!

---

**Bryce Schoulte**  
**Presho SD**  
**Bschoulte@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I believe it's unfair to "nonresidents" like myself. I currently live out of state but I still spend a lot time on the family farm. I look forward to hunting season every year but it's very hard to get tags.

---

**Joseph Peschel**  
**Phillips NE**  
**jwp@hamilton.net**

**Comment:**

Why aren't nonresident landowners allowed landowner deer tags----they still feed the deer on their land and pay S.D. property taxes.

---

**Brandon Jadwin**  
**Rochester MN**

**Comment:**

Why are you making it more difficult for NR to hunt your great state?

---

**James Delker**  
**Soldotna AK**  
**jddelker@aol.com**

**Comment:**

I was born and raised in South Dakota and graduated from SDSU and spent the majority of the first 30 years of my life as a resident of the state during which time I enjoyed a plethora of hunting and fishing opportunities in this great state. My career path pulled me out of state and I have been in Alaska for the past 15 years. I have tried to return almost yearly to hunt with my family and friends and have not complained once about the fees to access game. I expect to pay more for same opportunity afforded to the residents of the state. That being said I have been frustrated with the NR license opportunities being so restrictive. In particular the NR waterfowl license is a crap shoot at best. The northern flight is unpredictable and scheduling a trip home to "time the flight" is nearly impossible. It seems like more birds are holding longer to the north in Canada and North Dakota and the blowing through SD more quickly than the past. Having only 10 days (not divided) to attempt to hunt is stupid and truly limits potential access for non-residents to hunt throughout the season.

More of concern to me is the lack of access to Deer tags. I truly feel residents should be given preference over NR hunters, but not to the exclusion of NR hunters entirely. Despite having relatives with acres of private land, I have not even had the opportunity to draw a buck tag East River in over 15 years. Personally I think this is ludicrous. As much as I appreciate eating good doe meat, I cannot believe I will essentially never have access to another SD buck license as long as I live here in Alaska.

I am part owner of a residence in in our hometown SD that my family owns (some residents/some non-residents) We use the basecamp "lodge" where we congregate various times each fall. We had hoped to invest in crop ground nearby to keep our family hunting traditions intact for all our family, living both near and far. We had recently made and offer to purchase a large section of land and we were looking at ground that was a combination of crop ground and wildlife habitat. In the end the deal fell apart as it made little sense to invest in land in SD. I elected to invest that money in a property in another state where hunting restrictions did not preclude me from hunting on my own property. How dumb is it that I can own land, manage it for abundant wildlife, and yet not be able hunt that same land for well populated species of game?-- just because my residency lies elsewhere?? Your regulations are discouraging investment in SD and forcing NR hunters to look elsewhere for their opportunities.

As much as I would like to return home to hunt next fall, I am planning my deer hunt somewhere other than SD.

I am exploring an opportunity to hunt on private ground in Colorado where NR hunters have a good chance to draw all types of deer tags despite their residency. As you push former residents away from their heritage and family hunting opportunities, consider all of the lost income for SD businesses that you have sent to other states that do provide NR's with hunting opportunities.

I have heard at least one state offers a return "home to hunt" licenses, where former residents who have family still in the state can obtain licenses as if they were residents. I'm not sure how the logistics and parameters work for this program but just find sad that my "home state" is essentially precluding me from hunting opportunities-- on family ground we have hunted for generations. I understand the pressure to protect opportunities for residents, but it is BS when I have hunted alongside residents who legally shot multiple bucks in the same year with archery, east river, west river, muzzle loader tags, etc ... when I can't even get a buck tag every 3rd or 4th year??. Regardless of your intent to protect opportunities for residents your lack of empathy and concern for NR hunters is saddening...at least to this former resident.

Jim Delker DVM

---

**David Fraim**  
**Davison MI**  
**dfraim70@charter.net**

**Comment:**

As a long time out of state hunter, I believe it should be easier for out of state hunters, not harder. I believe property owners should have licenses to issue to their hunters compared to how much property they own. It costs them alot of money if out of state hunters are unsuccessful in the draw.

---

## Spring Turkey Hunting Seasons

---

**Ronald Stephenson**  
**Oklahoma OK**  
**Ron@gsaokc.com**

**Comment:**

Several of our annual Pheasant party have dropped out of going because they no longer are able to pursue A Turkey on the opening for the last 4 years.

---

**Bret Brown**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**bbrown68@me.com**

**Comment:**

It is nice that u are considering changing this law as it would still be hard to get away with poaching if the beard and feet were required to accompany the carcass.

I would however like to caution the eagerness to keep introducing populations into areas that don't have them. Turkey are very territorial and will drive Pheasants out of areas that they take over.

Don't believe me? Ask residents in Michigan that watched a flourishing population of pheasants disappear as the turkey population exploded to the point that they are out of control and the pheasants are gone. I saw it first hand as I moved there for awhile for work in the 2002-2011 time frame. If you would like to see an example of it locally, just drive out to the Sioux Falls water treatment area on Sycamore St. I've counted nearly 100 birds in that area at the same time during the spring. Coincidentally, I rarely see pheasants in that area anymore.

Like I said earlier.....just a cautionary tale that I have experienced and am experiencing again, and as a hunter I would much rather have the pheasants than the turkeys in my pheasant areas.

Thanks again,  
Bret Brown

---

## Turkey Transportation Requirements

---

**Steve Griffith**  
**Brandon SD**  
**Pringrif@alliancecom.net**

**Comment:**

the proposed changes for the transportation of turkeys for hunters is much needed and overdue! I am in favor of making these proposed changes.

---

**Lawrence Webinger**  
**Lacrescent MN**  
**webinger@acegroup.cc**

**Comment:**

Yes finally a good idea long in the making. Making it easier for non residents to transport their bird home .

---

**Gary Gilbertson**  
**Saint Peter MN**  
**oakleaf@hickorytech.net**

**Comment:**

Just trying to have a dialog about crossbow hunting during the archery season for seniors. A number of states are now allowing the crossbow for the archery season for seniors who have difficulty pulling back a bow. Thanks for your consideration.

---

**Jams Wipperfurth**  
**Sauk City WI**  
**jwipp4@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I come from Wisconsin to hunt turkeys. The proposed rule change would make it much easier to transport turkeys back home and allow me to conform to the law.

---

**Martin Wiernusz**  
**Ossian IA**  
**DOCMARTY@ACEGROUP.CC**

**Comment:**

Very logical. As a hunter from Iowa this really helps us out. Thanks.

---

**Richard Nelson**  
**Apple Valley MN**  
**rcnelson@arthurchapman.com**

**Comment:**

As an out-of-state hunter, this would be a very welcome change. It is hard transporting the entire bird when getting home.

---

**George Wilkes**  
**Grand Marais MN**  
**gwilkes@boreal.org**

**Comment:**

This would be a huge improvement ! It is very difficult on a long hunting trip to keep the meat fresh while keeping the foot and beard attached. So much better to allow separation of those parts, and I can't see a lot of violations occurring because of this change.

---

**Donald Wojciechowski**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**don.woj@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

ALSO, please consider adding a fall archery only turkey season beginning around mid Sept or 01-Oct. It is unfair to archery hunters they must hunt fall turkey only during gun deer seasons.

---

**Donna Bares**  
**Sturgis SD**  
**jbares@rushmore.com**

**Comment:**

I support this change as I would prefer to be able to bone out the parts we keep and place on ice as soon as possible after the kill rather than having to wait until getting to a domicile as I usually have other family hunting and it is 60 miles to my domicile

---

**Donald Holznagel**  
**Mora MN**  
**Mrdsbp@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I always skin my wild turkeys and to be able to debone my bird and freeze it in individual quart bags along with the beard and spurs would be a great improvement as far as maintaining the palatability of the meat

---

**Levi Muhl**  
**Hastings MN**

**Comment:**

Hunting turkeys in SD is a yearly tradition. However traveling over 10 hours and harvesting a Turkey early in the trip can be quite difficult to cool and preserve the Turkey through our trip and the way home. I support the current proposal as this will help with our travel logistics.

---

**Robert Winter**

**Yankton SD**

**bcwinter@vyn.midco.net**

**Comment:**

This is an excellent proposal. Not only for those traveling a distance, but also for when a turkey is taken in hot weather.

---

**John Dunn**

**Eau Claire WI**

**dunnjc@charter.net**

**Comment:**

Last spring I shot a beautiful Merriams on the 2nd day of a 7 day hunt. We were tent camping and had no easy way of keeping the carcass cold. Luckily, the weather was cold enough to keep the whole turkey from spoiling. It would have been much easier to cut up the turkey and keep the required parts in a cooler.

---

**Janet Schultz**

**Minnetrista MN**

**janetcschultz@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

support

---

**Edward McGee**

**Keystone SD**

**mcgeehfactor@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

support

---

**Mike Kervin**

**Brookings SD**

**Cmkervin@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Great idea and makes a lot of sense. Also, thank you for your part of stopping rifle hunting of turkeys. The sport is so much safer without long shots .

---

**Marv Rooney**  
**Stillwater MN**  
**ml\_rooney@msn.com**

**Comment:**

New reg proposal makes sense. Also strongly favor requirement to have a phone in registration procedure

---

**Craig Sinclair**  
**Waconia MN**  
**craig1outdoors@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Thank You!

---

**Lawrence Webinger**  
**Lacrescent MN**  
**webinger@acegroup.cc**

**Comment:**

Very good idea should not be an enforcement problem.

# Public Comments

## Deer License Allocation

---

**Robert Eddy**  
**Rapid City SD**

**Comment:**

I would like to begin by thanking you for challenging this topic and encourage you to make the best decision that benefits a majority of the states sportsmen and women.

I would encourage you to oppose this current compromise allowing hunter to apply for 2, first-round licenses. In reality, a hunter is allowed an additional Archery licence totaling 3 possible antlered deer licenses just during the first-round. The proposed compromise has complicated the system with too many variables. Help make this an equitable opportunity for everyone to obtain a licence before allowing a single hunter to obtain multiple firearm licenses.

Please support a 1 licence, first-draw for future deer hunting opportunities. Despite the very vocal opposition from a minority of opponents, many wish to have a simplistic application that provides everyone a chance at a tag first. There will be leftover opportunities for those wishing to extend their own season.

---

**Robert Eddy**  
**Rapid City SD**

**Comment:**

I would like to begin by thanking you for challenging this topic and encourage you to make the best decision that benefits a majority of the states sportsmen and women.

I would encourage you to oppose this current compromise allowing hunter to apply for 2, first-round licenses. In reality, a hunter is allowed an additional Archery license totaling 3 possible antlered deer licenses just during the first-round. The proposed compromise has complicated the system with too many variables. Help make this an equitable opportunity for everyone to obtain a license before allowing a single hunter to obtain multiple firearm licenses.

Please support a 1 license, first-draw for future deer hunting opportunities. Despite the very vocal opposition from a minority of opponents, many wish to have a simplistic application that provides everyone a chance at a tag first. There will be leftover opportunities for those wishing to extend their own season.

Thank you!

---

**Terry Spaans**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**terry.spaans@sdsmt.edu**

**Comment:**

SD Game Fish & Parks give out way to many out of state hunters for Deer License and there needs to be a better way of handling this. Your lottery system has to be set up better. No reason why a 12 to 14 year old can get better tags when I did have three years preference until this year. I also have a problem with your lottery system with ELK. 12 to 14 year old can get first draw and I have 20 years preference and can't get one. Its messed up.

---

**Daniel Kuyper**  
**Madison SD**  
**dan.kuyper@kibbleeq.com**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Gary Gruber**  
**Custer SD**  
**clawantlerhide@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I thought this proposal was suppose to give more hunters, especially the young kids a better chance to get a tag.

But when you give us two chance that just cut our chance in half. I don't think you accomplished anything. One year I might get no tags and the next year I get two tags.

I think you guys caved to the game hogs.

And another thing while you have my dander up, why do you keep moving the east river season later and later? Don't you know global warming is over. The east river season keeps getting colder every year. I can't even get the wife to sit with me anymore because its been so cold. And if you don't want the next generation to become just road hunters with there heaters on then you better think twice about this late season. I hunt public land and sit out in the elements. I don't have one of those fancy tree house stand with heaters and windows. Start it a week earlier instead of later when you have a possibility of some warmer weather.

Its usually warmer out west then back east. Swap with them.

I found my first fresh deer shed when I was a kid on December 2, harvesting antlerless bucks doesn't help manage deer either.

Signed,

Gary Gruber Custer SD.

---

**Michael Wenande**  
**Mitchell SD**  
**mwenande@andersencorp.com**

**Comment:**

As a family, we always apply for East & West River deer. We have close friends that we hunt with on both seasons and it would be unjust to have to pick one over the other. Everyone should have the option of applying for first draw on both of these seasons. However, I do not agree with allowing a hunter to apply for another license within a unit (county) in which he already has a tag (whether it's the 4th or 5th round draw).

---

**Kevin Hayes**  
**Rapid City SD**

**Comment:**

Why would put muzzle deer hunting in that category. It is completely. Diff type of hunting. Also how are u going to do preference morris I already have for your preferences still can't get a muzzleloader

---

**Shannon Bruggeman**

**Tea SD**

**shannonbruggeman@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

What a complete waste of time. The people spoke and were clear about wanting this change, but the loudest voices in the room are all that mattered. This current proposal isn't really a change, huge amount of money wasted, and proves to me my time commenting on these issues is a waste. SDGFP is gonna do whatever the commission decides, not what people want. Except of course the vocal minority.

---

**Rich Heiman**

**Canistota SD**

**chard@goldenwest.net**

**Comment:**

This Proposal is better than the other with only one in the 1st draw, but I would like to see some additional options. Why not let us purchase preference points for the other four seasons in 1st draw. The reasoning would be to improve our odds when a person would like to alternate there primary two selections from year to year or if successful the prior year and preference points start over. I think this would still give everyone a better chance as in the past, as a person would be limited to only two 1st draws in a given year but would not completely remove some of those family traditions of hunting. I know some will forgo applying all together in one or more of the seasons with your current proposal. Maybe give first time applicant preference if you want to give others opportunity and to draw their attention to hunting. Maybe these have all been discussed but thought I would share my thoughts.

---

**Cory Lacina**

**Elk Point SD**

**Comment:**

THIS IS A MUCH BETTER IDEA THAN YOUR FIRST PROPOSAL. IT WILL ENCOURAGE PEOPLE TO FOCUS ON WHICH SEASONS THEY REALLY WANT TO HUNT, WHILE STILL ALLOWING THEM TO HUNT DIFFERENT AREAS IN THE STATE.

---

**James Cantalope**

**Eureka SD**

**cantajam@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Final, it's my final comment, what I'm getting is the people I ask think that this new change is going to guarantee them a tag in the unit they hunt, so you better let everyone know this draw is no different now then in the past, its still the same process, actually less chances to get deer tags!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

---

**Torrey Quella**  
**Zimmerman MN**  
**torrey.quella@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I have been hunting the East River deer area (specifically Campbell County) for a number of years. There has NEVER been any out of state Buck tags available for non-residents. But in years past you have many leftover tags for 2 antlerless deer. It looks like you are trying to actively cull the deer population. Why not open the antlered tags a little for non-residents as well.

---

**Jack Dokken**  
**Pierre SD**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Kelly Eilers**  
**Canton SD**  
**kjeilers89@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Please please leave this alone. There is nothing wrong with what we have. Dont try ro fix something that is not broken.

---

**Bill Hadsell**  
**Brookings SD**  
**bill.hadsell@daktronics.com**

**Comment:**

Feels like you have it right now. Great work listening to us.

---

**Ray Konz**  
**Brandon SD**  
**ray@adrianstatebank.com**

**Comment:**

is it possible to make it a little more confusing????

i just hope you are not opening the door for more commercial (pay to hunt) deer hunting.

---

**Brett Lebrun**  
**Brookings SD**

**Comment:**

There is nothing wrong with the current draw system. If people are upset because they can't draw a buck tag in a specific county every year they need to step outside their comfort zone and hunt other places. Don't ruin the opportunity for us who are willing to put in the homework and draw tags in places we may have to travel to. This system is going to help anyone who is wanting to draw a high demand tag every year. Leave it the way it is

---

**Lance Rom**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**lrom@qualityservices.us.com**

**Comment:**

This system gets more convoluted all the time because you are trying to please everyone.

- 1 - Residents should have absolute preference over non-residents.
- 2 - A person should be able to submit only one application the first draw.
- 3 - Second draw one application if they didn't get license the first draw.
- 4 - After that apply for as many licenses as wanted.

Make it simpler -not more complex!!!!

---

**James Gonsor**  
**Webster SD**  
**Jagonsor70@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

It is perfectly fine as is, i would also like to see the elimination of purchasing preference points. Earn them, stop catering to money and nonresidents!

---

**Joe Casavan**  
**Watertown SD**  
**joecasavan@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I am opposed to this, or any change to the current deer season drawing process.

---

**Doug Nelson**  
**Chamberlain SD**  
**dn1stop@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

why is custer state park deer tags included and do the preference point just go way? Or due we get our money back??? Is this what will happen to the elk tags next? Forcing more hunters for big game to go to other western states!!!! Go back to the old

---

**Dave Redlin**  
**Watertown SD**  
**dave@dpc.us.com**

**Comment:**

Can the new drawing procedure be any more confusing? Who is the person that came up with this idea? This is way more difficult than it needs to be. If it's not broken...then don't fix it!!

---

**Eric Reisenweber**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**ereiser13@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I am in complete agreement with the current deer license proposal. It still leaves plenty of options for everyone that wants to hunt deer, plus it adds opportunities for more hunters afield.

I strongly encourage the nonresident license allocation to remain at 8%, and I would really like to see the nonresident archery tags follow that same 8% margin. I am not opposed at all to inviting nonresident hunters into our state, and I do encourage it. However, we will lose more and more access as residents, the more nonresident hunters we license to hunt.

---

**Darcy Kuyper**  
**Platte SD**  
**darcykuyper@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

This sounds like a great plan !

---

**Blake Jensen**  
**De Smet SD**  
**blake@dakotalandcommunityinsurance.com**

**Comment:**

What is the likelihood of an average Eastern SD Unit or Season not being completely filled within the first draw?

---

**Bruce Eldridge**  
**Chamberlain SD**  
**bseldrid@midstatesd.net**

**Comment:**

I think there is nothing wrong with the way we have done it in the past and have not heard anything to make me believe that we need to change anything

---

**Tom Hoffman**  
**Hot Springs SD**  
**tomandeva@goldenwest.net**

**Comment:**

I have been very negative about this entire issue ever since the citizen planning process started. It did bring out some important issues but it then appeared the Commission went their own way. This latest proposal established more common ground and should satisfy more of the hunting public. Thanks to the Commission for listening to us and making the right decision.

---

**Jason Haskell**  
**Aberdeen SD**  
**j.kr@nrctv.com**

**Comment:**

Muzzleloader, as it is restricted in SD, should not be thrown in with all the other rifle seasons. It is a primitive weapon and by restricting use to open sights and basically one shot it should have its own draw. It also should be easier to draw than once every 5-7 years. I also feel it should be given a window prior to rifle season but after archery and then run congruent with and slightly beyond the rifle season. Rifle season should be shortened and/or delayed. I'd be curious to see what the percentage of deer taken on that first weekend of rifle season are. Deer are still rut-crazed and have seen little pressure. Adding a muzzleloader prior to rifle puts a little pressure on the deer allowing Muzzleloader hunters a chance to get out and closer on deer that are less pressured and give the deer a bit of a "heads-up" to the impending rifle season. I think that this would also improve quality of the deer in SD. There needs to be a priority to those hunters who are willing to work harder for their hunt through the use of primitive weapons. Thanks for listening to my thoughts.

---

**Clinton Sieben**  
**Scotland SD**  
**Clintonsieben@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I still like the way it is today but I would support this draft it is better than the first. I don't feel you are going to get more hunters in the field you are just going to limit the amount of tags people get that like to hunt already

---

**Kenny Robbins**

**Spearfish SD**

**Machman\_76@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Seems confusing, why don't you just leave it alone!! The system isn't broken. Every South Dakotan has the same opportunities.

---

**Ronnie Jaenisch**

**Ashby MN**

**Rjjaenis@prtcl.com**

**Comment:**

Why change? The way it's set up now works. What you are trying to do is so confusing for a nonresident do I apply third drawing or fifth. Just leave it alone.

---

**Thomas Riddle**

**Mitchell SD**

**Riddleandsons@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

gain please leave license system as it was in previous years, old saying is if it ain't broke don't try to fix. It's not broke. Disappointed this commission does not hear the masses

---

**Lindsey Anderson**

**Hot Springs SD**

**yourcar@gwtc.net**

**Comment:**

Since the Statewide Any Deer Muzzle Loader Season is so limited in the number of permits available, it should be included in the early draw along with the Special Buck Season. An applicant should be able to apply for either of these on the same application, but only one. If successful, then the applicant would be allowed to apply for only one additional license type in the following First Draw.

---

**Loren Lunning**

**Centerville SD**

**lorenlunning@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

just leave it alone. why are you even messing with it .worked this many years. just gonna make more people find a different pass time

---

**Ethan Zakrzewski**

**Brandon SD**

**Ethanzakrzewski@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

This will be a Great way to get more new hunters in the field and Is a great idea. Let's get caught up with the rest of the western states.

---

**Lennard Hopper**

**Spearfish SD**

**Comment:**

This has really been a three ring circus act. I don't mean to sound cynical but the proposals have changed so many times now, I have lost track. I took part in a focus group last spring, and GFP was taking a very calm and collected approach to revamping our drawing system, but now it seems like last minute desperation to get something passed. I feel like it would be better to go back to the drawing board instead of forcing something through this year. I also think we need to take a more critical look at who any proposed change actually benefits. I don't think any system that requires the average hunter to follow through 5 drawings is serving the resident public well. It might leave a lot more tags open for non residents, but I thought our game resources were managed for the benefit of residents first. Just my two cents.

---

**Robert Deutz**

**Marshall MN**

**Comment:**

Non resident land owners are paying property tax to your state and have zero chance of a rifle tag for east river bucks until the 5th draw is ridiculous. There is not a license left after the 1st draw. Whoever is making these decisions are being extremely selfish. Why not have a chance like west river non residents have. At least it is a chance.

---

**Keith Christianson**

**Volga SD**

**walleye621@outlook.com**

**Comment:**

I do not like this proposal because I hunt locally and with allowing hunters two draws in the first round it takes away my chance to draw my preferred tag. Please consider the last proposal, it provided my a better chance for a buck tag. Those who want east and west river tags allow on buck tag and one doe tag. They then can continue the traditions they have hunting with family or friends in both side of the state,

---

**Steve Baldwin**

**Custer SD**

**sbaldwin9@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

This still doesn't adequately address the issue of some hunters getting multiple tags while most go without any. I still say it should be one deer tag per hunter and spread them out. You are listening to a few loud voices that like to harvest many deer every year and that just isn't fair.

---

**Tyler Tarbox**

**Watertown SD**

**Comment:**

Leave it alone. The SDGFP has already had so much more negative feedback on this than positive. Time to start listening to your SD residents. And quit raising SD resident licenses every year and start dramatically raising non residents. There is absolutely no reason that non residents can come to the state of SD and fish for the year with Paying such a minimal fishing license fee. This alone is absolutely ridiculous. SDGFP needs to concentrate more on the sportman and women of this state and quit worrying more about non resident. This should be one of the easiest fixes to get accomplished and raise more money for the outdoors of SD

---

**David Duffy**

**Oldham SD**

**dkduffy1980@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I was originally NOT if favor of any changes in the deer licensing system. I do think that this newest proposal is a VERY GOOD compromise for every one involved!! Thanks to the commissioners and Kevin Robling for working together to come up with this compromise. It was nice to see that we could come together on a plan that everyone should support. Thanks, David Duffy Oldham, SD

---

**Rich Fiedler**

**Selby SD**

**rfiedler@venturecomm.net**

**Comment:**

It seems like our local residents (which do not qualify for landowner preference) are having difficulty drawing tags for our own county because there is so much non local competition from other SD residents. It never use to be like this. Why couldn't there be a county resident level of preference added to the system. Most of our local residents only apply for one tag per year and it's for our county since that's where they have always hunted. It's a shame that they can't draw a tag, but someone who has never even been here before can get draw one?

---

**Scott Kuck**  
**Aberdeen SD**  
**kucklaw@nvc.net**

**Comment:**

Dear G, F & P: The fact that you have to send out this "Understanding" once again reinforces the following facts: 1. This proposal is a "fix" for a system that was never broken; 2. The hunters in this state have overwhelmingly voiced their opposition to a change in the deer license draw system; and 3. You have failed miserably in listening to the very people who buy the licenses that pay for your salaries. Wrapping this latest proposal in the blanket of helping the youth hunters is also shameful. I fully support the addition of the youth draw benefits that have been proposed, but believe that it was added for the sole purpose of trying to gain support for this proposed change to the draw system. You could have added the youth proposals years ago. It certainly would have helped my two teenage daughters draw a tag.

Please make sure that this e-mail is included in the public comments section for the next commission meeting. I have previously and continue to oppose any change to the deer license draw system that has served the hunting public of this great state very well for several decades. Once again, stop trying to fix something that is not broken.

---

**Frank Williamson**  
**West Linn OR**

**Comment:**

I've enjoyed hunting South Dakota for almost 40 years and would like the opportunity to rifle hunt my own property in Eastern South Dakota. Why can't there be allowances for South Dakota land owners that are non-residents.

---

**Steve Eide**  
**Mount Vernon SD**  
**sd57328@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Don't fix it if it isn't broke.

Leave it alone already.

---

**Jeff Jundt**  
**Lake Orion MI**  
**cobramach1@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I'm going to repeat my original reply, but this is so disappointing to me that this is going through like it is because you've effectively made it so that I can no longer hunt in South Dakota on my several generation family farm that I own.

I am not even sure where to start with this letter in regards to the upcoming changes proposed for deer in South Dakota. I grew up on a small farm/ranch in northeastern South Dakota and up until this year, my mother was still living on the farm. She was diagnosed with terminal cancer a couple months ago. In fact, this is the first year that I have not hunted on our family farm because I am caring for my mother in Michigan where I live. I have not lived in or been a resident of South Dakota since 1998 and have been hunting on our family farm as a non-resident all the years since. With the changes that are being proposed, there is essentially no chance that I will ever get another rifle deer tag for my county ever again in my lifetime if I have to wait until the fifth draw! Having to wait until the third draw like I do now has been hit or miss the past few years due to fluctuations with the deer population and numbers of tags as it is.

I guess what I don't understand is how South Dakota is so well known for inviting out of state hunters in to bring money to the economy, yet they don't offer the same to other hunters. I guess that is only if it is pheasant hunting. All other hunting, a non-resident is no longer treated the same way and those of us who grew up on a generational farm but happen to live out of state are punished and cannot even hunt on our own land for deer with a rifle. That is kind of a shame that former residents and landowners, in my instance, are treated this way.

I like how South Dakota manages their deer because they manage it by the county unit which is much better than how deer are managed here in Michigan where I can buy my licenses and hunt anywhere in the state. That never made any sense to me because it puts a lot of pressure on certain areas and not enough on others. This was the first year that I hunted in Michigan since I moved here 11 years ago and it is only because I was unable to hunt in SD this year except for pheasants. Looking over the proposal, it is kind of outrageous that a single person can obtain up to 9 deer licenses!? Nobody is eating that much deer in a given year no matter the size of your family. Therefore, they must have to give most of it away. These extra deer could go to non-residents in the third drawing as it has been so it continues to bring us in to hunt and spend money in the local economies, which I do every year.

Which brings me to another point. If you are going to go with this type of system that is fine, but at least allow a landowner to purchase tags to hunt on their own land. When my dad was still able to hunt with me, we hunted throughout our county but once his health deteriorated before he passed away I stuck to just hunting on the family farm and never left it and had always been able to get my deer there. I implore you that if you do make the proposed changes to add in a provision to allow landowners like myself who live out of state to be able to hunt on our family land. I would be perfectly ok with that, as I do not feel the need to hunt in the rest of the county. I was planning to build a new deer stand to put on my property, but in light of this, I likely will switch to elk hunting out west or down south from here on out. I will be giving another state and their local economy my money, which is a shame since I love South Dakota so much and own land, which I could hunt on for my deer each year. It is a tradition for me and this proposal is effectively killing that tradition. It puts such a sour taste in my mouth that I'm unsure if I want to continue coming out each year for pheasant hunting. I made two trips each year to SD to hunt, one for pheasant and one for deer, in fact this past year I made a third trip out for Black Hills turkey and was thinking about coming out again next spring to try my luck but again, with all of this coming down the pike, I've canceled my spring turkey hunt as I don't want to continue giving the SD GF&P my money any longer since they no longer care about all hunters.

I get why there might be some pushback to offering landowners a tag is that the residents then "feel" like deer are being taken away from them and they're worried that people are going to come in and buy land for hunting. The little bit of that land that may be purchased for those reasons is miniscule and the people complaining about landowners are ones that are never going to own any land anyway in the state so it makes more sense to make additional money off of a non-resident landowner. I don't have a problem paying the higher cost. I just want to be able to hunt on my personal land.

Please reconsider this proposal or at the very least allow family landowners such as myself the opportunity to hunt on our own land.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jeff Jundt

---

**Monique Newcomb**

**Rapid City SD**

**mozy444@aol.com**

**Comment:**

The current draw system works fine. Leave it alone. This proposed system simply limits the number of applications one can submit, thus diminishing the chance of getting even one tag per year. I do not want the proposed system. I have talked to at least 20 friends who all do not want the proposed system. If someone is having a difficult time drawing a tag using our current system, it is because the number of tags available continue to decrease.

---

**Shane Voss**

**Hurley SD**

**shane.voss@k12.sd.us**

**Comment:**

We went through this with the first proposal. The sportsman do not want our system changed. There is nothing wrong with the current system.

---

**David Hankins**

**Lafayette IN**

**dhankins@purdue.edu**

**Comment:**

Ive hunted SD deer for 45 years, both as a resident (military) and now a non-resident. Where is the improvement in this change? Very confusing! And if you want to increase the number of deer hunters in SD, then hunters that don't have tags should draw before a hunter can draw a 2nd tag....let alone letting them have 11 tags! thank you,  
Dave

---

**Paul Niederbaumer**

**Faulkton SD**

**paulniederbaumer@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

You are limiting our rights to apply for as many tags as we want with an equal chance at getting drawn for a license.

---

**Clarence Wohlwend**

**Spearfish SD**

**grizzlynut@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I served on a so-called focus group in Belle Fourche . The results of the focus groups are being discarded by the useless politicians who have control over any policy changes. I will never again participate in what has become a public participation joke!

---

**Lee Kinney**

**Onida SD**

**kinneyl@icloud.com**

**Comment:**

This is a lot better then the first draft.

---

**Chris Duklet**

**Watertown SD**

**Comment:**

I'd make one change to this and have non-residents draw for a limited amount of archery tags. During elk season in the Black Hills I ran into more non-residents archery deer hunts wearing orange stomping all over the Hills than I did other elk hunters. Reports out of Harding County were equally poor as all South Dakota hunters saw were non-resident hunters in what is traditionally nice quiet places to hunt deer. If your goal is to increase the number of resident deer hunters who get a tag, decrease the number of non-residents who can buy an unlimited amount of deer tags.

I'd also change the archery season back to a later start date. The deer and the elk this fall were pressured way too much in the Black Hills. It made elk hunting, which I thought was the premier big game hunt in South Dakota, a poor quality hunt.

---

**Clark Baker**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**clarkbaker27@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

This proves what a mess you guys have made. When you send this alledged explanation out. This is even more confusing. Leave the old way alone!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

---

**Joel Farnham**  
**White Rock NM**  
**jefarnham@comcast.net**

**Comment:**

Why do you need 5 draws? Why not simplify the draw process down to 2 or 3?

---

**Nick Gerjets**  
**Brookings SD**  
**ngerjets@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I feel that it would make the most sense to do away with archery season tags. If you draw a tag for any portion of a block (east west so on) hunt that whole block with a bow. Get a deer great your done hunting for the year. Or if rifle season comes and you have not filled, hunt your specific unit with a rifle. Continue on to black powder the same way. I have to think this allows you to give more tags as a whole, at the same time gaining more control over harvest numbers. The last I knew bow tags were still unlimited over the counter. If so my suggestion would let the other season hunters have a chance at a tag at the same time if there were left over tags a bow hunter could buy more after a second drawing.

---

**Garlan Bigge**  
**Huron SD**  
**gbigge@hur.midco.net**

**Comment:**

Leave it like it always has been.

---

**Dennis Engel**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**marcia.denny@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

what a hassle this would be, leave the current draw in place, but add free preference for the youth. this will not help you get your preferred license when most will still apply for their preferred choice. and who wants to buy preference points for third or fourth choices

---

**Beth Dokken**  
**Pierre SD**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Maddox Dokken**

**Pierre SD**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Bradley Olson**

**Dell Rapids SD**

**olsonranchs@outlook.com**

**Comment:**

Born and raised here been hunting 52 years. This was such a waste of time and money to force a change on us we didn't want. I guess you can go party now you forced it through. Thanks for hampering my final years of hunting South Dakota. Now how about doing something that is needed like predator control.

---

**Doug Van Bockern**

**Renner SD**

**davanbo@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I don't want eleven licenses. The postage alone would be cost prohibitive. Just leave it the way it was. By the time you are done drawing it will be time to put in for next season.

Whatever you were trying to fix, you missed the mark.

Maximum of 7 people are happy with your changes, the rest of us are made to feel dirty about wanting to hunt

---

**Jim Detoy**

**Rapid City SD**

**jsdetoy@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

It is getting more and more complicated to hunt in SD.

---

**Scott Bader**

**Aberdeen SD**

**Bades@abe.midco.net**

**Comment:**

It seems that every time GF&P is trying to make changes to their sub-sections, they are always TAKING AWAY more rights from residents that live in this State. We live here, work here, play here, let our kids see this great State for the natural resources that we have and every year, proposed changes are not beneficial to anyone except tourism. Let tourism stay out of our Sportsman revenue and make decisions to benefit us for once.

---

---

**Gary Major**

**Lithia Springs GA**

**gary.major55@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

It doesn't appear you allow non residents to get an East River deer license. I don't mind waiting until the 3d draw and only getting a doe tag but I like to come home to SD and hunt on our own farm.

---

**Ron Hulzebos**

**Harrisburg SD**

**ron2ponds@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I agree with changes being made to the deer draw structure with the exception of having the Custer deer application included in the first 2 choices. With a draw chance at less than 1%, this license should not be included in the 2 license restriction on the first draw. Thanks for anything you do to make this once in a lifetime type tag a possibility in the future.

---

**Andrew McDonald**

**Pierre SD**

**amcd627e@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I oppose this proposal very heavily. If you, the gfp are trying to drive hunters out of this state you are succeeding. Many of my friends and family have expressed concerns about the proposal and how it will end family traditions of hunting together due to being limited on the number of applications that can be applied for. For myself the decision is easy. If the proposal goes through im going out of state and will no longer support or hunt in this state.

---

**Clayton Larson**

**Selby SD**

**cmlarson@venturecomm.net**

**Comment:**

Leave the seasons the way they have been for years. It was shot down once and something else just comes back again and again. Listen to your resident hunter and not the out of staters. I get tired of hearing how much money they bring in. I live here I don't buy gas, beer and shells for one weekend, I do it year around !!!!! Cator to the resident.

---

**Ronald Funk**

**Tucson AZ**

**rrfunkaz@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Why in the world would you allow residents to have 11 licenses and so severely restrict nonresident tags? Where do tags gain SD the most dollars anyway?? I've purchased nonresident tags for many years and really do not feel that there is proper distribution of opportunities to hunt for nonresident big game of upland birds.

---

**Mike Kluth**

**Mount Vernon SD**

**mike\_kluth08@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I would like to know how much money has been wasted on this going back and forth back and forth and having all these meeting where people were invited to attend. I have not seen one good proposal. Quit changing things that arent broke and put the money into in the lakes that need to be cleaned out and stocked with fish and spray for thistles on walk in areas if you want to do something other then wasting thousands of dollars an getting nowhere.

---

**David Del Soldato**

**Rapid City SD**

**sheyanne97@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

you should just leave it alone or do what you first offered with only one choice on first draw

---

**Vern Falconer**

**Arlington SD**

**Comment:**

Why don't we make it as complicated as we can !?

---

**Bob Koscak**

**Rapid City SD**

**bobbyk@rap.midco.net**

**Comment:**

I hope this makes sense to you, because I don't think you could have done it in a more complicated way.

---

---

**William Phillips**

**Sturgis SD**

**billp@rushmore.com**

**Comment:**

I am life-long resident of Meade County SD and an avid Hunter/Sportsman along with a wife and two children who also hunt both west-river and Black Hills units. I am also an outfitter in Meade County and have been for 15+years. We control approximately 15,000 acres of private land in Meade County. We take approximately 8-12 non-resident hunters every year, we also have at least that many residents and kids that hunt every year. My frustration is when I see 200-300 left over any-deer tags in Meade County 49A every year, and every year half of our out of state hunters can't even get one tag! Then I watch the same residents end up with 2-3 tags in addition to tags in other counties! Or I see the countless residents driving up and down the road with no place to hunt, when I ask why did you get a tag in this unit then? "because I saw all the leftovers" or "I didn't draw a hills tag" on and on and then we have to deal with people poaching and trespassing non-stop. I felt the system the GF&P almost went to that had a first choice and then out until everyone had a first choice would be a much better system. Yes residents would not get 5 tags! But they would most likely get to hunt the place most important to them, or have a better chance at Hills tag if that's the only place they have to go. To me, offering three rounds of drawings for residents before Non-residents get an option is ridiculous! Most don't have a place to hunt and the tags are getting wasted! At least most non-residents that are putting in for the tag are planning a trip, staying in hotels, and spending money in our local economy and HAVE A PLACE TO HUNT if they could just get a tag. I'm not saying I feel they should have the same options as resident's, but 8% of the original until the 5th round does not make sense. Thanks for listening,  
respectfully,  
Bill Phillips

---

**Don Hantzsche**

**Summerset SD**

**tlwdah@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I know I am beating a dead horse but I am still opposed to including muzzleloader season with the rifle seasons. I have heard the main reasons for includ it is to reduce the number of applicant's for the muzzleloader any tag. To prevent it from becoming a once in a lifetime tag. If that is the case I understand the need for action. But would need to see the data supporting such a move. What is the hunter actual success rate in filling this tag. Would that support more muzzleloader tags? Bottom line I just don't think it belongs in a draw with rifle seasons.

---

**Russell Simonsen**

**Yankton SD**

**simonsenrl@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I believe this is a fair lottery system

---

**Guy Bennett**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**guy.bennett@rcgov.org**

**Comment:**

This helps with the 3 Rs of hunter recruitment

---

**Pat Malcomb**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**pmalcomb@sio.midco.net**

**Comment:**

leave it be

---

**Tim Schrank**  
**Pierre SD**  
**timschrank@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

If I already possess 2 preference points, what advantage is paying for any more?

---

**Dean Ritter**  
**Harrold SD**  
**Ritter8275@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

If you allow nonresident buck tags in the first draw it will lead to what we have with pheasant hunting. Paid hunting . Most South Dakotans can't afford to pay to hunt. Nonresidents don't have a problem paying \$5000 to 10,000 to hunt deer but we can't.

---

**David Jacobs**  
**Canton SD**  
**Dajacobs@iw.net**

**Comment:**

Non-residents should not be allowed to apply fir any licenses until after the third draw. It's hard enough to draw the desired license. You should be supporting in state hunters before catering to out of staters.

Quit trying to reinvent the wheel - the license system was fine until you started cutting licenses and trying to change the system.

---

**Terry Halvorson**

**Yankton SD**

**ttlhh4@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I have been deer hunting for some 35 years what it is going to do if it changes to new app process will eliminate me for deer hunting in sd most all the places I apply for their already is just one draw my odds will be worse if it changes , i myself and a lot of my friends will be forced to hunt other states because we can apply and get tags 95% of the time in other states, so in other words dont fix something that isn't broken to make a few people happy in almost all the meetings us sportsmen are against it wasnt it about 70 % against it and 30% for changing it ????

---

**Joe Arbach**

**Hoven SD**

**joe.arbachins@venturecomm.net**

**Comment:**

This proposal is very well done. Good job all involved.

---

**Lee Whitcraft**

**Webster WI**

**leew@schooltechbiz.com**

**Comment:**

I think again a non resident firearm season with an 8% allocation will continue to reduce the opportunity to draw a license. I have 5 preference points for west river. Did not get drawn last year again. I love deer hunting western SD

---

**Tim Chelgren**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**tjchelgren@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Muzzleloading season will again suffer. East river pushed into a full week in december. Late season moved to the end of the month. This leave only 1 weekend for muzzleloaders to safely set in a tree line or other cover. There is no ground blind hunting when there are high powered rifle hunters road hunting shooting at anything that moves. Why doesnt muzzleloading get moved to late oct, early nov? Why is east and west river overlap. We dont want that.

---

**Joshua Schmidt**

**Aberdeen SD**

**jjschmidt2270@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

If change has to occur, this proposal is much better than the first. This will not impact my current hunt preference over the last several years. I like the idea of being able to apply for two seasons in the first draw.

---

**Daniel Ferrell**

**Belle Fourche SD**

**57717**

**Comment:**

Only one liscence per draw on the first two draws

---

**Pat Schulte**

**Rapid City SD**

**Ggrazing@icloud.com**

**Comment:**

Muzzle loader and refuge should not be included,don't like any part of the proposal or the lowlife way you got your info,i did the original survey and you worded it so no matter how we answered you could interpret it how you wanted

---

**Daniel Langbehn**

**Huron SD**

**dan.langbehn@midco.net**

**Comment:**

support

---

**Romey Bromwich**

**Madras OR**

**pinshoot@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

As a former resident and now non resident hunter of SD. have hunted almost all 17 western states as well as my friends. EVERYONE OF US declared we would give up out points, super points and multipliers to just go back to a draw and you get it or you dont.

Its a game of mathematics that DOESN'T WORK. There are units in Oregon that I will never be able to hunt because 20 points plus multipliers means EVERYONE has 20 points plus multiples. The same for Arizona and other states. Its a slow death to a problem where hunting numbers dwindle more and more every year. I myself have over 20 points plus multiples in Arizona, I realize now by being pointed out from a PHD Mathematician with ALLLLL those points and ALLL that money spent its a mathematical impossibility to be drawn.

One member of our group had 28 points in a unit, if he was to draw he would now be nearly 70 years old..

Concider that when you go down this mathamatics trail. Eventually the public will tire of buying points and multipliers and SDGF&P conservation money will dwindle so tags fees will go up and force more to not put in, this is how we loose the North American Conservation Model.

---

**Brett Stekl**

**Letcher SD**

**brettstekl@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I'm not sure what the proposal is trying to accomplish anymore. It seems like the GFP is trying to push something through just for the sake of it. I believe the current system works fine.

---

**Duane Hinman**

**Groton SD**

**Comment:**

I am a little disappointed in the latest deer draw proposal. When the original deer draw proposal was approved I was excited to see a draw system that would increase the odds for everyone to draw one of their preferred tags.

It appeared to solve the general issue of having a select group of individuals receiving multiple any deer tags, when many people would end up with zero of there preferred tags. The original proposal clearly identified how more individuals would be able to receive a preferred tag every year. Now it seems the original plan is being scrapped based on a select few peoples complaints. It looks like we're going backwards with the newest proposal making it worse than it was before any of these proposals were initiated. From the outside looking in, I think a lot of people wasted their time for nothing. The same people will end up receiving two any deer first choices while everyone else will have to settle for the leftovers. Just my opinion from where I stand.

---

**Jonathan Schied**

**Huron SD**

**tlrook2bchamp@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I support everything in this proposal but one thing. I do not agree with people the age of 15 or younger getting free preference points. That is swaying the system to far to one side. There are those of us who have been hunting for years dealing with mostly the same rules and a little change from time to time is necessary but at an equal playing field. If they want a preference point they need to buy one and only receive the one they buy. I believe you are gunna lose faith in existing hunters with the system if you give people 15 and younger free bonus preference points. What that is saying is that they can apply for preference points and get 2 instead of one. For a guy like me who has paid his way for preference in say elk for 8 years now totaling 8 preference points a kid at the age of 11 could have 8 preference points in elk as well in half the time. That is completely unfair. I understand your concern with bringing in more youth which is great, but this isn't the way to achieve that goal.

---

**Darrell Nicholas**

**Spearfish SD**

**redhillranch@wyoaac.org**

**Comment:**

Are there landowner - rancher deer license available without drawing ? For us.

---

**Rodney Larson**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**rodneysfsd@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

The number of hunters that will benefit from the proposed changes will be so small it will hardly be worth making draw system so complex. The current system worked just fine and was very easy to understand as well as explain to a rookie. I'm almost certain somebody didn't get a first choice license and his buddy got both east and west river choices so this person who must have some influence at the state level has forced all these unnecessary changes.

---

**James Callahan**

**Madison SD**

**leesales@rapidnet.com**

**Comment:**

you are not clear about what you are doing to the youth season. Are you seriously going to throw them in the draw. If so that is a giant mistake.

---

**John Moon**

**Creighton SD**

**Jtmoon57790@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Instead of making the draw so complicated why not simplify it and offer land owner tags they can sell to other hunters? Many other states offer this strategy. It would free up your special tags and also help the landowners manage there deer herd better.

---

**Heath Siemonsma**

**Humboldt SD**

**siemonsmaelectric@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Jeff Allen**

**Piedmont SD**

**Mtclmr@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Too complicated!

---

**Miles Clark**

**Oacoma SD**

**miles\_clark@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Fred Carl**

**Rapid City SD**

**fkcarl@rap.midco.net**

**Comment:**

I supported the original proposal and still do--but not this version. In order to spread the hunting opportunity around, first draw should be one application for the primary season of choice. The only people being limited would be those that are used to hunting in multiple seasons--while it helps to get those in the field that only hunt a particular season and end up waiting for 2-3 years or more to draw that tag.

---

**Robert Wollman**  
**Yankton SD**  
**bwollman@iw.net**

**Comment:**

Your explanation I received by Email is very clear and easy to understand. I believe you made it very, very, fair for all hunters. thank you for your hard work.

---

**Dorn Severtson**  
**Cologne MN**  
**DORNJSEVERTSON@GMAIL.COM**

**Comment:**

Hi,

I own a functioning farm in Jerauld County and have since 1999. I am a non resident. I have never been able to buy a buck tag in the 19 years I have paid taxes and supported the SD economy. I realize residents should have preference, but as a land owner, I would like to have the possibility of a buck tag once every 5 to 10 years or so. Even if I have to buy preference points and be patient, please consider the investment and commitment I have made as a land owner and allow some option Est River.

Thank you for your consideration

---

**Derrick Nelson**  
**Hayti SD**  
**Mwgrind@icloud.com**

**Comment:**

I feel this is a fair way to draw for rifle tags. Thanks for your time. But there is a huge issue with nonresident bow tags. If I have my numbers right SD gave out 4000 nonresident bow tags. Yes that's a lot of income but we could do a cheap habitat stamp that every body that buys a tag or lisenche in SD has to pay to create some income. I believe ND gave out 680 nonresident bow tags last year. It's hard for residents to draw a special buck tag and when we do we go hunt on our public land that are over run by nonresident bow hunters. I spent 45 days last season out hunting and seen it first hand. Thanks for your time.

---

**Robert Brown**  
**Brainerd MN**  
**Llbrown@charter.netnon**

**Comment:**

A resident can have up to 11 tags but a non resident landowner is excluded from even applying for a east river tag. That's fair? Would like to take my grandson but he's excluded-yet he helps manage the land for deer. Is that fair? No-it's ridiculous!

---

**David Peck**

**Cherokee IA**

**delmag1942@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

The first draw looks like it is about back to the ways it was/should be. The leftover draws are still a smoke screen. Just make it all resident only as SDGFP knows that there will be none leftover from the NR pool. Letting the residents have up to 11 tags prior to letting NR have a shot at the leftovers is ridiculous. Might want to just go back to the way it was and left it alone. That being said open the ER to NR....as there is little doubt that the ER hunters are the ones that have pushed for this.

---

**Mark Knudtson**

**Deadwood SD**

**mkknudtson@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I would suggest limiting Draw 1 applications to only one instead of two, which would increase each applicant's chances of drawing their preferred license more often.

---

**William Podoll**

**Aberdeen SD**

**WKPODOLL13@GMAIL.COM**

**Comment:**

\$\$ that is all I see. Just keep changing so things get all fouled up. I read the changes 3 times, don't like them. Go back to the way it was several years ago.

---

**Alex Heilman**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**alexheilman31@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

This is worse than the first proposal that I opposed, if you want to have the opportunity including a once or twice a in a lifetime hunt like Custer state park is ridiculous. Your essentially throwing away one choice every year. If you like to apply for every tag like I do. The current system is the best system and allows for the most opportunities to residents.

---

**Al Shea**  
**Rock Springs Wl**  
**Wisheas@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I am an OOS hunter who has bow hunted in your wonderful state for many years. I appreciate the outreach you have done to keep all of your customers informed of proposals for changing the draw. However, it is never obvious to me if you are talking only about rifle hunting, or if the changes include bow hunting as well. I strongly recommend you start every update with a clear statement that the changes effect rifle hunting for deer only.

Thanks!

---

**Trever Marquardt**  
**Harrisburg SD**  
**Tgm5309@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

If it's not broke don't fix it.

---

**Brad Bond**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**Bondbassmaster@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Sign it!

---

**Mark Lottis**  
**Gold Beach OR**  
**info@5starcharters.com**

**Comment:**

would still like to see consideration for non resident land owners for tags to hunt on there land only . with so many draws before a non resident can even apply, makes almost impossible to be able to hunt on your own land. thank you

---

**Joseph Gregory**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**mickey@q.com**

**Comment:**

NO ONE PERSON SHOULD BE ALLOWED MORE THAN ONE ANTLERED DEER LICENSE PER YEAR. UNDER THIS LATEST PROPOSAL SOME COULD GET TWO ANTLERED LICENSES WHILE OTHERS SIT HOME WITH NONE. THIS IS TOTALLY UNFAIR. NO ONE, NO ONE, NO ONE PERSON SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO HAVE MORE THAN ONE ANTLERED LICENSE PER YEAR PERIOD!!!!!!!

---

**Jim McCullough**

**Osseo MN**

**jimmccullough123@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I hope that any upcoming changes will still allow a good chance for non resident hunters like myself a chance to harvest antlerless deer. Interest in antlerless deer harvest is starting to grow more accepted and if the State wants to protect bucks for the residents I am ok with that. But if few residents apply for buck tags in a selected area, then non residents should get a crack after a few drawing. From what I read- it seems that resident hunters may be able to possess up to 11 tags before non residents folks will be open to apply? If true, this seems way out of bounds and prone to unethical hunting and possibly the trading or selling of extra tags? To me- there seems to be a risk that commercial operations may benefit most from such a change or resident heavy allowcation? I cherish being able to harvest a deer late in the season and to tie it into a pheasant hunt. With a recent increase in the deer herd where I hunt (Northern Brown Co.) I sure hope commercial hunting does not start to dominate policy here. There seems to be plenty to go around and with non residents numbers going down, why start to restrict non resident numbers if the goal is herd managment and fair opportunity. There was little to no hunting pressure when I went the last weekend of the season. Perhaps if needed, limit non residents for the initial opening weekend but then open it up more 3-4 days after- if there is a current problem to deal with... Just not sure it is such a big problem currently? Is there widespread pressure to change the current system or just a smaller minority of very vocal residents? I will never hire a guide or go to a commercial ranch if that becomes the case and will look to move my deer and perhaps pheasant hunting to other states- if we start to get severely restricted! Thanks for the opportunity to express my opinion!

Jim McCullough

---

**Vernon League**

**Platte SD**

**vjleague@midstatesd.net**

**Comment:**

you do not need more one licenses in one unit

---

**Donna Bares**

**Sturgis SD**

**jbbares@rushmore.com**

**Comment:**

I find it ridiculous that anyone would want/need 11 tags especially for one season.  
I feel that no one should have more than a total of 5 tags in any one year no matter where or how they hunt

---

**Ron Freeman**

**Mitchell SD**

**ron.freeman@uj.s.state.sd.us**

**Comment:**

On the surface this seems complicated and not nearly as easy as the old system.

---

**Larry Dempsey**  
**Rapid City SD**

**Comment:**

The proposal is being made far more difficult to understand than the current process. Keeping it simple for everyone to understand is better.

---

**Tom Bielmaier**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**tom.bielmaier@rcgov.org**

**Comment:**

If I can apply for two licenses in the first draw, what was the point of changing the system? I attended the Public presentations and left thinking you would have to apply for 1 season that you really wanted. I walked in with a chip on my shoulder, I walked out liking what I heard. This is not what I heard. Perhaps I misunderstood. I realize that no decision had been made at that time, but the presenter was selling us on a plan that was not this one.

---

**Kelly Mcphillips**  
**Yankton SD**  
**kellymcphillips@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

this new alternative should make the new process palatable to most. unfortunately, the only thing that will cure the mathematical ailings of our big game drawing system is to eliminate the preference system.

---

**Gregg Yonkovich**  
**Aberdeen SD**  
**gjyonkovich1@mmm.com**

**Comment:**

Can applicants purchase preference points for more than two seasons during the first draw? Example: don't want a deer tag this year, but want to improve odds for drawing tag in future years.

---

**Ryley Thill**  
**Johnstown CO**  
**ryley\_thill@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Seems as though you guys finally listened on a somewhat realistic proposal, so thank you. I was wondering if you have ever considered any type of program for prior residents? Maybe either a discounted rate or better yet, a different draw class for prior residents who are now non residents? I was thinking if you were a 20 year resident of the state of South Dakota you would qualify for this consideration. Just a thought considering if you were there that long, you probably have family still there so it would be nice to have a little better opportunity to hunt with them sooner than in my case has been every 7-going on 10 years now

---

**Doug Baltzer**

**Mitchell SD**

**douglanda\_b@centurylink.net**

**Comment:**

To complicated, to many drawings. By the time you get to the third and forth drawings all that will be left are areas that no one is interested in and antlerless tags in areas with no access.

---

**Paul Kruse**

**Brookings SD**

**murphykruse@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

No, there is nothing wrong with the current draw that we currently have!! Why are you continuing to try and change it. Absolutely no changes needed!

---

**Matthew Christopherson**

**Mitchell SD**

**mattcarter1421@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

It's not broke and your second new proposal still is bad

---

**Brian Severson**

**Canton SD**

**Bpseverson@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I don't believe muzzleloader and refuge deer should be included in the new draw system. They are special late seasons. If a guy is too apply for east and west river deer by the time he gets to apply again the muzzleloader buck tags will be gone. Muzzleloader is not a guaranteed hunting season due to weather in South Dakota.

---

**Craig Holden**

**Pierre SD**

**craig.holden@state.sd.us**

**Comment:**

IF in the first draw a resident applies for a preference point only for one area, would that resident still be able to apply for 2 tags to use that year (say, pref pt for special buck, then apply for East & West River tags)?

---

**Justin Mettler**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**Mettler18@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Just leave it alone it's gonna mess everything up for a good 5 years not knowing the draw odds. Current system works good besides for a few counties and tags, but we will have happy people with any drawing. Seems like there is a small percent of people in favor of the change, but somehow we keep getting different proposals coming through so I clearly is just a couple peoples opinions seeming to matter more than the rest. It seems clear there is a different reason other than just higher drawing odds to push this bill through. Sick of all these different changes and dragging youth into this to try and get a this bill past. Let it rest for awhile again and don't keep putting a damper on a great state to hunt in.

---

**Mark Ervasti**  
**Chamberlain SD**  
**servasti@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Nobody needs 11 deer tags. Come up with a better proposal or leave it the way it is

---

**Bruce Behm**  
**Plymouth MN**  
**bruceb@quazarcapital.com**

**Comment:**

How can non-resident landowners get preference points for East River deer. Have you considered preference for non-resident landowners that own over 160 acres of land?  
Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Kenneth Brown**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**Dicksiouxfalls@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I oppose the deer drawing proposal

---

**Spike Jorgensen**

**Tok AK**

**spikecy@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Dear Commission and Commissioner

Shot my first deer in SD at age 8 and we virtually lived on pheasant some times of the year.

The trend is to accumulate points so one can hope to hunt some time in their life. So ranch/farms in S. Dakota sell to the rich so they can hunt themselves or ranch and do not allow hunting.

These trends to me are backwards. Game belongs to the state Not just rich actors or uban billionaires.

Every child age 8 to 18 should have first perferance for every species for that 10 years or we will not have any hunters except the rich and elderly to hunt. Eventually none.

This sytem should get every child into the field and streams. It does not even approach it. Although I see you are trying.

Sincerely

Spike

---

**Gerry Anderson**

**Owatonna MN**

**grandy74@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Still unbelievable that a resident can have 11 licenses before most non residents can have 1. We pay local landowners a significant amount for hunting and spend a great deal locally to support local business.

Why not ensure anyone who wants one license gets one before someone gets 11.

---

**Steven Johnke**

**Garretson SD**

**skjohnke@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Not sure why this continues to get brought up when over 80% of the people who would be affected oppose it. Is there some political reason?

Please leave the drawing as is!!!!

---

**Ronnie Jaenisch**

**Ashby MN**

**Rjjaenis@prtcl.com**

**Comment:**

What drawing can a nonresident for east river apply in. The new laws dont tell you. Why can't you leave it alone it works. Or just change for west river.

---

**Ronnie Jaenisch**  
**Ashby MN**  
**Rjjaenis@prtcl.com**

**Comment:**

What drawing can a nonresident for east river apply in. The new laws dont tell you. Why can't you leave it alone it works. Or just change for west river.

---

**Harold Bartsch**  
**Owatonna MN**  
**bartscha@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

There's no leftover non resident licenses available in the 8% allocation after the first drawing, unless it in reservation zones.

By the fifth drawing the residents have already bought up the unlimited leftover drawings.

---

**Paul Pierson**  
**Belle Fourche SD**  
**pperson@spearfishfp.com**

**Comment:**

I oppose the 2 choice 1st draw option that has most recently been proposed. This still allows hunters 2 tags (ie 1 special buck and a black hills) and another hunter who only hunts Black Hills to not draw a tag. If everyone only gets 1 choice than there will be a greater chance tags remain for 2nd choice options which would be when a hunter should be able to draw a 2nd tag. I support the last version of 1 choice per draw.

---

**Brian Rosa**  
**Beulah MI**  
**BRIANROSA29@HOTMAIL.COM**

**Comment:**

I don't understand the reasoning behind a resident being able to hold 11 licences before resident and non resident tags are pooled when many non residents recurve their one and only tag when the tags are pooled. I have been traveling to South Dakota to deer hunt for roughly 22 years always with my father as a family trip. It makes me sick to my stomach that we might not have an opportunity to continue this tradition while a resident holds 11 licences and essentially taking all of the tags away from non residents. Many many times we haven't been drawn on the first draw and have been fortunate to get our only tag when they are pooled. With this structure I fear that will be a thing of the past. Some of the very best experiences and memory with my family have been made in South Dakota and that is a testament to the quality of management and wildlife in your beautiful state. I hope I am wrong and people will not purchase licenses just to keep other people from getting the opportunity to hunt but I know from experience here in Michigan that people will do just that. Thank you for listening to my comment and thank you for the many great opportunities you have provided me and my family in the south Dakota outdoors. If you want more insight from a non residents point of view I would be willing to talk and help in anyway I can.

Thank you,  
Brian Rosa

---

**Stephen Haider**  
**Madison SD**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**David Fischer**  
**Brandon SD**  
**dbfischer@alliancecom.net**

**Comment:**

The proposal seems very confusing to me. Trying to keep track of all of the different drawing deadlines seems like it would be difficult.

---

**Tom Melick**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**tmpayup@sio.midco.net**

**Comment:**

I guess I am neutral on this issue now as long as it is a trial period and not etched in stone. I would also like GF& Parks to do some research on what hunters actually go hunting. I realize you take surveys and get a response from some not all. I've known people that never go hunting even when drawing a tag for a deer. This takes away an opportunity from someone else. I hate to see check in stations like other states but I hate seeing even one opportunity missed for someone.

---

**David Schwantz**  
**Elko New Market MN**  
**p47dman@mchsi.com**

**Comment:**

Are you NUTS???? Try to make it so that no one hunts anymore why don't you. My god in the same paragraph you state the you can apply for 2 licenses and then in the next line you state that you can only apply for 1 license. Never hunt SD again, you have lost 2 customers.

---

**Gary Say**  
**Spearfish SD**  
**garysay@rushmore.com**

**Comment:**

Draw one should have two chances for drawing a preferred license. Allowing the special buck license drawing to draw first and if not successful get two more chances in the first drawing is giving those folks 3 chances for licenses.

---

**Thomas Temple**  
**Burnettsville IN**  
**tcetem@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Who ever typed this new set of rules for S. D. should go back to school. This is very confusing and misleading. There needs to be a more competent way of explaining this.

---

**Mark Peterson**  
**Aberdeen SD**

**Comment:**

You are still trying to fix a system that isn't broke because of a vocal minority that believe it is their right to have a buck license every single year. You do not have public support at all for these changes yet still continue down this path. Please stop, start over with a new survey that has much more in depth questions prior to proposing changes of this nature. If the original survey that supposedly generated this effort would have eluded to the proposed changes I am 100% certain you would have lost all support in the survey stage.

---

**Robert Brown**  
**Waconia MN**  
**Llbrown@charter.net**

**Comment:**

After the 4th draw a resident can have 11 tags yet a non resident landowner who manages their land for deer is excluded from a east river tag. Seems a little unfair. North Dakota has non resident landowner tags-so should South Dakota!

---

**Brooks Goeden**  
**Yankton SD**  
**bcgoeden@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Much better, thank you

---

**Shane Muller**  
**Crooks SD**  
**SHANEMULLER543@GMAIL.COM**

**Comment:**

Keep it the way it was! If the new structure was to pass, I will lose access to the private land I hunt. Landowner oppose this and have told me they will shut down their land for all hunting.

---

---

**James Chadwick**

**Sandia TX**

**jachadwick@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Has the economic impact on the smaller communities for lodging, meals, groceries, and entertainment been considered? As a former resident and still a land owner in South Dakota, I regularly try and bring my family group hunting in southern Jackson county( if we draw tags). When we are there, we spend a lot of money in the Martin and black hills sections of the state. We are only 6 people and spend a couple of thousand dollars . That's revenue that our community will never recoup. I can't imagine how many hunters will be taking their money to other States that will welcome the financial impact that Hunters bring with them.

Also, I would love to see the landowner qualifications changed. Although we now live and work in another state, we still pay our taxes on our land and some of that take money no doubt is used for GFP programs. Because we currently only get drawn once every 3 or 4 years, the quality of the deer herd is affected by inbreeding and over population. If changes are going to be made, let them be smart changes based not solely on citizenship status but on economic impact as well.

---

**Karen Englehart**

**Bison SD**

**karenllew@sdplains.com**

**Comment:**

Are you really proposing a system that will allow one resident hunter to obtain 11 deer tags? Don't you think that is a bit gluttonous? I don't object to two or three deer per hunter but I truly believe that 11 is a bit over the top!

---

**Robert Smith**

**Jacksonville FL**

**rleesmith@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I think the 8% non resident licenses is considerably smaller than most states. You also give non residents that own land no consideration in being able to obtain a license to hunt deer on their own land. You can own 10000 acres of land in SD, pay taxes, hire many employees and contribute to the SD economy, but unless you can draw a non resident license with long odds you can't even hunt a deer own your own land. Doesn't make sense.

---

**Kevin Robinson**

**Ralph SD**

**Binson@nddupernet.com**

**Comment:**

Leave it as it is.

---

**Susan Chytka**

**Burke SD**

**[schytka@gwtc.net](mailto:schytka@gwtc.net)**

**Comment:**

Good Evening,

I'm not sure how the people in charge are keeping everything straight with all the changes that are being made to the deer seasons for 2019.

After my husband passed away 5 years ago, I kept our hunting operation going for financial reasons. I live in Gregory Co, which is Unit 30 and has a split season. My hunters come for the first season of deer hunting which is the first weekend of Nov. They are from Michigan and Minnesota and have to put in for vacation time early. They know that the season has always started the first weekend of Nov. With all the changes you are making, please leave these date alone for Unit 30, Gregory Co. West River Deer. I see no reason that it has to be changed.

Sometimes change is good, but sometimes it's best to leave things alone.

---

**Robert Brown**

**Brainerd SD**

**[Drbob@abcfamilychiro.com](mailto:Drbob@abcfamilychiro.com)**

**Comment:**

A resident can have 11 licenses after the fourth draw yet a non resident landowner who manages their land for deer is excluded from the draw. Not reasonable at all-grossly unfair to the landowner who pays taxes and takes the time, effort and expense to manage for wildlife! North Dakota has non resident landowner tags so should South Dakota. Bad enough to have to fight the trespassers and poachers-then have no chance for a tag-really unfair!!

---

**Tracy Freeseaman**

**Estelline SD**

**[tracyfreeseaman@hotmail.com](mailto:tracyfreeseaman@hotmail.com)**

**Comment:**

I still fee Non-Residents should NOT be included in the first draw!

---

**Jim Gruber**

**Estelline SD**

**[jgruber148@yahoo.com](mailto:jgruber148@yahoo.com)**

**Comment:**

all i can say is that it looks to me like after all the bickering and time wasted,,,, nothing is changing... the greedy ones who want it all will continue to get their way..and those less fortunate are left in the dust again... get rid of the 50%land owner allocation, it stinks... and i am a land owner. secondly... 1 buck per season per hunter is enough... and if tradition is so important, then i am sure they will not mind hunting does with their extra licenses.. enough of this 5 draws, and up to 6 licenses per person crap..

---

**Dean Sternhagen**

**Tabor SD**

**dntsternhagen@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Although this is better than the first proposal it still makes no sense! You are penalizing the avid hunter who applies for all the seasons and giving the novice hunter an advantage that probably only applies for one or two seasons a year. It's fair the way it is currently, everyone has an equal chance for each and every season.

---

**Ray Pearce**

**Spearfish SD**

**clanhead1@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

too confusing. make simpler -- i.e. submit for any and all you want, but receive only one license each drawing. if you receive one, you're done. if you receive none, then apply for leftover licenses. repeat as necessary.

---

**Shane Taylor**

**Rapid City SD**

**shane.taylor@nm.com**

**Comment:**

I Strongly support the new application proposal for hunting deer in South Dakota. Actually I would support having just one opportunity in the first draw rather than 2. I would also support Archery deer being included in the first draw. this will Create more opportunity for all to draw the desired tag they wish to have.

---

**Brant Sundall**

**Philip SD**

**brant@gwtc.net**

**Comment:**

If you're going to allow two first choices you may as well leave the draw as is. This defeats the original intention of allowing more people a better chance of drawing their preferred tag. I hunt only the Black Hills. I'm not there to "kill" a deer. I'm there to hunt deer. Most "double-dippers" are road hunters ( I know several). When the Black Hills first went to a draw system there were few applicants. A serious hunter could expect to draw a tag every year. Now that the buck ratio / size is built up these opportunists want a chance at them. By allowing two first choices you're giving the double-dippers a chance for two tags while people who only want to hunt one season could, and at least every other year, probably will, end up with none. Thank you

---

**Rich Sundberg**

**Alexandria MN**

**rich@sundbergoutdoors.com**

**Comment:**

The proposed changes to the 2019 deer hunting regulations will not result in better opportunities for resident or non-resident hunters, it's setup in such a way that the quality of deer hunting in SD will be greatly diminished. If I understand the proposed changes correctly, it's possible for a resident hunter to shoot up to 12 or 13 deer - all of which could all be bucks. Allowing this will definitely affect the number and quality of bucks that a hunter will see in the field. No hunter needs to, or should be allowed to shoot more than two bucks in any given year. If a family needs more meat for the freezer, then let them shoot does, which the state is overrun with. I personally lease a large ranch in Lyman County and only three of our hunters were able to draw buck tags in 2018 and only a couple received doe tags. We have far too many does, which need to be thinned out, but we can't since tags for non-resident hunters are near to impossible to draw. If we can't get tags, our rancher will be affected since they rely on our annual lease payment and even worse, the hotels, restaurants and retail establishments will suffer huge losses due to the reduced tourism income that non-residents bring into the state each year. If anything, South Dakota should reconsider allow party hunting, so that hunters will still come to the state to hunt, even if only a couple of hunters in a group draw buck tags. I agree that residents should be able to draw their favorite tags, but within reason and not at levels that will result in severe financial impacts to the state, land owners and business owners. This entire proposals needs to be revamped to ensure that all hunters can continue to enjoy a great experience hunting deer n South Dakota.

---

**Jeff Berg**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**jeberg@smithfield.com**

**Comment:**

I have emailed before on this topic. I do not understand the reasoning behind the proposed changes. From what I have learned, there is a majority of hunters that oppose these changes. I am asking you to consider what the majority of hunters want and do not change what has worked for many years. Upsetting South Dakota resident hunters does not make any sense. Changing something just to change does not make any sense and just because it is different does not mean it is better. I have always been proud to say that I am a hunter and fisherman from South Dakota because of our great state which includes everything from our resources to how they are managed. Please do not spoil this with unneeded changes to the deer hunting seasons. Thank you.

---

**Jon Haverly**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**haverly@sio.midco.net**

**Comment:**

It appears that someone wasted much too much time on this and is desperately trying to salvage this complication on deer license draws. It is a completely unnecessary change and should be discarded in its entirety.

---

**Justin Pliska**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**jjpliska@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

South Dakota is unique in there deer seasons we have a quite a few. Terrain is very diverse, allowing us to have 3 unique rifle seasons black hills, west river, and east river. This doesn't include the state park tags, and refuges. Some tags are harder to get than others. But now that change is on the horizon. I don't agree with the deer proposal, only allowing us to apply for 2 deer tags in the first draw. I am "that guy" that gets 4-5 deer tags a year but I draw a lot of units that are overlooked. I hunt majority of public land, I research, scout this areas months in advance. I look at draw statistics and plan my hunts based on numbers. Number of public land acres, kill percentage, and number of tags given out. I don't just hunt my grandmas back 40. So when I hunt a new county I have already given the state my tag fee. I than go to these small towns and buy food fuel lodging. These small town don't rely on hunting as an economical stand point but it brings in extra revenue. Do I feel bad for someone when they don't draw a tag, sure, it sucks but it's part of them game. I don't just do this in our state I do it in many. To the guys who whine about not getting a tag for 3 years branch our pickup a left over any whitetail tag and go explore new country you don't have to burn any points and you could find a new honey hole. But this society has turned into lazy mode and no one wants to work for anything. I find it very dissappointing that we are going to give into the lazy people and help them better get there back 40 tag which statistically might not even work. Leave this the way it is already no CHANGE. More people oppose this topic than ever before, so LISTEN to us HUNTERS!

---

**Paul Everson**

**Castlewood SD**

**Sandra-everson@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I do not support a change to current the current system.

---

**Dan Forster**

**Howell MI**

**forster870@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

As a former SD resident (1962-1985) and current Non-resident West River Deer hunter since 1991, I am concerned that this new ruling puts non-residents at a significant disadvantage to drawing a license compared to the current system. Currently, the 8% non-resident licenses are always gone after the first drawing. At the 3rd draw all available resident licenses not drawn in 1st & 2nd drawing are available to non-residents. New proposed ruling will not make undrawn resident licenses available to non-residents until the 5th drawing. We have relied many times on drawing a license in the 3rd drawing as usually there are 100+ licenses available in area 41A. Hard to believe any licenses will be left after residents can apply for as many as they want in 4th drawing. This will make it very difficult for a group of 5 of us to get licenses like in the current system. With the significantly reduced licenses available in the last few years, it has become very difficult to draw anyhow. In 41A, the ranchers and we as hunters think the reduction in licenses is not warranted. Whitetail does are over populating and antlerless licenses should be avaialble again, as well as, double lic tags. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

---

**Jeff Lyon**

**Burke SD**

**jefflyon25@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

After following the deer tag debate and remaining silent this is my take. I feel that the initial proposal was as fair as you can ask for. I was surprised and miffed that it wasn't passed. As a Gregory county resident an being 1 of the 3500 that was denied a tag, I'm left wondering?Has common sense and fairness lost out to greed and nearsightedness. Its hard for me to hear that its family tradition to go out west deer hunting when I have to watch the biggest buck I ever seen on my family land. It kinda feels like going to a local steak feed only to be told there out of steaks. While you watch a group of out of area people finish supper then get frozen steaks to go because its "family tradition" to grill steaks at home next weekend. I guess the new proposal is a slight improvement. I'd like to see something in the future that addresses local people a better opportunity to hunt in there back yard and or those that really would like to get that one tag.

---

**Lance Gerth**

**Brandt SD**

**lancegerth@outlook.com**

**Comment:**

I think we can all agree that there is no public support for this proposal and this would be a good time for it to go away. The time and money wasted on this would have been better spent somewhere else.

---

**Tony Sieber**

**Spearfish SD**

**tonys@golddustdeadwood.com**

**Comment:**

Please continue to add Lawrence County to Unit 2 for Canada Goose season stretching into February for upcoming seasons.

---

**Michael Rogers**

**Deadwood SD**

**captainmikerogers@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Why does the Special Buck Tag have to be included in the new tag Allocation system? It appeases the land owner and has no effect on other hunters nor the application process!  
Non resident tags should also be available on the East River, same percentage should be allocated for every unit!

---

**Sean Fulton**

**Rapid City SD**

**Fultonphoto@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

There are too many nonresident archery hunters using our public lands and since the archery season was moved to sept 1 there seems to be even more pressure. Please limit the number of nonresident archery tags on public lands and raise the fees.

---

**Jason Taylor**

**Fort Pierre SD**

**Comment:**

I would ask that the commission rejects this license allocation proposal and leave it as is currently is. Yes I do think that this new proposal is better than the original proposal and is a compromise, but why not let the new preferences point system work for a couple of years and then gather the data on how the preference point system worked. Until the deer herd comes back to where it was 8 years ago, there will always be hunters that will get turned down 2 years in a row.

Again I oppose any change to the draw system and ask that the commission leaves it as is.

Thanks

---

**Rob Skjonsberg**

**Ft. Pierre SD**

**Comment:**

I reside in Ft. Pierre and am a landowner in Jones County. I am writing to express my support for the plan coming before the Commission to increase the non-resident deer hunting licenses in South Dakota. While I do not offer commercial deer hunts on my property, I do support the position of the South Dakota Landowner and Outfitters Alliance, as it is an important tool for landowners to be able to enhance their existing ranching and farming operations with non-resident deer hunts.

Farming and ranching is a tough occupation, especially today. On my own property, it's imperative to have multiple revenue streams and the flexibility to exercise those options - just to cover input costs. From my point of view, the current proposal(s) from the SDGFP have placed an undue burden on both landowners and many sportsmen/ women. The current plan will unquestionably result in a reduction of tags that landowners can rely on for non-resident commercial hunting, thus resulting in additional financial harm. This opposition may be one of the few that unites a large number of landowners and sportsmen, alike. Consequently, I believe it's prudent to consider the proposal coming before you in order to find an improved compromise that may better satisfy the competing interests.

Your corrective action is needed to correct the situation. The plan of the South Dakota Landowner and Outfitters Alliance, in concert with SDGFP, will partially mitigate the concerns, provide additional revenue to support resident hunting and habitat, while also avoiding an increased burden on public hunting grounds.

With respect, I encourage you to support an increase in non-resident hunting options on private land in South Dakota.

---

**Douglas Christensen**

**Ashton SD**

**suechr@nrctv.com**

**Comment:**

I feel that a person should be able to acquire just 2 licenses, the remainder of the left over license should be left open. The Game and Fish Department is trying to acquire revenue instead of protecting the wild life. I feel 11 licenses is ridiculous, no one needs that many.

---

**Douglas Christensen**

**Ashton SD**

**suechr@nrctv.com**

**Comment:**

I feel the Game & Fish Department is looking for revenue from non residents and I feel that non residents should not be able to acquire a license on first drawing as several SD residents do not acquire a license on the first drawing.

---

**John Duffy**  
**Oldham SD**  
**jduffy03@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Dear GF&P Commissioners,

I have honestly been against the deer tag allocation changes from the very beginning; however, I have spoken with and met with many people involved with this process over the last year and the newest "2 tag" proposal is a fair way of trying to compromise with the most "serious/passionate deer hunters" that still want to be able to hold more than 1 QUALITY firearm buck tag the same year (i.e. an East River AND West River buck tag BOTH or any combination of 2 of the firearm buck tags). I now support this change whereas I did not support the previous "1 tag" proposal.

Yes; you could have received leftover tags in the previous proposal starting in the 3rd drawing but they weren't as likely to actually be where you wanted to hunt (maybe a brand new county where you don't already have permission or landowner relationships built) or what species you wanted to hunt (whitetail only tags in an area that is mainly mule deer); therefore, the previous "1 tag" proposal was realistically like to be only 1 QUALITY firearm tag per year rather than now with a better chance at 2 QUALITY firearm tags with being able to hunt bucks both East River AND West River, which is what most of the passionate deer hunters wanted and weren't getting with the previous proposal(s).

During this process, I realized that at the end of the day some level of change was going through whether most deer hunters liked it or not and this newest proposal is the best compromise I've seen so far. Would I still rather leave the system the way it is? Absolutely! Will it stay the same? No; not even if 80% of us want it to. I feel that the GF&P Commission and GF&P have good intentions with this change and this will still get roughly 1,000 more people deer hunting every year. I'm willing to give up my 3rd firearm tag to make that happen. I will still be able to get a good opportunity to hunt with 2 quality tags from either ER Any Deer, WR Any Deer, or Muzzleloader Deer that I currently hunt now (or others that I don't currently apply for like BHD, CSP, RFD). Before this latest change I was going to have to pick between East River deer or West River deer hunting. That wasn't a choice I wanted to make. Hopefully now many of us will not have to.

Thank you to the GF&P and commissioners for listening to the most "serious and passionate deer hunters" at the beginning of 2019 with this newest compromise proposal (and also listening to the "less passionate deer hunters" over the previous year or two that just want 1 tag) and coming up with some level of compromise between both groups, even if it still doesn't make some hunters happy on Facebook it shows you are trying to listen and do what you think is best for hunting in South Dakota long-term. Again, I was against any change initially, and would still prefer no change, but this latest proposal is good enough for my stubbornness to accept some level of change that would benefit more South Dakota deer hunters but will still not take away so much from the other passionate deer hunters that the previous proposal would have otherwise changed deer hunting very negatively for.

Best Regards,

---

**Ross Swedeen**

**Rapid City SD**

**reswedeen@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Esteemed SD GFP Commissioners,

First off, thank you to the new commissioners for taking on the responsibilities of being a SD GFP Commissioner.

I got a little long winded on the last email. I will definitely save you all from a book this time! After 2 years of this seemingly never ending topic rolling on, it astounds me how many people still do not truly understand these changes! That is very evident from reading all the public comments this morning. I guess the old saying of "you can lead a horse to water, but you can't make them drink" continues to have merit.

This current proposal is better than the last one in regards to all the seasons being combined. However, the current proposal is worse off than the last proposal as a hunter now has 2 first choices. This will allow hunters to "double dip". That is exactly what got us into this situation to begin with!

I still believe the original proposal of having all the deer licenses in one "bucket" with 1 first choice was a far better proposal. It would have allowed the most unique SD deer hunters to draw a deer license in any given year. Which contributes directly to all of the 3R objectives (Recruitment, Retention and Reactivation). The original proposal would have had the greatest positive impacts on the drawing odds as well.

This current proposal is absolutely an compromise. I understand the value of compromise. However, compromise is not necessarily warranted in all situations. This just may be one of them. 67% of deer hunters in South Dakota are one license applicants (35,140 of the 52,633 applicants in 2017). We are reducing the additional unique SD deer hunters that would have otherwise not drawn a 1st choice license by roughly 66% (3000 down to 1000). Purely for the benefit of the roughly 8% of deer hunters that draw 2 or more first choice licenses (3,985 of the 52,633 applicants in 2017). I was one of those 8% in 2018. Truth be told, I was one of the 0.6% that drew 3 or more first choice licenses.

I supported the first proposal. I supported the last proposal. I support this current proposal too. All were/are better options than our current system. Please support this proposal (or some form of it) as well.

Once again, I would like to thank you for tackling this very contentious topic. No matter your decision, there will be large percentage of unhappy deer hunters. I truly wish you the best of luck!

---

**Ken Krieger**

**Burke SD**

**oakcanyonranch@goldenwest.net**

**Comment:**

From what I understand, with the new regulations, it will be harder for Non-residents to draw a deer tag.

Restricting non-residents to less opportunities to draw a tag does not make any sense. If resident haven't established a relationship with land owners by now... having more opportunities to draw a tag will not secure them a place to hunt. Non-resident hunters will shift and hunt in other states where deer tags are available ... some of which are apply and receive a tag.

Wake-up South Dakota GF&P Commission, use some common sense and oppose the new restrictive draw regulations!

---

**Clifton Stone**  
**Chamberlain AZ**  
**cstone@midstatesd.net**

**Comment:**

Lets give it a try.

---

**Brian Baumgartner**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**treegardener@sio.midco.net**

**Comment:**

The description of preference points in your email is too vague and fails to help me understand how this change affects preference points and a persons chance of success in the first drawing. It is my understanding that this proposal is about improving a persons chance of success in the first drawing.

Currently I have about 5 pref. points for ERD. I do not have any for WRD nor any of the other five seasons allowed in the first draw. Since all six seasons are pooled in the first draw, are the preference points then also pooled or do they remain season specific?

For example; If I apply for only one season in the first draw, lets say WRD, and I am unsuccessful, do I then receive a point for only the season I applied for; WRD? I assume that I would not have been able to use the 5 preference points I currently have for ERD.

If this is true, I don't see any difference in the new proposal as apposed to the old system. There is effectively no change in a persons chance of success in the first draw. At this point the only change I can see is that all of the applications happen at the same time. That's nice but no big deal to me.

Thanks for your time. I look forward to a better understanding of how this new application system provides positive change.

## Other

---

**Cartor Carlson**

**Aberdeen SD**

**cartorkcarlson@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

This is being sent in regards to the issues and rulings regarding the use of leg hold traps. Our family loves the outdoors and we spend countless hours hunting and fishing in our great state. In regards to trapping, especially leg hold traps we have some major concerns. We live in the country, however close to Aberdeen. We are not opposed to trapping, but do feel there is a time and a place where it should be and not be allowed.

We live within the three mile radius of Aberdeen and there are a number of families in our area and most have pets. Last winter our dog got caught in one of these traps close to our home and spent over 24 hours in it while the temperature was around a minus 20 degrees most of this time. He survived, however had to have part of his foot amputated by a vet because of this event.

In addition to this our son's dog got caught in one of these traps in a public hunting area during pheasant season. This area is close to town and get lots of public use.

Again, we are not opposed to trapping, but do not feel these traps should be used in populated areas close to town or in public hunting areas during certain hunting seasons. To us this is only common sense. I am sure that these types of issues happen more often than you may think .

Thanks for your attention to this issue.

Cartor Carlson  
Aberdeen, SD

---

**Tony Sieber**

**Deadwood SD**

**Comment:**

I'd like to send a quick thank you to the SDGFP Commissioners for adding Lawrence County to Unit 2 this past season for Canada Goose hunting. As an avid waterfowler, it was a great benefit to be able to hunt geese into February this past season in Lawrence County. I was able to take my 14 year old son and some of his friends on numerous hunts after X-mas this year which made for great experiences in the outdoors.

Please continue to add Lawrence County to the Unit 2 Canada Goose hunting for late season opportunities.

---

**Greg Schroeder**

**Hill City SD**

**gregschroeder.muleyhunter@gmail  
.com**

**Comment:**

I oppose auctioning off a bighorn sheep tag near Badlands National Park. Any revenue gained from an auction will not increase resident access to Bighorn Sheep tags, only continue to give wildlife to the highest bidder. Allow the residents of SD to continue to have a one-of-a-kind experience for a trophy sheep, not just the wealthy.

---

**Paul Roghair**

**Kadoka SD**

**tallpaulr@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I regret that I will not be able to attend this meeting due to work requirements which I cannot avoid and miss. The SDTWS meeting is scheduled for this same time and I am attending it for work please forgive my absence and do not take it as my lack of passion on this topic.

I would like to further address the committee to plead for the use of rifles to be returned for the Spring turkey season. First of all the stats show that less than half the people who hunt are worried about it. Thus the use of decoys that are more lifelike doesn't worry people. I know that they are well made, however they are not equipped to move like real live turkeys. Each rifle hunter takes that responsibility on themselves to know for sure what they are shooting at which rests with the hunter not the State. If I remember correctly one should be sure of the target and what is beyond it, not "don't worry the rules will keep you from doing anything dangerous just follow them." Give the sportsman some credit and responsibility, we all still drive cars and people get killed in them all the time, do you want to ban a type of car that has more potential to get in an accident?

Second it seems as a matter of personal preference and opinion about how much enjoyment is had by said rifle turkey hunter. You may not find it fun but others do it seems unfair to press ones definition of fun on others when it is not hurting them or inhibiting their ability to pursue game. Also as far as ammo use, I have not had any problem eating my turkeys for years and not blowing them up. Please I ask you to consider this request for what it is, an effort by some to force their style of hunting on the rest of us. If for instance I feel that everyone should hunt deer with a shotgun and not rifles because its more sporting and safer, do I have the right to press a rule in to take the rifle away from everyone? No I do not its a matter of opinion, the turkey populations do not suffer from the use of rifles, rifle hunters (few) don't take extra birds out of the population just because they use a rifle, the tags are what they are no matter how they are harvested. Each hunter has the right to choose what they want to do within the rules to harvest a turkey, please do not keep this new rule because some turn their nose up at a method that has been used here in South Dakota for years, from my understanding not all GFP is behind this change but the ones that aren't must tow the line because of who you work for.

I have enjoyed taking several turkeys with my six year old son and was able to do so because I could use a rifle.

The areas hunted provided better use of a rifle, the turkeys did as well and he got to enjoy it with me. I feel saddened that it has a chance to go way and I will have to tell him we cannot share that experience anymore because some believe it is not a "sporting way" to hunt turkeys. Not everyone gets the same thrill from scouting hours and hours and getting up super early to call birds off the roost. Some may prefer to glass the countryside, find the game and sneak into position for an opportunity, they are both methods of hunting and thus please do not keep a new rule that takes a method out of play not for any good reason besides the some "TURKEY HUNTERS" doesn't like it.

In a time of losing hunters would not taking away one more way of hunting hurt the hunting community? A rifle can be a great tool for those not equipped to absorb heavy recoil (youth and disabled in particular). Help the sportsman of South Dakota out and allow the choice. You can't make a law that says a landowner has to allow the use of a rifle, but they can let you if you want, when they don't care, why should the rule makers? Furthermore, the last fatal accident in SD for turkey hunting was with a Shotgun! So that makes the shotgun safer than a rifle? Ask to look at the data, better look it up for yourself about how safe (or concerned about safety) Turkey hunter surveys have always swung back and forth on this issue, but that makes sense that it is less likely to get surveys from people who only use rifles and are very passionate about it if there are less of

them, it seems that basing decisions on a sample of 540 out of 8750 could really swing the results either way depending on the number of rifle hunters who got to fill out a survey (I for one did not) If you want a true look put it on the turkey application and require everyone to respond when they apply for a tag, then you would know but that would take a great amount of time and money. 13% of spring firearms hunters are moderately concerned and 7% are very concerned about hunting in the spring with a full body decoy. 54% are NOT CONCERNED.... So are people saying that rifles need to be out because they feel unsafe or because it's a preference??? I think it should be compared to how safe deer hunters feel in rifle season using a full body decoy. We all do not want to see people hurt while enjoying the South Dakota outdoors, but it happens. Like the last turkey fatality.... Shotgun so they have safety issues as well. If we all want to be 100% safe, then build a bunker at every ones house and hide in it, my point there is danger in everything, don't continue to limit peoples enjoyment of this sport under the guise of unsafe, to push the agenda of some.

Consider leaving rifle use out of the Black Hills where most accidents are likely to happen because of the greater hunter density and terrain, if not that then possibly on all public hunting areas and leaving private land open to the rifle. The stats don't show more or less favor there, I believe because the people who wanted the rifles out want them out everywhere, and those who hunt with them are few enough in number that when split up in their opinions on it don't show the same statically. Rifle hunting on private land allows the landowners to hunt as they wish; several I have talked with were still totally unaware of the change. Also I believe, continuing to ban rifles it will feed into the attitude that some landowners already hold that a person should not even buy a tag because turkeys are pests. Private lands provide the hunter with a more reasonably controlled situation, I see the potential for a hunter of questionable ethics to be riding down a Forest service trail in the Black hills, spot a guys turkey decoy set up and drop a rifle out the window to shoot one. Yep that's a problem, however on private land unless you have permission to be there, there is less LEGAL chance of that happening. (yes given people poach on private grounds, but rules that restrict the one whom abide by them does not stop that) In these areas hunters should know if there are other hunters around and adjust accordingly for safety if that is truly the concern. I have never had permission from a landowner who either told me whom either told me who else was hunting or I did not ask if there were others hunting, in addition to what I was hunting with. My opinion is that the life like decoys and safety are an excuse to press some peoples or groups hunting preference and opinions on others which seems unfair and unnecessary and we have now bought into it.

I would love to see rifles returned to the spring season; yes I know it would be for the 2020 season if so. But with their return also see a simplified version of the rifle regulations to include.... Any rim or centerfire rifle cartridge greater than 1 inch in length and less than 2.5in. The upper limit would not have to be there but this would be a really simple rule to use. No charts about ammo and Foot Pounds of Energy, but a ruler. Wyoming does this for their season with Rimfires, why not use what works for them. Thank you for your time.

---

**Paul Roghair**

**Kadoka SD**

**tallpaulr@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I Strongly strongly strongly (not sure how to emphasize this enough) OPPOSE any action that leads to the Badlands Unit of the Big Horn Sheep area being valid for the auction! 1 time is all our history since the BHG came back here did a SD resident get a chance to harvest one, and now Some may want to sell that off to the rich! Not even leave it alone for the same amount of time that the Black Hills populations where? Also were would this money go??? what more can pouring more money into the sheep program do? Unless they can buy more sheep so they can issue more tags to RESIDENTS. Please don't sell out our SD sportsman. Unless we like the idea of tame world records being handed out only to the rich. Makes a ton of sense right?

---

**Al Kraus**

**Rapid City SD**

**Bowguy@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Nonresidents are ruining the public lands and the quality of our mule deer.

---

**Jon Olson**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**jbolson426@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I am very much in favor of limiting nonresident archers for both deer and antelope seasons. The ND model is a good starting point.

---

**Wyatt Skelton**

**Bryant SD**

**wyattskelton@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Have muzzleloader season open for same length as rifle antelope season. Then reopen at current date in December.

---

**Wyatt Skelton**

**Bryant SD**

**wyattskelton@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Cap the number of mule deer that may be taken by nonresident archers.

---

**Wyatt Skelton**

**Bryant SD**

**wyattskelton@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Cap tags at approximately (8%) of resident tags sold. Not 2018 total tags sold because 3018 was a large increase in nonresident tags. This is attributed to SD being a unlimited cheap out of state tag where nonresident can shoot mule deer. More mule deer are shot by nonresident than residents!

---

**Wyatt Skelton**

**Bryant SD**

**wyattskelton@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

SD is currently a cheap unlimited tag for archery. Raise tag prices to be comparable to surrounding states like IA and MT. Raise amounts across the board for all nonresident licenses.

---

**Wyatt Skelton**

**Bryant SD**

**wyattskelton@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

The amount of nonresident pressure is affecting the quality of the hunt for residents and overcrowding on public lands is reducing game to be found on public land.  
Reduce nonresident pressure.

---

**Wyatt Skelton**

**Bryant SD**

**wyattskelton@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Public land is overcrowded and over pressured by large numbers of out of state hunters. Resident hunter experience is suffering and game is pressured off of public land. Cap number of nonresident antelope tags.

---

**Jerry Travis**

**Brandon SD**

**jt653byu@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I have 2 prior Long time residents of SD that bowhunt with me every year and they are not wealthy people. I hate to see hunting become a rich mans sport. I do support limiting NR licensing absolutely.

---

## Resident Nonresident

---

**Daniel Tracy**

**Vermillion SD**

**dan.tracy@usd.edu**

**Comment:**

Why are we allowing non-residents ANY tags ahead of exhausted resident demand (draws 1-3 at least). It is already difficult to draw licenses in my county of preference WITH preference points (about 1 out of 3 years). SD residents ALWAYS deserve the best chances at drawing a tag, particularly in a county where they live or own property.

## Turkey Transportation Requirements

---

**Ross Swedeen**

**Rapid City SD**

**reswedeen@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Please support the change to the turkey transportation requirements. The current transportation requirements place unnecessary burdens on the hunter with little to no positive effect to negate poaching.

---

**Clifton Stone**

**Chamberlain SD**

**cstone@midstatesd.net**

**Comment:**

support

**GAME, FISH & PARKS**

523 East Capital

Pierre, SD 57501

(605)773-3396

Fax (605)773-6425

Chris.Petersen@state.sd.us

4

**REQUEST FOR LISTS OF LICENSE HOLDERS****Application**Type of List Requested Small Game Now Resident W of SDNumber of licenses in list 5805

Name of Person, Entity, or Organization requesting list:

Sunrise Ranch LLC

Address of Person, Entity, or Organization:

Box 739  
EDGE MONT SD  
57735

How would you like your list sent to you: (email or disk)

DISK

Phone Number

605-685-3376

Purpose for which list will be used:

CONTACT HUNTERS THAT MAY COME  
THROUGH EDGE MONT**This list is Names and Mailing Addresses ONLY**

The sale of lists by the Department of Game, Fish & Parks is authorized by SDCL 1-27-1 and ARSD 41:06:02:04, 05 and 06. The fee for a Game, Fish & Parks Commission approved exception is \$100, otherwise the fee is \$100 per thousand names or a minimum of \$100 whichever is greater.

Unless requested and approved as part of this request, the license list will not include anyone under eighteen years of age. Names are for one-time use only and are to be used only by the person, entity or organization approved per this request.

Authorized Signature of Purchaser

Date

Date of Commission Action