

Minutes of the Game, Fish, and Parks Commission  
January 10-11, 2019

Chairman Barry Jensen called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. CT at RedRossa Convention Center in Pierre, South Dakota. Commissioners Barry Jensen, Gary Jensen, Mary Anne Boyd, Jon Locken, Cathy Petersen, Scott Phillips, Russell Olson and Douglas Sharp and approximately 65 public, staff, and media were present.

**DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION**

**Conflict of Interest Disclosure**

Chair B. Jensen called for conflicts of interest to be disclosed.

Phillips noted he has a limited number of commercial deer hunters on his property each year.

Peterson explained that each commissioner is asked to be on commission to represent all walks of life and there has always been a member in the commercial hunting business to bring that knowledge and expertise which is an asset to the commission.

B. Jensen noted that Phillips has disclosed his limited commercial hunting operation and he does not consider it a conflict.

G. Jensen asked Phillips if he would you be able to look at the deer issue on an unbiased bases.

Phillips said his experience would be advantageous in the discussion. He explained 13 hunters were given permission to hunter on his property this year. 11 came to hunt 9 of which were youth, 1 youth hunter and 2 muzzleloader hunters. 10 of the 11 hunters were successful and one did not report back. He and his family members have not had a deer license for the last 4-5 years leaving their tags in the bucket for others to have an opportunity.

G. Jensen stated he does not believe there is a conflict and feels Phillips is valuable to the conversation

Motion by G. Jensen, second by Sharp THAT COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS CONFLICT IS FAIR, REASONABLE AND NOT CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC'S INTEREST AND HE CAN OBJECTIVELY DECIDE THE ISSUE ON AN UNBIASED OPINION. Motion carried unanimously.

B. Jensen noted the Commission has voted to more the deer hunting season draw issues forward as a group and not as conflict being pushed forward by one individual.

**Approval of Minutes**

B. Jensen called for any additions or corrections to the December 6-7, 2018 minutes or a motion for approval.

Motion by Boyd with second by Phillips TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 6-7, 2018 MEETING. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Additional Commissioner Salary Days**

Commissioner Locken requested one additional salary day for participating in the Resident Nonresident Workgroup. Boyd requested one additional salary day for participating in the AIS Summit. G. Jensen requested one additional salary day for participating in the AIS Summit, one additional salary day for participating in the Resident Nonresident Workgroup and 3 additional salary days for attending WAFWA

Motion by Phillips with second by Peterson TO APPROVE THE ADDITIONAL SALARY DAYS AS REQUESTED. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Election of Officers**

B. Jensen opened the floor for nominations for president.

Peterson recognized and thanked Chairman Barry Jensen for his work and commitment to the Commission appreciating that he cares enough to come back after health issues to help the state.

Peterson motioned to nominate G. Jensen for chairman.

With no other nomination B. Jensen called for nominations to cease.

Peterson motioned for a unanimous ballot for G. Jensen for chairman. All present voted in favor. Motion carried.

G. Jensen called for nominations for vice chairman

Peterson nominated Scott Phillips for vice chairman.

With no other nomination G. Jensen called for nominations to cease.

Peterson motioned for a unanimous ballot for Phillips for vice chairman. All present voted in favor. Motion carried.

### **Budget FY2020 Overview**

Chris Petersen, administration division director, informed the Commission the budget overview will be presented once the Governor's budget details have been made available.

### **Resident Nonresident Discussion**

Scott Simpson, wildlife administration chief, provided an update on the resident/nonresident opportunity allocation discussion.

The first meeting of the stakeholder group took place on December 17. At this meeting, the group identified major themes that are important to the decision making criteria. These themes are:

- Species Abundance
- Recruitment, Retention and Reactivation (R3)
- Demand for Licenses
- Demand for Access
- Social Carrying Capacity of Residents and Nonresidents
- Economics
- Habitat and Status of Habitat

The second and final meeting will take place January 11 at 1:30 in the Matthews Training Center. The goal of the final meeting will be to identify specific items under each major theme to be forwarded to the commission for their consideration.

G. Jensen noted an email recently went out to 150 thousand people letting them know about the workgroup and asking for input.

### **Department Sponsored Legislation for 2019**

Tony Leif, wildlife division director provided an update on department sponsored legislation. This legislation includes HB1023 to revise certain provisions regarding the sale and purchase of big game animal parts and HB1024 to authorize certain species of game fish to be used as bait. Both pieces of legislation are up in committee on January 15.

G. Jensen asked for clarification on the Commissions role with legislation.

Tony explained it is the Department's is responsible to carry legislation.

G. Jensen noted the Commission works within the framework and legislative authorities given by the legislature by state statute.

Leif noted other potential legislation may include the use of drones for predator control and penalty for repeated trespass offenders.

Phillips said he is having conversations with Senator Cammack and they are drafting trespass legislation. He noted statistics show 64 individuals with multiple repeat charges for this offense.

### **Non-meandered Waters**

Kevin Robling, special projects coordinator, provided an update on non-meandered waters stating 4,280 acres have been marked closed to public recreational use. This is less than 2 percent of the publicly-accessible nonmeandered water acres across the state and down from the peak of over 5,000 nonmeandered water acres closed in March 2018. The department's goal is to continue providing recreational opportunities for families and outdoor enthusiasts who enjoy South Dakota's great outdoor resources, while also addressing concerns of landowners who own the land under the water. The "Recreation and Respect" campaign and the "Adopt-a-Lake"

program have been front and center. The department has been strongly encouraging recreational users to “leave no trace” and pick up all garbage.

B. Jensen noted comments have been received in regards to the agreement with Reetz family and asked what the department is hearing.

Robling responded that people have asked for permission which has not been granted by the Reetz family. Only the Reetz family has been fishing that body of water which they indicated has not been much. Anglers are utilizing other bodies of water in the area that have good fishing.

## **Ag Forum**

Arden Petersen, Special Assistant to the Secretary, provided a brief update on the Agricultural Leaders Forum to the Commission.

The Agricultural Leaders Forum took place at SD Corn’s Office in Sioux Falls on December 18, 2018. Approximately 50 folks from different agricultural groups were invited and 19 were able to attend, along with nine Game, Fish and Parks staff. There was good discussion from all in attendance on how the groups, including GFP and the Habitat Conservation Foundation, can work together towards more sustainable habitat moving forward. Some felt there was a need for more advertisement of conservation programs that are currently available, some believe that precision agriculture will create more opportunities for conservation on less productive lands and most indicated that, regardless of the programs available, they have to make financial sense to the producer. Recreation and Respect was discussed and is an ongoing effort for both hunters/anglers and landowners to work more closely together. Many in attendance expressed their appreciation to GFP for providing the opportunity to get together to discuss habitat, recreation and respect, and other topics important to them and to conservation in the state. They believe there are opportunities for the agricultural and conservation communities to work closer together and they look forward to more discussion in the future.

The Agricultural Leaders Forum was the fourth and final in a series of forums GFP hosted in 2018, and will lead up to the Conservation Summit to be held sometime later this winter.

1. Sportsmen/Sportswomen Forum - held in Oacoma in April, 2018
2. Shooting Preserve Operators Forum - held in Pierre in July, 2018
3. Wildlife and Nature Forum - held in Pierre in October, 2018
4. Agricultural Leaders Forum - held in Sioux Falls in December, 2018
5. Conservation Summit – location and date yet TBD, 2019

As in all of the forums, discussion topics at the Agricultural Leaders Forum included:

- Sustainable Habitat
- Sustainable Funding for Habitat
- Public Access
- Recreation and Respect
- Collective Conservation Voice
- Other topics of interest to the attendees.

The forums have provided excellent opportunities for staff and groups to get together in the same room and discuss conservation issues important to us all. The discussion has been positive and will be beneficial as we work together moving forward.

### **Every Acre Counts**

Robling explained the Habitat Conservation Foundation contributed \$1 million to fund a new project at SDSU. The project is geared towards improving the profitability, diversity, and ecosystem benefits of agriculture by using precision technologies to empower producers to make better management decisions for every acre of their operations. Project objectives includes; 1) Characterize current technical and financial status of participating landowner operations, 2) Re-assess technical and financial status under potential alternative uses of marginal acres to enable landowner to make informed decisions, 3) Implement alternative practices on marginal lands and assess impacts on technical and financial status over multiple years, 4) Develop outreach materials and share with landowners, agronomists and the agricultural business sector, 5) Assess impacts of marginal acres program on taxpayer funded programs and agriculture policies. Area of focus will be four regions across eastern South Dakota including; Moody, Lake and Minnehaha counties with eroded and wet areas; Brown, Spink, Clark and Day counties with saline/sodic and wet areas in addition to Edmunds, Potter and Faulk; and Aurora, Brule, Buffalo and Jerauld counties with saline/sodic and eroded areas. Project findings will be distributed through SDSU iGrow and project partner outreach. Efforts will be specifically developed to share information with landowners, agriculture businesses, agronomists, agricultural lenders and financial consultants.

Secretary Kelly Hepler noted Governor Noem spoke to habitat during the State of the State address so people should have no doubt that the Governor is all for habitat. The Department will be working with the Commission to find ways to implement initiatives regarding habitat. He applauded the efforts of passionate people getting involved and hopes to see passionate people help move initiatives forward along with partnerships with producers and industry groups. The commission will play a vital role in this process.

G. Jensen said habitat is at the top the of commissions priority list it has been and it will continue to be. Habitat will be discussed at every meeting to keep it on the forefront as well as what can be done to lead efforts to get youth involved.

### **PETITIONS**

#### **Muzzleloader Antelope Season**

Leif informed the Commission this petition was withdrawn by Petitioner as it does not propose all the changes the petitioner wanted to bring forward at this time. It may be brought forward in the future.

#### **Deer Tagging Requirements**

Leif presented the petition submitted by Benjamin Lewis to allow tagging of deer on the antler/horn base. Leif explained the petition process noting the Commission can approve or deny the petition and cannot amend it. He also noted staff were already reviewing tagging requirements when this petition was received.

Phillips asked if this would be beneficial for times when a deer is harvested and meat is taken to Feeding South Dakota and the horns go to taxidermist. He inquired if this is the time to address this so a portion goes on the ankle and another on the horns.

Leif said that is something that happens on occasion with the requirement to have the tagged leg go with the animal. He explained that if the commission chooses to move forward with the petition the change can be made at finalization.

Motion by Phillips, second by Locken TO APPROVE THE PETITION TO MODIFY THE REQUIREMENTS FOR TAGGING DEER. Motion carried unanimously.

## **PROPOSALS**

### **Hunt for Habitat License**

Leif explained the Department plans to bring the Commission a recommendation in March to establish "Hunt for Habitat" super licenses and allow residents and nonresidents the opportunity to purchase raffle chances through the state licensing system without restriction on the number that can be purchased. The plan would be to impose a restriction that no more than one set of "Hunt for Habitat" licenses can be issued to a nonresident in a year. The Department is working on draft legislation that would authorize the Commission to establish an application fee for these special licenses with the revenue dedicated exclusively for habitat projects.

### **Turkey Transportation Requirements**

Andy Alban, wildlife law enforcement administrator, explained that over the last year, Department officials have been contacted by licensed hunters regarding turkey transportation requirements. Many of these individuals desire the ability to remove the edible portions from the turkey and transport the cleaned turkey in a cooler similar to how some other big game animals are cared for in the field. However, current regulation stipulates that the beard, leg and foot remain naturally attached to the rest of the carcass. The proposed changes to 41:06:03:02

1. Eliminating the requirement that the beard, leg and foot bearing the tag remain naturally attached to the rest of the turkey when transported from the place where taken until the bird has arrived at the domicile of the possessor.
2. Establishing an alternative requirement that the beard, leg and foot bearing the tag simply accompany the rest of the turkey when transported from the place where taken until the bird has arrived at the domicile of the possessor.
3. Eliminating the aforementioned requirement to transport the beard if a person is licensed to take "any turkey".

This would make the transportation process easier and align with other big game transportation requirements found in 41:06:03:06. The turkey transportation requirements would remain waived for birds processed at a wildlife processing facility and accompanied by the receipt or those birds processed at the domicile of the possessor.

Motion by Phillips, second by Sharp TO APPROVE THE CHANGES IN REQUIREMENTS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF WILDLIFE TURKEY AS PRESENTED. Motion carried unanimously.

## **Spring Turkey Archery Hunting**

Tom Kirschenmann, wildlife deputy director, presented the recommended changes to the spring wild turkey hunting season to close archery turkey hunting in Lake County south of State Highway 34. He explained that in cooperation with the National Wild Turkey Federation and private landowners, GFP is conducting turkey transplants in southern Lake County with the goal to establish a sustainable wild turkey population. Current efforts have resulted in only a few male turkeys transplanted, with additional trap and transfer efforts planned for 2019. Until the population reaches a sufficient size and gender composition, it is believed necessary to close this area to archery hunting. SDGFP will continue to work with partners to trap and transfer appropriate birds to the area and monitor this turkey population.

Motion by Boyd, second by B. Jensen TO APPROVE THE CLOSURE OF ARCHERY TURKEY HUNTING IN LAKE COUNTY SOUTH OF HIGHWAY 34. Motion carried unanimously.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

The Public Hearing began at 2:00 p.m. and concluded at 2:15 p.m. The minutes follow these Commission meeting minutes.

## **FINALIZATIONS**

### **Deer Hunting Season Drawing Structure**

Per the Commission's request Leif presented a revised proposal combining all eight seasons into the pooled drawing.

1. Create a combined drawing for the Black Hills, East River, West River, Refuge, Custer State Park and Muzzleloader deer hunting seasons where each applicant may submit no more than two applications including any application(s) submitted for a special buck license.
2. Modify the leftover license allocation process for the seasons in the combined deer drawing:
  - a. In the second draw, an applicant may not apply for a leftover license if the applicant possesses 2 licenses for any of the Black Hills, East River, West River, CSP, Refuge Deer and Muzzleloader deer seasons in the first draw. A person with 1 license for these seasons may submit 1 application for a season that the person does not hold a license.
  - b. In the third draw, leftover licenses are no longer pooled in a combined drawing and an applicant may submit one application for each season for which they do not possess a license. Only those nonresidents without a license may apply for a license remaining in pools originally designated (8%) for nonresidents (BHD, WRD or Refuge Deer).
  - c. In the fourth draw, licenses remain segregated in their respective seasons and residents may submit up to five applications. Only those nonresidents without a license may apply for a license remaining in pools originally designated (8%) for nonresidents (BHD, WRD or Refuge Deer).
  - d. After the fourth draw, all remaining resident and nonresident licenses would be pooled and sold first-come, first-served. There will be no limit on the number of licenses that a person can acquire (like it is currently).
3. Allow applicants to use preference points for both 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> choices in draws one through three. First draw applicants must use preference points for their first choice selection (as is currently required). An applicant who uses preference to acquire a license in a season may not purchase a preference point for that season.
4. Preference points for a combined deer drawing shall be issued without cost for any hunter that is or was age 15 or younger during the calendar year when the preference point is acquired.

5. A first-time applicant for a combined deer drawing that is or was age 15 or younger in the calendar year of the drawing shall receive a bonus preference point for that drawing.

Drawing	Resident	Nonresident
1 and 2	Maximum of 2 licenses in ERD, WRD, BHD, <u>CSP</u> , <u>Refuge Deer</u> or MZD	Maximum of 2 BHD or WRD or <u>Refuge Deer</u> licenses
3	Maximum of 1 license in <u>each</u> of the WRD, ERD BHD, <u>CSP</u> , <u>Refuge Deer</u> and MZD seasons.	
4	Maximum of five additional licenses for a maximum total of nine licenses.	
<b><i>Leftover Resident and Nonresident Licenses Pooled</i></b>		
5	Unlimited. First-come, First-served	Unlimited. First-come, First-served

Robling explained this has been an 18 month process. There has been a lot of discussion on both sides with lots of passionate deer hunters which is a good thing. Robling and Olson meet with a group on Monday night where this potential compromise approach was presented.

Olson said there are still 20,000 applicants we have not heard from so we have to base facts and statistics and comments we have been able to take in from the avid deer hunters as the voice of the deer hunting community. The main goal for this was to increased hunters opportunity for their preferred license. We hear about family traditions which we understand and we still want to increase opportunity because unless you are a land owner you are not guaranteed a tag. The draw structure may still a little confusing but it is currently in a format that is easier to understand and Olson is in support of it. We listen to our customers which are hunters, but they are not our only customers and we need to answer to all of our customers. This will probably set a record for the longest proposal and public comment period

Phillips noted there have been a lot of negative comments and he is tired of hearing the negativity toward the Commission and GFP staff. So if passed will there be support from these same people?

Robling said he spoke with Wayne Lloyd and others at the meeting and the majority support this compromise and there has not been any negative feedback on this compromise. They understand the Commission wants to help the deer hunters who do not get a tag and they are willing to give up a 3<sup>rd</sup> 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> application. We will give this a three year run then evaluate. This will take out about 9,600 applications.

Phillips stated at a previous meeting he told the public that if we pass this plan we will review it in 3 years. He urged that it must be reviewed in 3 years with the new deer plan to be reviewed just like any other plan.



Hepler thanked members of public involved and noted his displeasure with negative attacks on staff. He said in South Dakota we can find a compromise. So now instead of continued negative comments we are now looking for positive input on Habitat. It is difficult to see Commissioners who basically volunteers receive very little compensation having to deal with the negative attacks.

Phillips asked if it would be possible to pass a resolution to ensure a future commission reviews the plan in three years.

Leif responded that would certainly be an appropriate action to be put in the record that a comprehensive review be completed in 3 years. You could also take a look at it next year and make minor revisions if necessary.

B. Jensen said he wouldn't wait three years and recommended it be looked at after next year's season and tweak it if necessary. He noted some good changes have been made here and we worked to react to what hunters want. By adding two tags it makes quite a difference from the original proposal. His concern at this time is nonresidents now being in the in the 5<sup>th</sup> draw, he but will support the compromise as it is.

Boyd said because we heard from a few nonresident landowner can you clarify that they do not have opportunity to draw a tag.

Robing responded it would be very difficult for them to draw a license for those east river. Theoretically there will be fewer licenses made available.

Leif explained the preferential treatment for landowners in statute only pertains to resident landowners.

G. Jensen asked why it would be more difficult east river than West River. Leif said it is due to allocation of license per unit and demand for those licenses.

Locken said he had two interactions with east river with deer hunters. One was excited to have a doe tag. The other moved out of state for his occupation and is counting the days until he retired and can move back home to South Dakota. Locken said he would like to see nonresident draw moved to 4th draw, but will support the proposal as it is with nonresidents in 5th draw

Motion by Locken, second to B. Jensen TO MOVE NONRESIDENTS BACK TO FOURTH DRAW.

Petersen said she appreciates the help of all to work together with the idea to provide opportunity to those who do not have an opportunity. She explained the main concern is getting these people in the field and asked the avid hunters making input on this proposal to help by taking these new or reactivated hunters get back in the field. She is also hoping we can turn the social media culture around to be positive

Sharp said we will have so many more resident nonresident issues to address and recommended the Commission take up deer license draw opportunity with the other nonresident issues. He then asked staff to again explain the rule process and include when the draw will take place.

Leif explained that if the new proposal is approved it will go out for comment for a 30 plus day period until March meeting. At the March meeting it will be up for final approval by the Commission then introduce to the new IRRC for their approval. If passed it will be implemented to hold the combined deer draw in May or June with a report back on first deer drawing at the July meeting.

Phillips asked if the Commission does not adopt Locken's amendment if it is within the scope that it could be adopted at the March meeting.

Leif confirmed it would be within the scope of the rule change.

Phillips said it is a good thing to bring up and talk about and recommends bringing it up again at finalization if not passed today.

Locken withdraw motion TO MOVE NONRESIDENTS BACK TO THE FOURTH DRAW.

Motioned by B. Jensen, second by Locken TO AMEND THE DEER HUNTING SEASON DRAWING STRUCTURE PROPOSAL TO INCLUDE A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW BE COMPLETED IN 3 YEARS. Motion carried unanimously.

Motioned by Olson, second by Peterson TO APPROVE THE DEER HUNTING SEASON DRAWING STRUCTURE AS AMENDED. Motion carried unanimously.

## **OPEN FORUM**

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

Steve Nelson, Pierre, SD, spoke in regards to dove hunting legislation introduced by Representative Gosch to allow hunting next to the road which was killed in the Senate. This was good legislation and should not have been killed because one legislator was afraid someone might shoot his pet pigeons. He will ask legislators to reintroduce this piece of legislation.

Josh Lieberman, Pierre, SD, spoke on behalf of the Conservation Company, in regards to waterfowl refuges, requesting a schedule of future meetings and have it posted in three newspapers.

Steve Stoneback, Pierre, SD, signed up to speak in regards to the Spring Creek Lease, but had to leave for another commitment.

David Zuercher, Pierre, SD, spoke in regards to the Spring Creek Lease, as part of a group of lease holders who have concerns and have prepared a memo. If department extends the contract the concessionaire they will be immediately in default.

The rates charged for slips need to be comparable to those in the region. New lease raises the rates 24 percent. The lease notes concessionaire increases from 2 percent to 5 percent which would be paid by raising lease holder rates. If this is in fact true we would like some information to explain that this is accurate as it is our understanding that these rates are to be comparable. There are also maintenance issues.

Dana Rogers, Hill City, SD SDBI, spoke in regards to nonresident archery He said the increasing pressure and number of nonresidents archery hunting in South Dakota causes concerns with their being an unlimited number of deer and antelope archery permits. Because the cost of the licenses are low and the quantity of public land available there is an overabundance of nonresident archery hunter's statistics show nonresident hunters are more successful. He wants something to be done because it is impacting resident harvest even for firearm hunters in limited access units as well as the quality of resident hunter experience. Increase fees, put a cap on it, have a draw or require them to purchase a small game license.

Roger Hatling, Pierre, SD – no comment

## **DIVISION OF WILDLIFE**

### **Statewide Fisheries Plan Adoption**

John Lott, fisheries chief, requested the Commission adopt the statewide Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Adaptive Management System for 2019-2023.

Motioned by B. Jensen, second by Locken TO ADOPT THE STATEWIDE FISHERIES AND AQUATIC RESOURCES ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR 2019-2023. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Fisheries Management Area Plan Overviews**

Geno Adams, fisheries administrator, provided the Commission an overview of the fisheries management area (FMA) plan. He stated that over the past year, the Aquatics Section of GFP has been working on updating strategic plans for the East River, West River and Missouri River FMA. The previous FMA plans ran from 2014 – 2018 with the updated plans encompassing the 2019 – 2023 timeframe.

Outlining management priorities with a strategic plan is a way to optimize use of limited resources (staff, money, facilities and equipment) by prioritizing how these resources are used to best meet fisheries management needs. Objectives and strategies contained within the updated plans will help guide fisheries and aquatic resource management based on the mission of the GFP. The commission update will highlight accomplishments from the previous planning period and objectives from the new FMA plans.

### **CWD Management Plan Update**

Chad Switzer, wildlife administrator, presented an update on activities since the November Commission meeting was provided and included the following: summary of the first CWD stakeholder group meeting; updates to website; CWD conversation on GFP's Podcast & Blast; meetings and conversations with stakeholders; progress of draft action plan; and timeline moving forward

### Timeline Moving Forward

January 10-11: provide next update to GFP Commission

February 1: make draft action plan available for public comment

February 22: end of public comment period on first draft

February – March: present information at GFP regional meetings, conduct public meetings, meet with organizations and other stakeholders on draft action plan, and solicit public comment

February 28-March 1: present summary of modifications incorporated from public comment and provide final draft to Commission for review and additional public comment

Mid-March: next CWD stakeholder group meeting

April 4-5: ask GFP Commission for plan adoption and present Department recommendations related to applicable administrative rules

May 2-3: ask GFP Commission to finalize proposed rule changes and follow-up with implementation of action plan

### **Farm Bill Update**

Mark Norton, hunting access and farm bill coordinator, provided an update on the 2018 Farm Bill which was signed into law on December 20, 2018. Many of the priorities that the commission identified in a letter to South Dakota's U.S. Senators and Congressional Representative were addressed to some extent. The CRP national acreage cap will increase by 2023 to 27 million acres from 24 million with a minimum of 2 million being enrolled in Grassland CRP. The allowance of haying and grazing was increased while maintaining the wildlife habitat value of the program. Rental rates were limited to 85% for general CRP and 90% for continuous CRP of the county average rate. The Soil Health and Income Protection Program was created as a pilot within CRP. It will function like a short-term CRP of 3 to 5 years on up to 15% of the least productive land on a farm with annual payments equal to 50% of county average rental rate and allow haying and grazing with a 25% rental rate reduction.

Swampbuster and Sodsaver were maintained with additional requirements of USDA to track native sod conversion and report on it annually. The Ag Conservation Easement Program had annual funding restored to \$450 and allows more things including landowner donated value to count as required match towards Ag Land Easements. The Voluntary Public Access and Habitat Incentive Program was reauthorized and received a \$10 million funding increase. The Environmental Quality Incentive Program will receive an additional \$425 million in funding over the next 5 years with an increased requirement to spend 10% instead of 5% on wildlife habitat. The Regional Conservation Partnership Program also received increased annual funding \$200 million. All of the increases in funding came from cuts to the Conservation Stewardship Program which was reduced but maintained.

G. Jensen so we will look at the new farm bill and look at how we can work with the department to focus on habitat.

Norton stated there is a need to work to create more programs and funding to put more habitat on the ground.

Kirschenmann detailed the second century initiatives we are currently looking at and brainstorming what can be done short-term and long-term to put habitat on the ground as well as maximizing opportunity. At this time we have the ability to expand on partnerships. Opportunities are endless we just need to partner and implement.

G. Jensen noted the Commission wants to be helpful where they can so please let them know what they can do to help.

Locken said it is a complicated process to be knowledgeable of the programs that are available and utilize the marginal acres.

Kirschenmann responded the department will do their best to inform people of the opportunities available to them such as Every Acre Counts. Staff will also work to collaborate with SD Department of Agriculture and have already had discussions.

### **Shooting Range Partnership Projects**

Simpson provided background information on the shooting range program and highlighted the funding sources used. The department currently allocates approximately \$280,000 in the Wildlife Capital Development budget to provide grant opportunities to nonprofit and governmental entities looking to establish or improve recreational shooting opportunities for the public. This allocation also provides funds for maintenance and operation of GFP owned shooting ranges.

Simpson also highlighted some significant projects that were placed into the Wildlife Capital Development budget as standalone projects. This included a partnership with the Rapid City Trap Club for renovation of some of their facilities (\$263,000) and a partnership with the City of Watertown for the construction of a rifle and pistol range (\$228,000).

Peterson inquired if the public utilizes and takes care of the ranges

Simpson responded the public appreciates that they have great local facilities to utilize and police and govern these ranges themselves.

### **Year-end License Sales Update**

Simpson provided an update on the sale of 2019 licenses which went on sale December 15, 2018. Most license types, both resident and nonresident, are lagging behind last year's totals. The exception is nonresident small game sales, which were up about 25% over the same few weeks last year. The department will be providing reminders to previous license holders over the next few weeks to encourage them to purchase their annual privileges.

Simpson also provided a recap of 2018 license year sales. While revenue for over the counter licenses was similar to 2017, several annual licenses saw reduced sales in 2018. These included resident combination, junior combination and annual fishing licenses. While the decrease in revenue was offset by an increase in nonresident small game licenses, the decrease in participation is a source of concern.

Additional emphasis will be placed on recruiting, retaining and reactivating hunters in anglers in hopes of reversing these trends.

Simpson provided information on the Apprentice, Archery and Mentored deer seasons. Each of these seasons saw reduced regulation or increased opportunity in 2018, and participation increased in each season. Of note were the 531 Apprentice deer licenses issued to individuals 18 years of age or older and the 1051 Mentored deer licenses issued for use by youth under the age of 10.

Peterson thanked GFP staff and administration on behalf of the Commission stating they couldn't do what they do without the staff. They appreciate the support, help, expertise and friendship even though they may sometimes forget to say please know it is appreciated.

B. Jensen said it has been a huge honor to work with the department and to get to know everyone.

Peterson said this has been one of the greatest privileges of her life. It has been wonderful and part of healing to get back here and finish her term.

## **DIVISION OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

### **Custer State Park Private Cabin Transfer**

Bob Schneider, parks and recreation assistant director, asked the Commission to approve a resolution authorizing the department to execute a Consent to a transfer and assignment of a private cabin permit in Custer State Park from Larry and Betty Swick to Andrew Swick. The Commission approved the action.

Motioned by Peterson with second by B. Jensen TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 19-01 (Appendix A) as presented Motion carried unanimously.

### **Spring Creek Resort and Marina Concession Lease**

Al Nedved, parks and recreation assistant director and Jennie Fuerst, concessionaire manager, appeared to present to the Commission a resolution that would facilitate an extension of the current lease held by Spring Creek Ventures for a period not to exceed 1 year. A representative of the boaters at Spring Creek appeared earlier during Open Forum and presented a letter to the Commission regarding slip fees, maintenance, and safety. After some discussion, the matter was tabled until the next day. Nedved reported that the Department staff had some discussions with the boaters and did some quick analysis of the fees being proposed. However, it was still difficult to determine if the fee proposal was not in compliance with the lease language, so Nedved recommended that the extension be held contingent upon Spring Creek Ventures being in compliance with the lease agreement.

Commission voted for approval and motion passed 7-1.

Motion by Sharp, second by Boyd TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 19-02 (Appendix B) as presented. Roll Call Vote: Boyd-yes; Locken – yes; B. Jensen – yes, Olson – no, Peterson-yes; Phillips – yes; Sharp- no; G. Jensen-yes. Motion passes with 7 yes votes and 1 no vote. Motion passes.

B. Jensen inquired if the department will be organizing a meeting with lease holder and slip holder?

Nedved explained staff will continue to assess what is acceptable according to comparable and reasonable rates as well as the other issues which are maintenance and repair items. Through the lease the department does safety inspections as does SD Bureau of Administration. The department will continue to enhance these inspections.

Olson asked if we are ultimately responsible for the concessions. He noted the complaints received and concerns with lack of due process. He said he cannot support something that does not allow due process for our customers.

Nedved responded there are lease rules on performance standards and provisions to addresses complaints but the department is looking at input to improve this.

G. Jensen requested lease language be sent to the Commission.

Sharp stated we are dealing with a unique situation and is not sure we have the ability to take into account a free market system when lease holders will need to raise prices to operate as we cannot dictate what the economy does.

### **Lake Hiddenwood Update**

Nedved updated the Commission on the status of Lake Hiddenwood Recreation Area. The dam at Lake Hiddenwood was breached on May 18, 2018. No injuries were reported. On June 14, 2018 Governor Daugaard made a request for a disaster declaration that included Campbell, McPherson, and Walworth Counties. On August 31, that request was denied. An appeal was issued on September 25, and that appeal was denied on October 15, 2018. Therefore there are no resources that would be able to assist with any efforts to repair the dam, which is conceptually estimated in the \$3-5 million range. In December, the engineering staff began evaluating the property to help determine possible options for restoring access, recreational facilities, and cleanup of the damaged dam and associated structures. Also, in December, the Department began contacting people with an interest or stakeholder interest in the Lake Hiddenwood to form a working group. To help provide input on option development for the property and identify potential partners that could assist in making repairs or provide maintenance/management of the area in the future. The Department is anticipating a meeting date in late January or early February. The Department would welcome the participation of a Commission member and will provide an invitation when the details are determined. The Department hopes to have a final plan by May.

### **Emerald Ash Borer Preparation Efforts in State Parks**

Travis Theilen, parks and recreation division staff specialist, explained to the Commission that State Parks are responding to the Emerald Ash Borer (EAB) threat and developing management plans for the process of removing ash trees and replacing with diverse tree species. Over the course of 5-10 years, all parks should have ash trees to a manageable level in the event EAB is detected in the park. These plans will

be reasonable so the impact to park use and operations is as positive as possible. Parks will be using a GIS tool to track and understand important areas to focus their efforts.

### **Palisades State Park Land Donation Update**

South Dakota Parks and Wildlife Foundation Sean Blanchette and Al Nedved gave an update on the Palisades land acquisitions. Since the transfer of 80 acres last month from the Foundation to the Department, the Foundation was able to secure a purchase agreement on another 97 acres of property directly east to bring the total of 177 acres that will be added to the park. The Foundation is also working on an agreement that would facilitate the trade of property in the area for another 80 acres bringing the total to 257 acres. Nedved reported that these acres will help give Palisades room to develop additional recreational opportunities to the growing Sioux Falls area such as camping, trails, river/canoe access, interpretive and education facilities, and better access to the park. Next steps include doing some master planning and public input, identify stakeholders and potential partnerships, and identify funding sources for future development.

### **Revenue, Camping and Visitation Report**

Schneider reported that overall revenue for CY 2018 was up 25% from CY 2017 while the number of camping units was down 2% and visitation was down 3%. Schneider stated that 2017 was a record year for revenue and camping and 2018 numbers were second only to that year. April and October were low park use months, due to inclement weather and was the primary factor causing the lower annual numbers.


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

No agenda items were recommended

### **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 11:27 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Kelly R. Hepler, Department Secretary



**Appendix A**  
**RESOLUTION 19-01**

WHEREAS, the South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks Commission has been advised that Larry and Betty Swick are owners of a cabin located in Custer State Park (Custer County) on property described as:

No. 2 Camp Narrows in the Northeast Quarter (NE 1/4) of the Southwest Quarter (SW 1/4) and the Southeast Quarter (SE1/4) of the Northwest Quarter (NW 1/4) of Section Seven (7), Township Four (4) South, Range Six (6) East, of the Black Hills Meridian, Custer County, South Dakota.

WHEREAS, the property upon which the cabin is located is owned by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks and has been leased to Larry and Betty Swick and other joint owners by permit by reason of a Stipulation of Settlement and Dismissal entered in Craft v. Wipf, Civil Action No. 85-5092, U.S. District Court for the District of South Dakota, Western Division, and subsequent agreements and permits executed thereafter based on said Stipulation and Dismissal; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has been advised that Larry and Betty Swick desires to and have transferred and assigned all of their joint interest in said cabin and cabin site permit to Andrew Swick; and;

WHEREAS, the Commission has been requested to approve said Transfer and Assignment.

NOW, therefore, be it resolved that in the event the Department receives an executed Agreement and Assignment of the cabin site permit and cabin and appurtenances located thereon and which further provides that said Assignee agrees to abide by all of the terms and conditions of the aforementioned Stipulation of Settlement and Dismissal and all subsequent agreements relative thereto, including but not limited to Cabin Site Permits, Addendums, and all agreements relative to establishing the lease or rental payments due the Department, then in that event, the Department is authorized to execute a Consent to the requested Assignment.

**Appendix B**  
**RESOLUTION 19-02**

WHEREAS, the current Concession Lease Agreement at Spring Creek Resort And Marina located in Spring Creek Recreation Area dated February 29, 2008 expires on December 31, 2018; and

WHEREAS, as required by the regulations promulgated by the Game, Fish, and Parks Commission, the Department has issued prospectuses on June 28, 2018 and December 26, 2018 to solicit a successor concessionaire for a new ten year concession lease agreement; and

WHEREAS, the prospectus issuances will expire on January 31, 2019 and have not yet yielded an acceptable proposal; and

WHEREAS, as further provided in the regulations promulgated by the Game, Fish, and Parks Commission, the Commission may extend the Concession Lease Agreement for one year at a time to allow for a successor Concessionaire to be found; and

WHEREAS, the current Concessionaire, Spring Creek Ventures, LLC (Concessionaire) is agreeable to a one year extension of the Concession Lease Agreement

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the GFP Commission does hereby approve an extension of the current Concession Agreement for one year resulting in an expiration date of December 31, 2019.

Public Hearing Minutes of the Game, Fish and Parks Commission  
January 10, 2019

The Public Hearing Officer Scott Phillips began the public hearing at 2:00 p.m. at RedRossa Convention Center in Pierre, South Dakota. Commissioners Gary Jensen, Mary Anne Boyd, Jon Locken, Cathy Petersen, Scott Phillips, Russell Olson and Douglas Sharp were present. Vice Chairman Jensen indicated written comments were provided to the Commissioners prior to this time and will be reflected in the Public Hearing Minutes. Phillips then invited the public to come forward with oral testimony.

**Deer Hunting Season Drawing Structure**

Wayne Lloyd, Wentworth, SD, spoke in regards to the current proposal which includes 4 tags. He proposes throwing all 8 tags in allowing the hunter to apply for 2 tags and then the average hunter can still draw an east and west river tag and put more tags in the draw with 1,000 or more hunters receiving tags that do not. This gives the tags to the avid hunter who puts their money into habitat. He noted concerns are the public doesn't feel like they are being heard by the commission.

John Simpson, Pierre, SD, As a multi-tag applicants he likes the opportunity to apply as a passionate hunter but realizes he will not get all the tags he applies for. Suggests this will get more hunters in the field, but should do it by encouraging people to apply for more tags. Also thinks we should wait and see how the cubing of points does and possibly look at other options.

Ron Erion, Spearfish, SD thanked the Commission for their efforts knowing it is not easy. He was on focus group and is a single tag hunter who lives in town and doesn't have access to other places to hunt. He understands the argument of others but just wants the opportunity to draw one tag. Note he will probably draw 3 tags in 9 years. Encouraged the commission to move to plan forward as the current system is broke and needs to be fixed.


Dana Rogers, Hill City, SD was on one of the stakeholder groups, attended the focus groups and provided open public comment. He said this is not perfect and never will be. He is a hunter like many who apply for every tag, but is willing to receive a reduced number of tags to give others the opportunity to be a hunter. He said some people apply for only one tag also have their reason for how they apply. Changes have been made to the proposal as requests were made. He urged the Commission to take action to move forward and hope the IRRC passes it this time.

Dayne Weelborg, Estelline, SD, As a multiple tag applicant and passionate hunter he does not like this stating the same people who spend their money on habitat and mentor youth hunters which needs to be looked at not just the spreadsheets and hunters. Can't afford to lose these hunters to nonresidents.

See attached public comments submitted prior to the public hearing

The public Hearing concluded at 2:14 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Kelly R. Hepler, Department Secretary

# Public Comments

## Deer License Allocation

---

**Chris Larson**

**Vermillion SD**

**cjlarson@nrctv.com**

**Comment:**

If you can't figure out the reason the legislative group sent it back was because a majority of people told you to leave things alone than there is a bigger issue than the license drawing. The legislators told you that you held meetings and took public input like you should but you ignored the results that you received. Mr. Olson's comment that it was about getting more young people a chance for a license is something I never heard until today. Youth can get tags they want in mentor and youth seasons along with additional chances in the regular draws in today's system. They also can get landowner preference if they live at home. Before today it was always about getting 3500 more hunters tags in their preferred unit. not young people more tags. Someone is trying to play the sympathy vote. Time to listen.

---

**Jordan Miller**

**Canton SD**

**Jordan@run2gun.com**

**Comment:**

Changes to the deer application process ARE MOT NEEDED.

Please start listening to the drastic opposition to these changes. You have been shot down time after time on these changes.

---

**Terry Halvorson**

**Yankton SD**

**ttllhh4@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I apply for all seasons separate as it is stated will increase chance for drawing a first choice it is the opposite for the people like me and my friends, as it is now we have 3 x the chance as we apply for 3 separate tags , example under the proposed change we apply for one tag if we get it have to wait for 3 re drawing to apply for more , all the areas we apply for only have one drawing after the first drawing their are no more tags left, so we are getting less a chance to draw a tag under the new plan, if it goes through Gfp will loose a lot of hunters and income from hunters like myself and my friends, so I am against the change of app process as of approx 60% of all the sportsmen in sd

---

**Jacob Puetz**

**Parkston SD**

**Jackpuetz@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Please stop moving forward with the proposed deer licensing changes. You continue to ignore the overwhelming opposition to the proposed changes. The most recent changes (12-07-18) do not make this proposal any more desirable to the established hunters that you seem bent on driving away. I was thankful that our legislators shot this down, and I hope that the new legislative committee members will do the same with the modified proposal if it makes it that far. Thank you.

---

**Chris Solum**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**csolum@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I hunt east river every year. My family has land in Robert's county. I am only able to draw tags there approx once every 3 years. I think I should get to hunt private land every year vs having to abandon land I can hunt and have to go hunt public land in a different county before non resident people get tags in Robert's county.

---

**Thomas Harnois**

**Pierre SD**

**Tharnois888@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Same thing still just focused on pooling it as one. Just trying to make it about the kids to shove it threw and is not right! At least pull muzzel loader and black hills to one draw choice for both and west and east as one draw choice. Lesser of evil

---

**Justin Knight**

**Watertown SD**

**Advancedconcrete13@icloud.com**

**Comment:**

The whole deer draw change is not for the sportsman! I don't know who's idea it is but they are not for the best interest of the South Dakota deer hunter! Is this persons pockets getting lined? Must be! Bad bad bad idea!

---

**Dan Bridenstine**

**Lead SD**

**dbridenstine@live.com**

**Comment:**

I would love to see just a one tag per unit. That way hopefully myself and family can obtain a tag!! Lots of deer. Don't like seeing them.but by cars trucks ect. Thanks

---

**David Mines**

**Yankton SD**

**davidmines4831@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

This deer proposal is such a joke. The sportsman and women of South Dakota told you we didn't want it to change, you didn't care or listen. Then it was thrown back in your face by the rules committee. Take the hint we don't want it. Drop the whole st You are losing the support of Sportsman over this idea. Don't go down this path.

---

**Daniel Ridgway**

**Lennox SD**

**Comment:**

I would like to see these changes tabled till next year seems like there is a lot of opposition and it seems to work fine now

---

**Joseph Rotert**

**Garretson SD**

**jwrotert@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Please leave the process as it is today. We spend our time and money purchasing preference points and applying for both our first choice areas and others that are less pressured to hunt. These changes will not make a difference. The same amount of people will be applying for the same amount of tags in popular counties and areas. Please don't prohibit those conservationists that choose to travel our great state and spend time in less populated and popular parts of our great state.

I humbly ask that the deer application process stay as it is. It is not broken by any stretch. Please don't try and change something that is currently working for the majority of hunters today.

---

**Lawrence Wold**

**Armour SD**

**larry@atailfortales.com**

**Comment:**

I believe what the Public wanted was to go back and separate West and East river drawings - returning to the existing system. We can give youth more preference points and limit non-res... but don't combine the drawings please!

This new proposal will screw up our potential separate hunts that we all have, yearly, to visit long term friends- on both sides of the river. Your messing around with long standing hunting traditions. That cant be taken lightly.

---

**Brock Abeln**

**Groton SD**

**b.abeln@nvc.net**

**Comment:**

That's great and all, but when in the hell are you guys going to start considering all of us resident disabled hunters and give us the season of our own earlier in the year than the rifle season. Do you have any idea how much work my family and caregivers go through to get me ready to go hunting in 35° or colder weather. I am wheelchair-bound and deer hunting is more than a passion to me, it literally is an obsession. My family and caregivers will do it but other peoples may not. Why don't you make a season just for us in like October or September when the weather is nice and allow other people who are not able to tolerate the cold or snow if we have it. Why don't you allow Disabled residents even more opportunity to get out in the field. Isn't that what hunting is all about. To me it's about getting out in the field, spending time with friends and family, and enjoying nature. Other states have done it maybe it's time the South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks get out board. You are going through all this trouble to help youth hunters and residents and you're missing a completely different group who honestly could use that help even more. Four years now you guys that make ignored us hunters with limited mobility. I agree with what you guys are proposing all I am saying is that I think resident disabled hunters should also be considered on the list of people you guys should be helping and thinking about. If you think there are not that many of us in the state you're wrong. Feel free to contact me if you would like my comments on anything else regarding this subject.

---

**Kory Knutson**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Comment:**

I believe this is fair for all residents. I normally hunt West River and was unsuccessful. Yet I knew others that drew an east river and west river tag.

Making hunters select what their first choice is will only allow more hunters in the field.

---

**Tyler Richardson**

**Rapid City SD**

**Comment:**

This proposal does not help resident deer hunters. It takes away the opportunity to hunt through out the fall. The gfp simulations showed there would be a minimal increase in draw odds. While drastically limiting my ability to enjoy hunting throughout the fall wth my family and friends. I strongly oppose any change to the current system.

---

**John Karlen**

**Howard SD**

**karlenj@alliancecom.nwt**

**Comment:**

East River Land Owners are still getting screwed if they want to put West River hunting first choice. We put up with all the damage these animals do. So land owners should be number one priority.

---

**Gene Brockel**

**Mobridge SD**

**Midco.netebrockel.@abe.**

**Comment:**

Seems to me what I have read only 42% of surveying people were for it which means majority don't want the proposed draw system take the hint and leave it the way it is. Every one I have talked to in north central wants it left the way it is now. Concerned landowner

---

**David Artz**

**Valley Springs SD**

**dartz81@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Adding chances for youth is an outstanding idea. Taking away opportunity from hunters who have put in the time and effort to cultivate relationships for both ERD and WRD is a horrible idea. It will not allow more people to draw tags as those who are not drawing tags are not willing to be proud active and not willing to look outside of a given unit, you are not adding tags in a given unit, so people not willing to put in time and travel to appreciate the outdoors and hunting opportunities will gain nothing, if they are willing to do this they have already put together ways to be able to hunt yearly.

---

**Casey Smith**

**River Falls WI**

**Caseyrachaelsmith@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I would hope that tag costs would drop for non residents if our opportunity's are being so limited. I respect the fact that residents want to hunt more. However it is extremely disappointing that I annually spend hundreds-thousands of dollars to hunt and fish SD and to so clearly be shoved to the back of the line just because I don't reside in your state (btw my parents do live in the Black Hills) is insulting to say the least. I'm sure you have plenty of residents that hunt and fish in other states including WI. Stats welcome the additional revenue and support of their local economies. BAD move!

---

**Logan Roth**

**Salem SD**

**Logan.roth.m@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

The system the way it is set up currently is more than fair. This was something that was already voted down. Why is the GFP pushing this issue. Spending resources they could be spending on other areas that need work such as hunter education, non hunter education, and enforcing the current rules.



---

**Brett Bollinger**

**Houston TX**

**Bollinger.brett.m@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Hello,

I am a Nonresident and suggest Youths and Residents of South Dakota receive priority over Nonresidents for deer licenses. Nonresident hunters by definition have the money to travel somewhere outside their state to hunt. Your Residents may not have that luxury. Thank you for your consideration and desire for fairness.

Best regards,  
Brett Bollinger

---

**Dan Bridenstine**

**Lead SD**

**dbridenstine@live.com**

**Comment:**

One tag per unit. I think this is the right way to go

---

**Paul Carroll**

**Rapid City SD**

**paul-hunter@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Unless we are giving out 3800 more tags ! Then the 3800 more hunters seems very unrealistic!

---

**Jason Haskell**

**Aberdeen SD**

**j.kr@nrctv.com**

**Comment:**

I am generally in support of this modified proposal. I appreciate that youth are being pushed to the forefront and that residents are a focus. I also feel that there needs to be attention paid to the amount of tags that are issued to non-residents during archery season. I feel that there needs to be a percentage maximum in relation to the number of resident tags issued to help limit the number of non-residents that hunt South Dakota.

---

**Tony Mischke**

**Altamont SD**

**tonymischke01@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the current deer proposal. I just can't understand why this change is needed, and surely is not needed. This has nothing to do with providing more opportunity. If it was truly about that there would be no available deer tags on 12-7(Faulk, Edmunds, and Harding). This change is only about buck hunting, nothing about deer hunting. This proposal will not change your opportunity to draw an east river rifle tag. I went to Harding county this year with my friend and harvested two does, had a great time. I made the decision just like many to hunt where there are more tags available. If the commission really wants a great idea, help with hunter/landowner access programs. I think that would be a great help to hunters that are not comfortable talking with landowners. It also could ease pressure on public ground.

---

**Philip Mccauley**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**philip.mccauley@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Your purposed changes still do not address the main reasons why there was opposition to the original purposed change.

---

**James Gruber**

**Estelline SD**

**jgruber148@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

if you really want to provide more opportunity. get rid of the 50 percent land owner allotment..allow only one license per landowner period.. not every member.. secondly provide this license only to those land owners who prove they are providing for wildlife with foodplots, crp or other forms of wildlife habitat instead of giving the license to those who do nothing and not even hunt on their own land.. then your talking..

---

**Aaron Busmann**

**Brookings SD**

**aaronbusmann@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Why should youth hunters get two times the amount of preference points that I do when I've been hunting deer in South Dakota for over 25 years, not right should make it the same for every hunter. Why can't you just leave the drawing alone this is changing nothing for the people sending off for those desired counties. The same people are still going to send off for them. there for your chances of drawing are still the same. So what are you trying to accomplish?

---

**James Goesch**

**Montrose CO**

**jmgoesch@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

My son and I have enjoyed hunting I South Dakota for several years. We have been happy to be able to acquire east river doe tags after residents have had their opportunity to get tags. My question is does this new system mean nonresidents will no longer be able to acquire any east river doe tags? I also wonder the logic behind having residents being able to obtain up to nine licenses in the first four resident only draws. Seems pretty glutinous! It may be the case that South Dakota doesn't want nonresidents coming there and spending our money and if that's the case so be it. Thanks for the memories!

---

**Josh Schmidt**

**Aberdeen SD**

**jjschmidt2270@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

In my current situation I'd like to apply for any deer in Corson County and any deer in Lake County. My understanding is, similar to now, my odds will not be increased in the drawing for either County. It will continue to take several years to ever get a tag. I thought the point is to increase your odds in the first draw. I'd like to continue hunting eastern Meade County, but the hunting pressure is going up and public land access is going down. Not much fun anymore.

---

**Phillip Campbell**

**Pierre SD**

**Waleyhnr@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I am highly against changes to the current system but understand that tags like the muzzleloader any deer tag would have to take numerous years to draw and as far as east west and black hills licenses should stay the same

---

**Pat Schulte**

**Rapid City SD**

**Ggrazing@icloud.com**

**Comment:**

With the majority of the people. Against this why don't you drop it,who the hell is in charge over there,think it might be time for a house cleaning

---

**Scott Hall**  
**Milbank SD**  
**Scotthall529@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I would like to ask why you would go against the majority of sportsman in south dakota with this praposal? In my opinion there is nothing wrong with the current system. I get tags every year. So do lots of other people. This new system will not make it easier to get a coveted tag in a specific unit. I'm for getting youth involved in hunting but using them to push this threw was really low. And tag muzzle loader out its a primitive weapon.

---

**Matt Sommerfeld**  
**Tea SD**  
**Smsumms@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I am not sure why I am writing this because the commission already know what they want even though the resident sportsman of this state don't want it changed. Leave everything alone. It works fine the way it is. We have been hunting west river and east river for 40 years with family and friends. Some years we get tags and some years we don't. That is life. Leave it alone!! No one wants it changed!! I would think if people don't want it changed the commission would leave it alone or is the commission getting something out of it being changed???

---

**Andrew Albers**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**swedefish.aaa@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

This was a great amendment to the current changes. I would like to say something needs to be done about land owner tags. I should not have to compete with landowners on public land that are trophy hunting. It's not right. They get tags every year sometimes for the entire family. They should be limited either to their own land or only private lands. This especially applies to west river mule deer hunting and Black Hills elk hunting.

---

**Jason Weishaar**  
**Fargo ND**  
**Weishaarjason@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Why not look at a lifetime license system like many other states do that would allow non-residendents who lived in SD for some period to still apply during first draw as long as they have purchased a lifetime reidency tag? I was born and raised in SD and still spend many days of the year back there fishing with my dad and my kids. I still purchase a youth deer tag for my daughter every year but this year was the last year that my oldest daughter is eligible. I would be more than happy to pay a reasonable non resident fee so that my daughter and i could get a tag if I could apply during the first or second drawing, just like everyone else. This new system is a serious step backwards in my opinion and allowing resident hunters to get 6 or 7 tags is ridiculous. Has SD ever looked at offering lifetime tags for residency like MN and other states do? Thank you.

Jason Weishaar

---

**Sven Wilen**  
**Belle Fourche SD**

**Comment:**

I am concerned that the limitation of non-residents not being able to draw until the 5th drawing would effectively eliminate their deer hunting opportunities in South Dakota. Perhaps I misunderstand, and it only applies to multiple tags for them, but I quote "Nonresident deer hunting opportunities would be pushed back to the fifth draw, giving resident deer hunters an increased opportunity to acquire multiple licenses ahead of nonresidents". In my roughly 35 years of deer hunting as a resident, I have met numerous non-resident (often former residents) hunters that are ardent supporters of SD deer hunting and great advocates. Of course, they also provide significant economic benefits. Usually these interactions have taken place in the Black Hills where there is so much opportunity to enjoy the outdoors and public lands. I appreciate your serious consideration of my comments and look forward to your response.

---

**Mark Ohman**  
**Brookings SD**  
**mohman@itctel.com**

**Comment:**

Why are we trying to change our deer application system? What we've been doing for many years is working fine. You've already made it impossible to get both special buck tags for some unknown reason. Instead of having a small group of commissioners decide this proposal, some of which may have a monetary incentive, why not let the SD resident hunters decide? It wouldn't be too hard to send your proposal on a survey ballot to all who received deer tags in 2017 and 2018. The resident hunters should be the ones who decide this.

---

**Arnold Veen**  
**Milbank SD**  
**arnieveen@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I was on a focus group and would encourage the commission to remove the MZD application from the proposal. MZD is a primitive weapon season and should not be included in the proposal as such. By adding the youth to the proposal to run the same proposal thru does not change the original proposal that has so much opposition from the public.

---

**Randall Pratt**  
**Mitchell SD**  
**rpratt@mit.midco.net**

**Comment:**

Keeping hunters active and recruiting younger people must be done. Hunting will die along with the old "no change" crowd as hunters become a small minority of the population. When actually seen in operation I don't believe the people making noise about this will see a big change in opportunity because probability will continue in the process at only slightly modified levels unless a large number of folks learn to game the system somehow the tags drawn over 10 years will balance out because second draw will be better sometimes.

---

**Jason Bryant**

**Canton SD**

**jasonjr.bryant@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

South Dakota Deer Hunting. I cant figure out why the state would want to change anything with how drawings have been done. Its not broken so dont fix it. It worked just fine the way it was. Now its going to get so screwed up know one is going to know Leave hunting alone South Dakota. Its worked fine for how many years and how your going to screw it up

---

**Jane Kingston**

**Eveleth MN**

**janehkingston@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

WRD License Draw; pro-youth & pro-residents vs. nonresidents. Understand completely necessity of giving youth hunting incentive, as well as SD residents preference. My family/friends (NONRES) group loves Perkins County deer, its landscape, & people; WRD License Draw; pro-youth & pro-residents vs. nonresidents. Understand completely necessity of giving youth hunting incentive, as well as SD residents preference. My family/friends (NONRES) group loves Perkins County deer, its landscape, & people;

---

**Matt Bones**

**Hartford SD**

**mjbones2007@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Strongly oppose!!!! Leave the draw system alone! There is no need to change things around when they already work great. But I'm sure emails wont matter again because the sdgfp has their mind made up and want to do this with or without support. Oh by the way you don't have support on this proposal

---

**Dan Snyder**

**Pierre SD**

**Shunkaska57501@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Not a fan of the changes, first off it what about all my preference points I have paid for, the percentages are only 8% better in my west mellette and and east sully any deer counties I hunt in and when I look at muzzle loading the percentage jumps but when I emailed and talked to the commissioners that wasn't going to be included. It looks like the most active in this sport are not the ones you are interested in. I will give up 100's of free labor to hunt in east and west river ranches and become part of these families just for the right to hunt. Although I respect GFand P and the commissioners I disagree with this whole heartily. With a shrinking deer heard and licenses being reduced because of the deceases, our opportunity has already been effected. We are being kicked to the curb over the group who apply for 1 license and the data show shrinking numbers of some class of hunters now include the most active to that list. the 3500 more in the field also means 3500 of us. I have never drawn an east, west in muzzle loading in a yr,we wait out turn. I am 63 yrs old and my opportunity over the next 10 yrs with this new idea doesn't increase only decreases my chances. I choose where I spend my most time helping, I will never get a east sully or muzzleloader on second draw, let alone 3rd draw. The idea of paying for preference points was to increase your odds the following year. It comes down to refunding my preference money and start all over or you keeping the most active participants applying and receiving preference points. Our pheasant numbers are way down, take the most active and give them a two week license and allow the rest of us a two week window not competing for the few birds, 1.5 avg this year. Or allow only 1 choice in the elk lic. don't see you talking about more people in the fields over this? Bless you all for the work you do and I hope you are surrounded by loved ones at Christmas, may this coming year bring you joy and happiness.

---

**Gary Lueth**

**Blooming Prairie MN**

**garylueth@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

The absolute contempt you treat Non-residents and resident landowners with is astounding. Resident landowners who feed and care for the deer AND PROVIDE hunting opportunities for hunters who contribute NOTHING to hunting other than showing up and buying a license have absolutely no say in the process. Their children cannot even hunt the home they grew up on if they took a job in the Twin Cities of Minnesota or elsewhere out of state. You have forgotten what happened out west when landowners shut down hunting years back. I deal with many many SD Farmers and Ranchers and they are sick and tired of the Politicians telling them who can and can't hunt THEIR property. What don't you understand about private property rights. You have a backlash coming that will find all your Sioux Falls hunters unable to gain hunting access. You pay them nothing, you do not even provide them with a few landowner tags that THEY control and can distribute as they see fit and they have had it. They deserve a form of compensation and a direct say in who hunts their lands besides the city dwellers from Sioux Falls. The farmers financial situation is dire and they need revenue and the state has stolen that right. You will experience the same situation you had out west only this time the whole state. I suggest you shake your politicians and bring them back to today's reality because the backlash is coming!!

---

**Tyson Reinesch**

**Hartford SD**

**treinesch@verneide.com**

**Comment:**

I don't understand the reason for any change. There are some people that ultimately rely on harvesting multiple deer to feed themselves and their family... When something's not broke don't fix it...

---

**Bob Lee**  
**Watertown SD**  
**BI@wat.midco.net**

**Comment:**

Thank you for limiting the deer license, this will make it easier for people to get the license they want first. It spreads out the license better.  
Bob Lee Watertown South Dakota  
605 880 4167.

---

**Cory Hoffrogge**  
**Pierre SD**  
**hoffrogge88@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Leave the current process as is. I have friends from all around the state that hunt and not one has stated they think any change is needed. The current preference point system works as I may not get my first choice one year but always do the next year. I have yet to find a single person in support of new rule so I question where GFP is getting their info that a change is needed.

---

**Robert Nash**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**bobbo\_\_5@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

East River tags MUST be made available to non-residents. I understand that ALL resident hunters are frustrated with non-residents drawing tags that a resident could have acquired, but to exclude them from East River seasons is a very poor decision.

---

**David Dossett**  
**Lake Preston SD**  
**parts@bobcatofbrookings.com**

**Comment:**

would like to get my son involved in deer hunting but cant even get a tag for the county I live in and have access to ground to safely hunt. the last three years I have been denied first draw in my county forcing me to get leftover in another county in which im forced to hunt public ground which is hard to find with out a bunch of other guys do the same thing making it dangerous . I think the restructure program is long over do, most people don't have a bunch of money to buy points to get tags where they can hunt safely. I know there are more people out there that feel the same. it would be nice if our state reps would think of the little guy once in awhile instead of the guys pushing buttons with there check books!!



---

**Robert Schwarz**

**Sioux City IA**

**schwarzr48@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Why are you making it so difficult for non-resident hunters to get WRD licenses? It's not like there is a tremendous amount of hunting pressure. The 7,000 acre ranch we hunted had just three resident hunters opening weekend, when we were not allowed to hunt. I don't understand your restrictive limits on licenses, as both mule deer and whitetails are quite plentiful in that area (Haakon County).

I have spent a small fortune over the past 35 years hunting in South Dakota, on licenses, gas, hotel stays, restaurant meals, ice, groceries, game processing and taxidermy fees. You are killing the goose that laid the golden egg.

---

**William Cornman**

**Newville PA**

**huntfishshop@aol.com**

**Comment:**

Yes I think residents should have a better chance at a draw but this is unreal 9 to 1 its hard enough now for a nonresident this will make it about impossible I will be finding another state to hunt and fish

---

**Max Fjelstad**

**Sturgis SD**

**Prairieemporium@gmail. Com**

**Comment:**

You say this proposal will open 3800 tags. Break it down into dollars for the state of South Dakota. What percent of these 3800 our kids and families and party hunting. Sounds to me like some East RiverGuides and pencil pushers are trying to change what's always worked. Follow the dollars that's usually what it's all about. Sugarcoating this for kids and families is not right. I deal with the public on a daily basis and I've been hunting deer in the state of South Dakota since 1974. There is not one Hunter that I have spoke to you that is in favor of any of this legisla

---

**Rodney Hanson**

**Lead SD**

**rodwh84@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

leave us residents deer hunting alone, residents should get tags first and nonresidents can apply for any left over tags, it that simple, if you really care about the resident`s chances of getting tags versus receiving more money from nonresidents show us.

---

**Mitchel Rydberg**  
**Dell Rapids SD**  
**mprydberg@Gmail.com**

**Comment:**

For those of us (using your numbers) a majority will now be limited on the West river, East river, muzzle loader and black hills apps. For non-land owners, it can take up to 4+ apps to get a lic. Multiple apps will now longer be available for those of us that like to hunt west and east river. We now have to wait up to 3 yrs to get a west river lic. You are forcing us to choose one and forget the rest. Second choices fail in the areas we have permission to hunt. Leave the system alone and not use our youth as a dangling carrot to change the current system. You can add the youth proposals to the current system and achieve the same outcome. Thank you

---

**Sean Payer**  
**Chisago City MN**  
**sdpayer@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

As a nonresident, who was born in south Dakota, I find this extremely tough. We are now getting drawn every 3 years for firearms. Our revenue in the state is large with non resident licenses, gas, hotel, etc. I find it ironic that my dad owns 160 acres in south Dakota and still can't get a residence tag and considering he owns more land than most south Dakota hunters and pays taxes on it and can't get drawn for firearms. I am proud of being from south Dakota and because I don't live there you are making it extremely hard to get a tag. Thank you

---

**Nathan Kizer**  
**Howard SD**  
**kizer@alliancecom.net**

**Comment:**

I prefer the draw as it was.

---

**Tyler Lewandowski**  
**Clear Lake SD**  
**Tylewandowski17@outlook.com**

**Comment:**

I feel, if muzzleloader tags are gonna be held with any of the four limited-draw deer seasons during the combined drawing (East River Deer, West River Deer, Black Hills or Muzzleloader). Hunters should have the opportunity to use any power of optic/scope on a muzzleloader as they please, if the tag drawing for muzzleloader is in with the rifle drawing the regulations should be no different of those of the high power rifle.

---

**Dylan Vogel**

**Groton SD**

**Dylanj1000@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

This measure is horrible for small town economies. With this proposal most hunters will no longer travel out to small west river towns where they pay at bars, restraints, hotels, gas stations and many other services in the areas. If this passes many small towns who rely on this income will continue to shrink at an even faster rate. However you guys probably dont care like your previous measure that was shot down. This needs to end your government officials not a private buisness you need to listen to the people your not kings. The only way I would support this measure is if you seperated east and west river.

---

**Jeremy Stulken**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**jjstulken@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Our state offers three distinctly different deer hunting opportunities and this proposal limit a hunters opportunity to experience these hunts in a given year. This proposal also limits the ability to hunt with a group of friends our family by making people choose one season as their primary for the year. If this change is solely in place to give youth an opportunity, simply add a special youth buck tag or allocate a block of licenses to the age group you are trying to get tags to. So not blow up a perfectly good system. This is coming from a hunter who only gets buck tag every couple years in the east river county I hunt. I feel this proposal would make my odds even worse at getting a tag.

---

**Aaron Holguin**

**Corsica SD**

**wheelwrightsales@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Putting sugar on a turd won't make it a cake. Please eliminate the Commission (and the special interests) and listen to the voices of hunters.

---

**Jacob Zettel**

**Dickinson ND**

**wallydiver@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I realize that this is meant to give preference to residents, but the existing structure of limited NR tags also limit NR hunters, yet allow some chance at a first draw tag. NR hunters are not going to flock to SD for leftover tags. If this passes, I would expect SD to refund \$10 per preference point for all Non-Residents points that become worthless under this system, as this amounts to theft of the purchased points.

---

**Lonny Kracht**

**Sturgis SD**

**lonzo@rushmore.com**

**Comment:**

I am all for this proposal if the Special Buck tag is included in the first draw group with WR, ER, BH, and ML like it was in the original proposal. With the Special Buck tag drawing separate a private land hunter can apply for a special buck tag and also either the WR, ER, BH, or ML tag and if successful can have two first choice tags in the first draw. This is exactly what this new proposal is supposed to eliminate! A Public Land hunter has to choose either WR, ER, BH, or ML. He can't use a special buck tag to hunt public land like the private land hunter can. With all the money the SDGFP spends on the walk-in program it seems WRONG to put the public land hunter at a disadvantage. Plus many first time (new) hunters hunt public lands. Adding the Special Buck tag season back into the first choice group of WR, ER, BH, and ML fixes this unfair issue. It puts all hunters on an even playing field with the same chance of drawing ONE preferred tag. Make this change and add the Special Buck tag to the first choice and I support the new proposal 100%. Thank you for your efforts to improve the system. Respectfully

---

**Josh James**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**silverfox\_71@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

There is nothing wrong with the system on how its set up now. Just cause we have people that don't use the system to its fullest now, Does not mean it needs to be changed. Very good possibility should be is educating the hunters on how the current system works. Plus how its being portrayed to help new hunters is a joke. Don't try and undermine people how sloppy this is put together

---

**Jesse Hartman**

**Lennox SD**

**jesserhartmann@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

SOMEONE PLEASE TAKE THE TIME TO READ THIS.

First of all giving kids is not earning it. If you give kids what they want they have no concept of what it's like in the real world to earn something. Second thing shame on gfp for using kids to get what they want it's like a divorce couple using their kids against each other. I honestly don't think gfp cares about the future of hunting I think it's more about the almighty dollar and here's why. If gfp cared they would be looking more at the animal population than changing the deer draw. The way I see it the future of deer hunting will be done in 10 to 15 years because of the changes being made. By taking away the minimum age limit to shoot doe the doe population will decrease significant. I do not agree with the no minimum age limited and not having to take a hunt safe course.

Here is a proposal I would be willing to work with.

1) allow 2 tags to be applied for in the first draw that way people have a 50/50 chance of drawing at least one tag.

2) put the minimum age limit back to 10 years of age and require a hunt safe course. If they are too buisey to take a hunt safe course they are too buisey to hunt. I believe by having no minimum age limit the doe numbers will decrease so bad that there won't be a deer population just like a few years back when youth were allowed 5 doe tags the population never bounced back in my area. Next give them 3 weeks to fill that youth tag not 4 months. Everyone is worried about Hunter when they should be looking the deer population in the future to hunt without a healthy deer popluation who cares about the Hunter numbers.

3) this goes for youth hunters and land owners. If the proposal was to go through I believe if a youth hunters wants to apply for a general buck tag and receive it they should not be able to apply for a youth doe tag. Same with land owners if they apply for a land owner tag and receive it they should not be able to apply for a general buck tag. Why should either of them get multiple tags when your only allowing other hunters one tag.

4) raise the non resident prices the cheapest out of state tag around South Dakota is 551 dollars trust me I know cause if this proposal goes through I will be applying for a lowa tag. 225 dollars for a non resident tag in south Dakota isn't squat if I could apply to other states for 225 I would.

5) limit the number of non resident archery tags and raise the price.

6) quit spending money on walk in areas that only have a drainage ditch to hunt. Spend money for walk in areas that have sloughs crp grass and trees something worth hunting and spending money on.

I am sure there is more I can come up with but not knowing if this is actually going to get read I am not sure if it is worth my time.

Thank you for your time if you actually read this

Jesse hartman

---

**Tyson Gau**

**Alexandria SD**

**tcgau09@ole.augie.edu**

**Comment:**

Our tag drawing system that we have now needs to stay. Changing to this new system would fit into our "participation trophy" society. Why change something that isn't flawed just because some people can't adapt and go try new things? I haven't met one person who is supportive of this new proposal and I have talked to a lot of people about it. Please listen to the majority of South Dakota sportsmen and women and keep the drawing system as it is.

Tyson Gau

---

**Neil Waldera**

**Alexandria SD**

**neil@spencerquarriesinc.com**

**Comment:**

System works as is, there is no reason to change it.

---

**Justin Picek**

**Huron SD**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Jeff Puthoff**  
**Yankton SD**  
**puthoffs.jm@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I believe the proposals to change the deer license drawing structure is unnecessary. The increased odds for anyone drawing the high demand licenses with the changes would be miniscule at best. These seasons and counties are in high demand because there are a lot of people that want to hunt those, the chances of people no longer wanting to hunt those is not going to happen by these changes. If people wanted a higher chance of drawing a deer tag: increase the number of tags they apply for, or increase the supply of tags. It's basic economy, supply and demand. The department still relies on the survey they did to support these changes, saying that more than half support it. Well, if you look at the survey question, it asks would you favor a system that would increase your odds of drawing your preferred tag?, well most everyone would be in favor of better odds to anything they enjoy doing. How about a system that would increase my odds of winning the lottery... as long as we are dealing with fantasies. The only way to increase odds of drawing is to decrease number of hunters or to increase the tags available. This does neither. If you are so certain that hunters of South Dakota are in support of this system you created, why not leave it up to the hunters themselves. BEFORE you ram it through, release a new survey to all hunters that applied to ANY deer season, successful or not, and ask just one simple question, are you in favor of the proposed system as it is now written? Yes or No. Then do something outrageous...actually listen to the people who you will affect with these changes. The one good change you do have going for you is the youth focus. Just add that to the current system. Go ahead and give them better odds, but you don't need to change the whole system to do that. Thank you, and I hope to see a survey of hunters to see what they actually think about this specific proposal very soon! I think you know the blowback you would, and have, received and that is why I am very disappointed in the commission and my GFP. Listen to your face of the GFP, the CO's that deal with the people you are supposed to be working for... I do not know one that supports this! Thank you for letting me voice my opinion and would appreciate you actually listening to the hunters for once.

---

**Loren Lunning**  
**Centerville SD**  
**lorenlunning@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Leave it the way it is. Kids already have a youth season for does tags so why do they need extra preference points. all your promoting is that they have to shoot a buck . I raised 3 boys and they were glad just to shoot doe. I've seen kids start off on big bucks, now they don't want to hunt anymore cause they can't get a deer bigger then their first one. Sad that hunting is all about horns now and not about the hunt it self.

---

**Derek Beaumont**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**dbeaumont29@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Looking at the draw data non-residents make up a very small portion of overall applicants, yet do just as much if not more for conservation on average in South Dakota than many, if not the average, resident hunter. The few tags they do get also bring quite a lot of money into the state without really effecting residents draw statistics significantly. So why punish this small group of people when it won't empirically improve draw odds of residents significantly? There are many once residents that have had to move for various reasons that still have family in South Dakota that like to spend time here to hunt, often times even on land they may still own or be in their family, yet this is trying to essentially bar non residents from drawing deer tags. I believe the heart of those supporting this are in the right place, but it is not backed up by the numbers.

---

**Chris Kayl**  
**Worthing SD**  
**buckstopr@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I'm all for any changes that will give our children more chances and opportunities to get tags and get into the outdoors. While this might possibly (very unlikely) get more people their first choice tag, it will also create more tags that go unfilled. Why is the problem of the few becoming the problem of everyone? Isn't there another option other than alienate the 11,000 plus resident hunters that enjoy hunting both east and west river? Combine whatever seasons you want, just make sure east river is separate from the west river drawing!

---

**Jeremy Iverson**  
**Groton SD**  
**ivyusu22@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I feel the commission is trying to please everyone, when 99% of sportsman do not see a need for change. I say 99%, because, to date, i have not talked to a single person that is in favor of the original proposal. I'm not even talking about this latest amendment, but the proposal as a whole. Please leave the drawing structure as it is now. Thank you for your understanding.

---

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

**Comment:**

would like to see some consideration given to out of state land owners, in regards to land owner preferance for lic and tags so they can hunt on there own land with family. they pay taxes. maintane the property and spend dollars localy . no tags no hunt no dollars, Also a yearly lic for non resident for birds to elliminate having to do 10 day lic back to back. thank you

---

**David Peck**  
**Cherokee IA**  
**delmag1942@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Going to put 3800 more resident hunters in the field??? Sounds like the ER hunters want some 2-4 draw tags so the can road hunt WR? Same hunters not more unique hunters. I think it is past time to allow NR to apply in the ER draw. There will be no tags after the 4th draw, so what is the use in having NR eligible for the 5th draw when there will be no tags?



---

**Troy Holsing**

**Horace ND**

**tdholsing@aol.com**

**Comment:**

Why do you not even consider setting aside a few non-resident rifle tags. I own land in SD, pay real estate taxes and can not even hunt my own land. I am not opposed to paying a non-resident fee for the tag, but pushing a non resident back to the 5th drawing in ridiculous. You are shooting yourself in the foot. Do as you first proposed and don't allow on hunter to have 3-4 buck tags in the state. This gives others the opportunity to get a tag, but also gives the non-resident land owner a chance also. By you doing this, I will never give permission to hunt my land and also my family who owns land will never give permission also. It would be well advised to rethink you proposal. The state would bring in more revenue which is what you are all about. I am pretty sure that no one will respond to me because you don't know what to say. There are boardering states that allow non-resident land owners to get a land owner tag. When I have to wait till the 5th drawing there are no tags left. Can't even get a buck tag. I should be obligated to at lease put my name in the first drawing to have a chance for a tag. Please respond!!!

---

**David Fickbohm**

**Sturgis SD**

**DFick75@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

If you could pass it on. I am totally for the new rule changes for the deer hunting. This coming from someone that hunts where ever the tag takes them because I hunt public land to fill the freezer and this year we hunted, East River (Union) West River (Gregory), Black Hills and Archery ( both sides of the river and the Black Hills) So I am one of those that this will effect greatly, however I am Ok with it to let all Hunters have a equal opportunity. Us in South Dakota will still have it pretty good. A lot of states you get one tag period, whether you fill it with a bow, muzzleloader or rifle, such as Idaho. All for the rule changes.

---

**Jim Hyde**

**Pierre SD**

**j3m2hyde@pie.midco.net**

**Comment:**

The IRRC rejected your last proposal for not considering public comments. I oppose your most recent proposal more, because you're allowing non-residents to apply for leftovers earlier.

---

**Tom Riddle**

**Mitchell SD**

**Riddleandsons@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Please leave deer apps as they are,not broken ,I believe all efforts and concentration should be with pheasant habitat and hoping to keep efforts on the that track,Deer apps are special for South Dakota hunters ,I feel a change will go to a commercialization of sorts,people with leases will be the ones to benefit.

---

**Steve Wiese**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**stwig1347@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Hello, I want to begin by saying I'm not opposed by trying to change things to make people happier with their draw results. I feel the Special buck and Custer state park should also be in the 1st drawing. I also other options should be tried prior to making this amount of change. No one really understands how this will affect there draw success and the folks I know that are for this change will not draw every year which I feel they think will happen. I do have a proposition that may be a small but effective option to the new proposal. If all the proposed 1st draw seasons, opening day, start at the same time across the state it may help limit the number of applicants for multiple licenses. My thought is land owners and folks that have permission to hunt private lands many not give up opening day in there preferred unit to hunt another unit after it has been hunted opening day. It would also limit time of hunting and sway people to apply for only one tag. This is just a small change that may prove to solve the problems without this major change. Thank you for the consideration.

---

**Dalton Stack**

**Watertown SD**

**dalton.stack@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

"We received more emails from objectors than supporters. We see that often, a reoccurring example of human nature. It's not scientifically valid to extrapolate those email totals to the vastly larger deer Hunter population. Furthermore, we also believe the Commission is expected to do much more than tally emails and vote accordingly. We have an obligation to thoughtfully consider all relevant factors, including all types of public input, and exercise our discretion to best serve the greater good - all South Dakota sportsmen and women."

This is apart of an article that the GF&P released on October 19th. The issue I have with that statement is "For the greater good." With the public out roar that I have heard, seen, and been apart of, it still confuses me on how the state is so bound determined to change this, considering the public is who they are changing it for. As somebody who lives for the outdoors in South Dakota, this will have a huge impact on myself like many others. Here are the reasons I oppose:

1) There is no clear evidence to me on how this better manages the herds of either Whitetail or Mule Deer in any specific region of the state. I am aware they are not raising nor lowering tag numbers, but if everyone and their dog applies for a Lincoln county any deer tag, it is still not concise on how the proposal would help my odds of getting a tag.

2) By example, Earlier this year, I drew a whitetail only tag for 02C, north of Wall if I remember correctly. Opening day we set out for a piece of public. Being the first ones there, we are aware of the fact that other people may try to pursue deer on the same piece, which happened to be a square mile. Covering this square mile, was give or take 80% pasture. The two others and myself ended up packing up and heading out of that land ten minutes after legal shooting light after witnessing more than seven other pickups proceed to crash in on us. I know that it wasn't against the law, but highly disappointing of them to not play by the common courtesy rule. Saying all of this leads me to my point, South Dakota has plenty of wonderful opportunities for me to successfully harvest a deer. The bigger issue the state should be dealing with for sportsman would be this such as landlocked public ground, the landowners who own thousands of acres who try to turn profit on wildlife behind the states back, and micromanaging herds based off location and population different areas as small as different chunks of the same county.

3) On paper, it looks like a quick way for the State to get more money. I saw a figure somewhere in one of the newsletters and it ball-parked 3500 more opportunities for South Dakotan's to hunt next year. Well, for the average any deer tag that sells for forty dollars, that would be another 140,000 dollars to the state. In the years that I have been applying for any deer tag the state gives out I have never been 100% successful in one year for every application I applied for. So, if the state really wants to improve the hunting, access the landlocked public, and explain the system we have that is tried and true to the people who can't figure it out, and find ways to shut down the illegal guiding operations on big ranches out west

---

**Troy Stulken**

**Pierre SD**

**trailside@pie.midco.net**

**Comment:**

You seemed to be think youth hunting is at most importance with your new proposal. Helps nothing for the youth hunter. Most hunters have problem accessing a good place to hunt deer were they can get a tag. Youth season needs to run into January so land owners can allow youth to hunt after other season close. As a land owner on both side of river your new system would work great for me I would get a muzzleloader tag easier and just get land owner tags for east and west. Not what you are after or is it?

---

**Ryley Thill**

**Johnstown CO**

**ryley\_thill@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

So this seems like you guys are headed towards a class action law suit from non-resident hunters on the basis of fraudulent activity. I hold 9 preference points for a unit that I've been trying to draw that you are now making unavailable to non resident hunters, basically setting up non resident applicants for failure. Going forward with your new stupid, uneducated, moronic proposal where non resident applicants are only allowed to apply after the 4th draw, we all know that there will not be any limited units or tags left for those applicants. At a minimum you should have to refund all non residents for every preference point they hold and then they can just tell the state of Sd to kick rocks.

On another note, your new regulations were based on east river hunters who cried about not getting their tags and who are friends or buddies with the morons who are pushing this agenda. Last I remember, non-resident hunters weren't even eligible to apply for east river, so screwing non-resident hunters really does nothing to promote hunting or new hunters or current resident hunters to continue to hunt in your state. I think SD hunters realized your game management sucks and has for quite some time, but I don't think anyone really knew how uneducated and moronic your whole commissioning committee would end up being. Taking away non-resident and resident tags can only put a bandaid on the real issue, and that is SDGFP itself.

Being a resident of Colorado now, if your State decides to go through with this, I will push hard for the State of Colorado to not allow any non-resident hunters from SD and make sure that it is known that this is the reason why.

---

**Jeff Albrecht**

**Brookings SD**

**gopack@svtv.com**

**Comment:**

Once again I am voicing my opposition to the change in the deer application process. Recently the change was made to "cube" years preference to improve draw chances. You need to let this system play out a few years to see if it works.

I don't always get my first choice in the draw so I may have to take a second choice perhaps a doe tag and the next year I will get my first choice. In the 2018 draw there were about 200 left over license in Perkins County alone.

All of a sudden GFP says this is a means to get more people in the outdoors. I don't feel that this is a way to do it.

I have been a large supporter of GFP over the years but with this proposal I am losing my confidence and support in the decision making process. Perhaps it's time to get the Legislature more involved in the way the department operates.

Jeff Albrecht

---

**Robert Winter**

**Yankton SD**

**bcwinter@vyn.midco.net**

**Comment:**

The GFP is circumventing the legislative review committee by amending the original proposals that were overwhelmingly opposed by hunting. Adding youth and out of state recommendations does not change the original proposals. Do not make any changes to the present system.

---

**Steven Hassenstab**

**Ashland NE**

**steve@ibiomaha.com**

**Comment:**

I've been deer hunting in the black hills with a group of best friends for more than 30 years. We are all residents of Nebraska. We bring an outfitters tent and stay over Thanksgiving. Its our favorite hunting trip and one we look forward to the most. The deer management practices that were implemented the last several years are working beautifully. In all the years we've been going the quality of deer has increased substantially in the last 5 years. We used to be able to buy unlimited permits over the counter. I understand why the permits have been limited (and this practice is improving the quality of the deer herd). However, I was heart-broken to hear that non-residents may not have as good an opportunity to draw a license if the new rules are implemented. As it stands now, it takes about 3 years for our group to draw a tag. With the new rule, not sure if there would ever be any leftover permits remaining by the 4th drawing for the black hills. I'm hoping this doesn't happen. Thanks for the opportunity to express my opinion.

---

**Lee Koch**

**Stratford SD**

**koch@nvc.net**

**Comment:**

#19 eligible landowners can use landowner preference in 1st draw 1st choice application + apply for a 1st choice - 1st draw license in a different season . #22 Nobody would have two licenses after the 1st draw four firearm season. It seems like landowners could have two licenses after 1st draw.

---

**Lonny Kracht**

**Sturgis SD**

**lonzo@rushmore.com**

**Comment:**

You really need to consider the following improvements to the proposed proposal! I copied it from a Facebook post from Tim Wenz. It is 1000% better than the current proposal. If the current proposal passes myself, my son, and my granddaughter and grandson will cease hunting west river deer and solely hunt the Black Hills even though we prefer to continue hunting both seasons when we are successful in the draws. Reason is we hunt public land and the Special Buck tag doesn't work for public land like it does for private land hunters.

Tim Wenz: My suggestion was to take the six seasons (BH, WR, ER, Muzzle, WRSB, and ERSB) and put them into one draw. Then allow an applicant to apply for two first draw choices but only two of the six. And if you draw two then you are done until fifth draw. For an example this would allow a Rapid city person the ability to apply for both a BH unit and a WR unit in which say they have land to hunt instead of just BH unit and then wait to see if there are any left over tags WR and where they may be, a person who loves to muzzleloader hunt can apply for it but if they don't draw in still has the ability to get their first choice for ER in a unit where they actually have land to hunt. This would be my suggestion to make a move in the right direction. It would get rid of the guys that draw three or four buck tags in a year and would improve odds of drawing a preferred tag. Then if this didn't get us to the desired results we adjust. Sorry I know that got long and I know people can poke holes in my suggestion as well

---

**Gerald Anderson**  
**Owatonna MN**  
**grandy74@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

After more than 20 years of supporting local business by coming to hunt, it is sad to see a system change that will have negative effects on small town South Dakota. Non-resident hunters such as our family group, pay a rancher to lease the land, sta

---

**Tyler Henderson**  
**Marvin SD**  
**tyh1@msn.com**

**Comment:**

The majority of people do not support this. I know you want younger hunters to get out but for my family we do this through multiple seasons. Yes I am one of the hunters that applies for several seasons. I like to hunt plus I like to take my kids out when the temperatures are nice. We camp west river, setup on the fall days for bow, hunt east river as I have my entire life. I bought a muzzle loader to continue hunting through December, I now hunt refuge, this change will take this away from me and my kids will spend less time in the outdoors in South Dakota. I live in South Dakota because of the hunting and fishing. Don't commercialize this like the pheasant and fishing seasons are. If I need to start looking at Montana, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado or Idaho as hunting opportunity all of my kids will start to experience the great outdoors there. Let them have as many fond memories of South Dakota as you can, this might be enough to keep them in the state and hunting their entire life. I see the current hunting license structure as the future of hunting for our kids. Help me get them outside more than 1 season a year.

---

**William Haase**  
**Bismarck ND**  
**bhaase@nd.gov**

**Comment:**

I am very concerned with the new proposal which removes the opportunity for non residents to apply during the first 4 lottery drawings. I have been investing time and money now for 8 years. I have finally accumulated enough points to hopefully draw a buck tag, but that will not be an option if the rules are changed. I can understand a reduced number of tags available to non residents, but this will eliminate the opportunity to draw most preferred tags. Many South Dakota residents hunt in other states and I'm sure they could relate to my concerns! There are some states that require reciprocity and this change may take opportunities away from South Dakota residents. Please reconsider this proposal so there is at least some opportunity in the first draw for non residents. Thanks!

---

**Doug Geary**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**douggeary!@allstate.com**

**Comment:**

Please keep the new proposed deer draw so every can pick their first choice. To many hunters are losing interest in hunting due to the amount of time it takes to get their preferred tag. The new system would get more people interested in hunting. Please do the right thing and pass the new deer proposal. Thank You

---

**Greg Peterson**  
**Clear Lake SD**  
**petegang@itctel.com**

**Comment:**

I really appreciate the commission's intent with this proposal, but it continues to have an adverse impact on many applicants that have planned ahead for many years and diligently applied for seasons (and paid for preference points). I know the commission seems resolute to make this happen, but please consider the position of the vast majority of sportsmen and sportswomen that oppose the proposed changes. These changes are complicated, unnecessary and adversely impact those with preference points in multiple units.

---

**Phil Hudson**  
**Howard SD**  
**philjvn@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I still oppose the proposed changes to the deer licensing system. Why does it seem like the GFP commission really wants to pass this proposal, even if it goes against the majority of hunters wishes?

---

**Randy Clarksean**  
**Ottertail MN**  
**randy.clarksean@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

As a father and out of state resident, my comment relates to the establishment of family traditions. My son lives in Eastern South Dakota and loves to hunt. I too enjoy hunting and especially enjoy hunting with him, and hopefully with his young son I appreciate the chance to provide feedback on the proposed changes.

---

**Greg Schweiss**  
**Rapid City SD**

**Comment:**

The revisions to the proposal, although fine in and of themselves, do nothing to address the fundamental issue of making it nearly impossible for a hunter or family to enjoy hunting in more than one of the seasons. I have a long-standing family tradition of hunting with my children in the west river deer season. Under the revised proposal I could never expect to draw a black hills any whitetail deer tag without abandoning my family hunt in the west river season. The current system allows everyone an equal chance of drawing in any and all seasons, and should not be changed.

---

**Lonny Kracht**

**Sturgis SD**

**lonzo@rushmore.com**

**Comment:**

By removing Special Buck from the first choice group every Public Land hunter is put at a disadvantage. The SDGFP spends millions of dollars each year to secure Public Land hunting opportunities and by removing Special Buck from the first choice group Private Land hunters win because they can use this tag to hunt Private Land and Public Land hunters cannot. The time to fix this is now and not in 3 years. The focus should be to pass the most fair proposal now and NOT to re-evaluate in 3 years and make changes then. Adding Special Buck to first draw group eliminates the disadvantage to Public Land hunters.

---

**Scott Guffey**

**Rapid City SD**

**guffeyscott@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I am in full support of the Deer Hunting Season Drawing Structure proposal. The plan has been well thought out and structured by the department. The latest changes the commission approved, has improved upon the plan for the resident rifle deer hunter. The current system is no longer keeping up with demand in desired draw units, point creep is setting in and is just going to get worse if something isn't done. I applaud the commission for sticking with the plan, after the legislative review committee sent it back for no reason or direction on what to do with it. I believe the legislators on the review committee only heard from the vocal minority that are against the plan, supporters thought it was a done deal and didn't voice their support for the plan to the legislators on the committee. Please pass the proposal and send it back to the legislative review committee for approval, I'll be sure to let them know I support it.

---

**Randy Mink**

**Gettysburg/Rapid City SD**

**randyrmink@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Please stop calling the points preference points. they are lottery chances plain and simple. A true preference system needs to be put in place ASAP. I understand the large numbers of elk hunters with large numbers of lottery chances. First timers still get drawn before many of them.. Somehow try to protect the integrity of their preference purchases but trash the lottery system. For all apps. Please. My compliments on the many access programs thruout the state. Other than the national forest they are the only places I can hunt for free, AND I refuse to pay. I especially like the walk in areas with suitable habitat. please acquirw more walk in areas and longer leases on them. One last point, there are several parcels of public land that are land locked and need access points. I would be glad to help the game warden in the areas I know of identify them. sincerely Randy Mink



---

**Benjamin Lundeen**

**Brainerd MN**

**Lundeenb@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

BASED UPON THE UPDATED PROPOSAL, NON-RESIDENTS WOULD NOT HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO DRAW LICENSES IN THE FIRST 4 DRAWINGS, LIMITING THE ABILITY TO UTILIZE UNITED STATES PUBLIC LANDS ALONG SIDE RESIDENT HUNTERS. PLEASE CONSIDER REMOVING THE PROPOSAL TO LIMIT NON-RESIDENT HUNTERS TO THE 5TH DRAWING, ELIMINATING THE IDEA THAT RESIDENTS MAY ACQUIRE MORE THAN 1 TAG BEFORE A NON-RESIDENT IS ALLOWED TO OBTAIN ONE. IT SEEMS THAT THIS IS CONTRADICTORY TO THE IDEA OF KEEPING FAMILY HUNTING TRADITIONS, ADDING MORE TAGS FOR RESIDENTS REALLY DOESN'T INCREASE THE NUMBER OF RESIDENT HUNTERS IT INCREASES THE NUMBER OF DEER RESIDENTS HUNTERS ARE ABLE TO SHOOT. IF THE GOAL IS TO ONLY LET A SELECT FEW HUNTERS TAKE GAME ANIMALS IN THE STATE THIS PROPOSAL WOULD DO THAT, HOWEVER IF THE STRATEGY IS TO ALLOW FOR AN INCREASE IN HUNTERS ACROSS THE STATE (INCREASING REVENUE TO MANY OF THE SMALL TOWNS IN SOUTH DAKOTA) THEN SURELY ALLOWING NON-RESIDENTS AN OPPORTUNITY TO DRAW ONE TAG ALONGSIDE RESIDENTS WOULD BE A BETTER OPTION. THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT ON THIS PROPOSAL.

---

**Pat Malcomb**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**pmalcomb@sio.midco.net**

**Comment:**

While this proposal is better, it is still not needed we can implement the youth preference point portion of the proposal while leaving the drawing application as is. The way the current drawing is if you buy the preference you can draw at least one tag every year, even under the new system there is no guarantee you will draw your preferred tag every year. There is a small minority of people complaining the amount of opposition should tell you its no broke and doesn't need fixing.

---

**John Culberson**

**Custer SD**

**johnsusan@gwtc.net**

**Comment:**

I wonder who you are managing the deer population for? It seems deer hunters are not happy and as a non hunter I certainly am not. 83% of us do not hunt, yet we have to put up with some of the highest car/deer accident numbers in the country. Figures I have seen say we are in the top 5 but I believe the Hills are in the top 1 or 2. When will you recognize the cost to the average South Dakotan of an excess deer population? On our drives from Custer to Rapid one of us is the lookout while the other drives. It still does not help. I had 3 deer hits on a car with 45,000 miles. Crazy. I am told there are fewer deer now than when I was growing up in the 1960's but not a single one of my classmates buys that line. Do something to help us!!! The cost to the majority of South Dakotans is unacceptable.

---

**Robby Beyer**

**Winfred SD**

**Farmerbob65@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I as a deer hunter know it is important to introduce new hunters to the sport. With that being said I feel your new proposal with the preference points can be implicated with the current license system for the 15 year old and younger. There is no need to change the whole system to do this proposal.

I also can't believe you are so willing to push this through that you won't listen to the current hunters. You say you will gain 3800 which is up from last proposal of 3500 and I am not sure how you figure this. Second how many will you lose when someone applies in your new system and don't get there tag and just give up. You as a commission need to realize that the number of hunters is dropping due to the fact that small farms are being bought by larger farms which in turn leaves less hunting opportunity to hunt these deer. You stress on the application to not apply without asking for a place to hunt. I know this from a fact from people that don't hunt around me anymore and I ask why don't you hunt anymore they always say I have no place to hunt anymore so and so sold there land and now I can't hunt any more.

When this land changes hands the hunting rights go with it. Next thing you know a shelter belt is leveled no more habitat for deer. Where I live public is not a option by the time deer season opens the pheasant hunter have the deer driven out weeks before season. So where are these new hunters going to hunt.

You as a commission need to look at the big picture instead of taking opportunity away from current hunters. Stop this nonsense proposal and leave the system the way it is. Go a head and give the preference points to the youth but don't upset the whole system and take away from the current 16000 pulse hunters that care so deeply that they got there elected representatives involved with this. Do what the hunters truly want and don't change the current system and sell out the greatest thing about South Dakota so are children and grand children can share in the same tradition we have grew to love and look forward to year after year. I as a hunter love going westriver and hunting east river. I was looking forward to taking my nephews out west someday when they got old enough that missing school would not be as big a deal as now. But with the changes I am not sure this will ever happen. I hope you weigh everything before making a decision on this. We are not ignorant people we understand your proposal and don't like it. So quit saying we don't understand because we do and don't like or care for this new proposal.

---

**Nathan Olson**

**Detroit Lakes MN**

**nolson981@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

The proposed modifications of the deer drawings will negatively impact my chances of being able to hunt in SD. The commissioners talk about how this is needed to increase participation and carry on traditions, but they are not thinking about people who grew up in SD (such as myself) but moved out of state, and how they use deer hunting to come back home and visit with family and friends. If it continues to get more difficult to draw a tag, my tradition of coming home and hunting with my family and friends is over.

---

**Troy Kirsch**

**Platte SD**

**tkirsch@midstatesd.net**

**Comment:**

The changes will still hurt the youth opportunities. If they are not first time applicants it does nothing plus if they send in with an adult it still goes back to the lowest preference. Just leave it alone it is fair to everyone and the outfitters can still do it illegally like they have been?

---

**Craig Scheffler**

**Lonsdale MN**

**craigscheffler12@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Jason Taylor**

**Fort Pierre SD**

**Comment:**

To SD GFP and Commission,

I am against any changes to the deer license allocation and hope that the commission will look at what the majority of the sportsmen are wanting and vote against this proposal. The current system works well and is not broken. SD deer tags are allocated in a weighted lottery system and not a participation tag system, where everybody wins. Just because someone applies for a tag, which is in a hard to draw unit and gets a tag every 2 to 3 years, doesn't mean that the system is broken and everything needs to be changed. If someone draws 3 to 4 tags in one year, then they are considered lucky, then next year they might only draw 1 tag.

I keep hearing about hunters that have been turned down with 2 or more preference points, so I went through every license option that has a buck tag. Every unit that is a highly sought after unit is either along the Missouri River (public land along the shore) or has a large amount of public land throughout the unit. All of the other units a person can get a tag with 1 point or 2. If a person has their mind set that they really want a buck tag then, they might have to do some research and see where they have the best chances of drawing a tag. The same for those hunters that are complaining, because they have 5, 6, or 7 preference points and can't get a BH Any Deer tag (which there are only 100 allocated). If the BH hunters wanted a buck tag that bad, they could do a little research and apply for an Any Whitetail tag, and get one every 2 years (where there is around 3500 tags instead of 100 Any Deer tags). The proposed system is going to punish those of us sportsmen that have done our unit research and have put in the time to build the relationships with the landowners.

One thing that was never brought up by the Commission or GFP and was only brought up by the public was the deer population. Back about 7-8 yrs. ago the deer population was extremely high and the number of deer tags were extremely high, so in turn, there was a high draw success rate, not one person complained then or even before that. But since then the deer population has drop significantly (due to diseases, harsh winters, and predators), which in turn the number of tags have dropped, which also means that the draw success has dropped. So when the deer population goes back up so will the number of tags and the draw success. Yes a great number of the tags that have been cut were antlerless tag but there were also "buck" tags too. Take Stanley County and West Sully, probably two of the hardest units to draw a buck tag in. From 2016 to 2018 the Any Deer tags went from 150 to 100 in each unit, which was a 33% decrease in those tags. Which I do agree, it needed to happen, I am for dropping the tag numbers when the population declines. I am just saying that there was 50 hunters on each side of the river, in those 2 units that use to get a tag and now didn't, many of them are complaining without probably realizing the true reason behind them not get a tag, a low deer herd population. Now look at all of the other units, 50 less tags here and 50 less tags there, that makes a good number of those that get turned down, because of low deer numbers and are now complaining and upset. Go back 7-8 years ago, Stanley County had 400 Any Deer tags, now figure that into the equation, and even more people have been turned down, all due to low herd population, and not hunters getting multiple tags.

You had asked for public comments and had received. There are 80-90% of the sportsmen that are against this change, which includes a lot of hunters that only put in for 1 tag, and yet you ignored us. If you weren't going to listen to the public, then why did you ask us for our public comments?

I do like the new youth bonus preference point part but it is BS to attach it to the license allocation proposal. It is a bad idea to use the youth hunters as a way to push this license allocation through. It make us that are against the license allocation, look like we are against youth hunting, which is far from the truth and false. Plus youth can already start getting preference points at age 10 and have 2 points built up by the time they are 12.

The commission already changed the preference point system last year and the GFP had said in the October meeting, that it is working the way that it is suppose too. So way not wait a couple of years, study it, and see how well it works before making more unwanted and un-necessary changes?

There is no reason for muzzleloader deer to even be in this conversation, they are "bonus tags" just like CSP and Refuge. The GFP took the other "bonus tags" out of the conversation, but yet left muzzleloader in. The majority of the hunters are fine with getting a bonus tag every 4-5 years. There is such a small number of these tags (1000 STATE WIDE) that they shouldn't even be talked about in any of these conversations.

I had emailed Vice Chair Gary Jensen, back on October 26 about this proposal, with some comments and questions for him and the commission. I would like to thank him and the commission for not getting back to me. The commission and the GFP have continued to show no interest in what the public thinks or feels.

---

**Richard King**

**Oak Hill VA**

**rking@wbbinc.com**

**Comment:**

I have been coming to SD to deer hunt (west River) 14 out of the last 18 years--every year I could draw a tag, even on "3rd draw". Every year, that brings over \$5000 to SDGFP, and local ranchers and businesses. The new policy that prioritizes youth and resident tags over even a modest amount of Non-res tags is unfair, and will forgo significant revenue to the state. Futhermore, ranchers who lease, and outfitters, rely on non-resident clients. This new tag policy will make it difficult to line up clients for a given year

---

**George Bogenschutz**

**Nunda SD**

**mtnmach@itctel.com**

**Comment:**

In the section that describes using various shallow ponds/sloughs to raise transplanted young fish for a year before transplanting them to final fisheries for sports purposes, it states that these shallow ponds are closed for fishing during these periods. That is not what the tech's are telling us that live around Mud Lake in summit township of Lake County. They are seeking ponds that provide public access so they can be fished. I agree with the techs, but for the record which policy is it?

---

**Tom Kuck**

**Aberdeen SD**

**mrduck@abe.midco.net**

**Comment:**

I support the Department's efforts to get more young hunters in the field, I personally have had the opportunity to take both of my grand daughters on cow elk hunts in the Black Hills when they were 15, and both killed an elk. However with regards to the remainder of the licensing proposal I am opposed, and I want the licensing system now in place to remain as is. Tom Kuck

---

**William McMullen**  
**Leesburg VA**  
**wcmcmullen3@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I've been a non-resident hunter for 20 plus years in SD. I primarily hunt Haakon County on private land that several of us have leased for many years. Often as a backup we hunt Ziebach for whitetails in walk-in areas. It appears the new proposal further limits our ability to obtain a WRD license which in recent times has been more miss than hit - i.e., draw every 2-3 years. To say that a resident can acquire up to 9 licenses while at the same time potentially shutting non-residents out is not only short sighted but likely to have an impact on the resources non-residents bring to SD. I know each of my group spends \$4500-\$5000 annually in SD. The draw system is already cumbersome and lengthy giving non-residents little time to arrange hunting privileges elsewhere. Even our ranch owner has complained about our inability to get a license every year thus denying them a needed source of revenue. Please relook at your proposal. Why not landowner tags for private properties?

---

**Marty Wilcox**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**mrwilcox@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

support

---

**William Schwarz**  
**Pierre SD**

**Comment:**

I do not agree with the decision to modify the current structure for deer tag allocation. I do not feel that the current structure is in any way unfair or that it prevents hunters from drawing deer tags. Simply put, if you take the time to familiarize yourself with the current draw structure, you should be able to successfully draw your preferred tag very often.

It is very clear that the Commission and its members have almost completely disregarded the public's incredibly strong opposition for the new proposal. There was obvious frustration that led to multiple online petitions and scores of opposing public comments.

Even after the Commission passed the strongly opposed proposal, the members of the Rules Review Committee refused to approve the changes due to the backlash that they received from their constituents. That alone should be enough for the Commission to see that the citizens of South Dakota so strongly dislike the proposal that they should scrap the proposal completely.

Then, the commission plays ignorant and acts as if they're surprised as to why the proposal was not approved and they attempt to dress up the proposal with the new youth preference point changes.

I am incredibly happy with the addition of the new youth preference point changes and think that it will help get youth more involved.

However, it does not fix the underlying issue that the public has incredibly strong opposition to the proposal. If there is anything about the proposal that should be kept, it is the addition of the youth preference point changes.

The Commission should scrap the entire proposal and keep the current draw structure in place.

---

**Arch Beal**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Comment:**

The current lottery system is fair and gives everyone the same opportunity to choose what season they want to hunt.

---

**Trent Pettis**

**Austin AR**

**trent.pettis@va.gov**

**Comment:**

SDGFP Commissioners. I am a 35 year SD Resident currently residing in AR. I am proposing a suggestion for consideration as it relates to licensing for Non-Residents. First, the possibility of spreading out the draw cycle for big game. I often want to apply for BH Deer, WR Deer and Antelope. At times the application cut offs occur before the other draws are complete. This makes it difficult as many NR's cannot come back twice or three times if they draw multiple tags. Would the SDGFP consider spreading the draw out to allow the results to be posted prior to the next application period. This would also free up other tags for expanded hunting opportunities for others.

The second question I have is as follows: As a disabled Veteran I am involved in several groups (Safari Club, Freedom Defenders and NE AR Wounded Warrior). Every three years or so I organize hunts in SD for Purple Heart Recipients or Wounded Warriors. With the current draw system requiring two-three years to draw a NR tag, it is difficult to help Veterans as the wait period is long. Would the SDGFP consider an allotment of tags for special projects such as this at an expanded fee with proof of Disability/Purple Heart? Another option would be allowing a license transfer or Preference Point transfer to expedite drawing? Other states have very successful programs of this nature. I love showcasing my home state and would really like to conduct more of these events. Thank you in advance for any consideration.

---

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

**Comment:**

Dear commissioners,

I would like to address issues with the deer drawing proposal. I've been following this issue from the beginning and have kept an open mind about it but after seeing all the data and information. My conclusion is the current system that's in place is fair for everyone with the lottery system given everyone opportunity to choose what they want to do. But after listening to your meeting from 6th & 7th you want to know why the legislators Committee voted no and reason. The biggest reason why it did not pass was because of the perception that the commission and the department is not listening to the majority of the people. Those are the words of the legislators. The commission is only listen to the one sightedness of the department and not the public. You have heard the public comments and the majority each and every time have not wanted this proposal, not just in the 90 day review period but ever. But it continues to be pushed forward. Now you are throwing the Kid card into this proposal.

**Facts:**

The fact is nobody knows if this will work, it is a guess. The 3,800 more people getting there deer tags, how will that be measured. It can't be explained well. How will that be tracked? How do you know who if its a new hunter or old? I want to know?

It was stated on the 6th that now we need to do something so we can retain the kids. This has already been pointed out, we do not have a problem with retaining young hunters in South Dakota. You want to retain the kids, retain the hunters that hunt all over the state that take the kids hunting.

Why the people do not want this change, there is a different reason why for each hunter. My reason is one of my hunting partners will staying home because of not drawing a tag, as you know most of the buck tags will be gone by the 3rd drawing.

I don't like the tone of how the commission is treating our resident hunters. Some of commissioner sound annoyed by the public input and come across that these hunters are not bright and don't know their facts. If you commissioners are new to these issues in only the last few years and not what has been happen from past 30 years, you won't understand the reasons why some of these hunters distrust the department. I can see why you wouldn't think this should not be a big deal, just seeing what's been going on in the last view years. Lost hunting opportunities is a big deal no matter how small the change can be.

From the beginning of this proposal there was three choices, the first two would change how the current drawing system works and option three was no change. Why not kill this idea and leave the current system in place. The department has put a lot of effort into the Deer hunting Season Drawing Structure Plan and have made changes to it. However, just because you work hard on something doesn't mean it's a good idea. South Dakota resident hunters wanted more oppotunities, not less according to the dept surveys.

If this proposal passes the legislators in January and the Rules Review Committee in April does not reject it. My opinion next hunting season here will be more hunters staying home, because of buddy or family member may not want to hunt in the same unit as they do. More hunters will be applying for the black hills for their first choice because of all of the public land. Deer hunters now will put emphasis on stating unfavorable or incorrect information on upcoming hunting surveys because of survey being used as a tool against them. There will be deer hunters that will not know of this subject until they apply for licenses next year. In 3 years after this trial run for deer tags structure it will be pushed again without public favor, and rubber stamped for approval. In the end this will tarnished the gfp and the commission.



---

**Justin Pliska**  
**Hartford SD**  
**jjpliska@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I have been hunting in this Great State I live in for almost 13 years. I grew up watching my dad harvest deer and my love for hunting was fuel by these moments. I strongly oppose this order to change the draw system. This is only helping the lazy and uneducated people on getting their "back 40 tags". I travel from one part of the state to the next stay in a hotel of average 10 nights a year, spend time in a tent 15-20 nights a year. I am giving these small towns my money for fuel, food, and lodging. Not saying im the only one doing this but I am upset that I have to choose between 4 seasons and to me that's not right. This state we are blessed with an abundance of deer in any area of the state. I understand it is extreme being able to obtain 4+ buck tags a year (this is including archery) but we are not like iowa montana north Dakota or Wyoming. We have a different in landscape and the animals that use the land. I strongly oppose this decision  
thanks Justin

---

**Rob Powell**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**rob.powell6@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

This is great news! As a life long resident of South Dakota I look forward to increased odds of drawing a Black Hills buck tag. I live in the Black Hills and its where I prefer to hunt. Please vote yes on this proposal and thank you!

---

**John Price**  
**Fredrick SD**  
**Bear19612002@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Deer draw is just fine the way it is I do not want change

---

**Matt Christopherson**  
**Mitchell SD**  
**mattcarter1421@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I do not support the change I prefer to leave as is.

---

**Tom Rogers**

**Ft Pierre SD**

**tom.rogers@k12.sd.us**

**Comment:**

Please leave it as is.  
Thanks

---

**Dereck Whitlock**

**Watertown, Sd SD**

**dereckwhitlock@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Leave it the way it is. If you are going to change anything, give the sportsmen and women back the opportunity to draw a STATEWIDE Antlerless muzzleloader tag rather than having the whole northeast part of the state closed off. Not everyone horn hunts!

---

**Mark Peterson**

**Aberdeen SD**

**Comment:**

sometimes you just get things wrong. Please drop this farce of an idea and understand that the wrong question was asked in the survey. If I ask anyone if they would like to get their preferred tag more often of course they will say yes. But if I add that the first vote was unanimous when there was way more opposition to the change than support speaks volumes of the commission and it's agenda.

---

**Nathan Fossell**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**fosselln@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Folks, you are missing the boat here. You have an excellent system, backed by excellent science. You're commission is misinformed. You're stats, show less than half support and then there is one showing more support. I don't buy this. Your survey

---

**Stephen Harkness**

**Standish CA**

**jandsshootingsupply@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

So non-residents are not allowed to participate in the mentor hunts, have a hard enough time drawing a tag at all and now the residents that already get 3 and 4 tags each will take the rest of the tags as well. Now there will be almost no reason for a non-resident to make the trip back there to hunt. The non-resident tags are a major revenue source for your state, I would think that would be a consideration as well.

---

**Randall Pratt**  
**Mitchell SD**  
rpratt@mit.midco.net

**Comment:**

The wording in the email begs a question. It only addresses non-resident 8% for west river and Black Hills seasons. Does 8% pertain to any season or will non-residents be eliminated east-river and others? Is the 8% on the total tag availability or on the specific season availability? In general I supported the very first version of the proposal but I think it is getting complex and meaningless with all these exceptions and tweaks. You are losing me.

---

**Bradley Olson**  
**Astoria SD**  
olsonranchs@outlook.com

**Comment:**

Selling the youth part and hiding the part the residents hate is really disgusting how low will you go? Your so hell bent on getting your way you've refused to listen to us South Dakota hunters. We strongly OPPOSE

---

**Shawn Lambertz**  
**Groton SD**  
fshalot@nvc.net

**Comment:**

what is wrong with the way it is now? if you want more people to hunt add more licenses. with more licenses come more conflicts. leave it the way it is.

---

**Tony Minnaert**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
minnaert@sio.midco.net

**Comment:**

Just leave as is. If people need to find different counties so be it. Let residents get there tags before out of staters. Up there fishing license and make it individual and not family. Make a heck of a lot more money for the state then messing with the hunting license.

---

**Earl Nelson**  
**Erwin SD**  
dakotalabs9@yahoo.com

**Comment:**

No additional % of ANY SD Deer Tags Go To Non-Residents !!

---

**Markus Nelson**

**Concord NC**

**Markus.Nelson@Hendrickauto.com**

**Comment:**

This is a complete slap in the face for non resident deer hunters coming to. SD! Who would think of this crap? If you don't have a tag as a resident by the 3 draw your an idiot and don't need to be hunting!! Open the draw up for all after the 3rd draw! This is a horrible proposal!!

---

**Jeremy Nettifee**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**jerenet1341@live.com**

**Comment:**

Don't fix what isn't broken.

---

**Justin Murphy**

**Lyons SD**

**Comment:**

As I have stated, this proposal is not in the best interest of the people of this state. You are limiting opportunities for the sportsmen of this state. Using youth hunters to push your agenda doesn't sit well. I urge you to reconsider this proposal.

---

**Jason Heintzman**

**Ipswich SD**

**daksat@valleytel.net**

**Comment:**

Do not approve this, this will just make things harder and more confusing and it will force less people to apply, leave it as it is now! Its hard to allow more opportunity for tags when there are not enough deer around to allow any more tags/hunters to get out, this year was the worse I have seen, there were very few deer around, there were way to many tags available for the few deer that was available, someone really messed up the population this year and by doing this proposal will make it even worse!

---

**David Potts**

**Toronto SD**

**david.c.potts@centurylink.com**

**Comment:**

There is no reason to change the existing rules. This change is catering to the few not the many. This has been proven with the petitions and overwhelming opposition shown.

---

**Tim Fieber**

**Milbank SD**

**Tjfieber13@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

After all the nonsense that went on the first time they tried this change not one person I talked to in eastern sd that deer hunted approved this change. Why change something that is perfectly fine. All your going to do is mess with traditions and the amount of people that deer hunt on a regular basis. If people want better chances at tags they need to switch units and try for a tag in a different county. That's what I had to do and I'm successful almost every year in east and west river. Not one person I know is in favor of this and we're is the money coming from to support this. I hear there is game farms and paid hunting support for this bull. If that's true there won't be a dime spent from me on tags.

---

**Matt Bones**

**Hartford SD**

**mjbones2007@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Leave the draw system as is! No need to change one of the best and most fair draw systems in the country. Sad to see the commission more worried about trying to please the minority than focusing on more important issues like what is best for the w Stop trying to please people and worry about what is best for the wildlife of the state.

---

**Mike Hogan**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**mikehogan64@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

You might have enough deer tags for everyone if you didn't make some of us get two west river tags because you don't have normal unit numbers. All hunting units should be the same geographical land mass regardless of species! If you need to break down units so you can split them then so be it. But 49B is 49B for all species.

---

**Brad Landon**

**Garden City MO**

**Brad.landon@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

As a nonresident I am grateful when I am successful in a deer drawing. However I don't believe changing the current system helps the residents which should be paramount in any change. As I see it nonresidents will benefit and the resident loses many opportunities. This is wrong. Take care of the residents. If a nonresident wants to hunt they will in be able to in time. It shouldn't be about the money nonresidents bring in to the state. There wouldn't be any hunting opportunities if it weren't for the residents. And it's the residents we come to visit and be with. Leave the drawing as it currently is so that we nonresidents and residents can continue to hunt together.

---

**Robert Sayles**

**Beresford SD**

**Robertdsayles@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Please do not change anything. Leave the draw how it has been. This has overwhelmingly been opposed.

---

**David Mines**

**Yankton SD**

**davidmines4831@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I am against all changes to our deer tags you are proposing. If you want a change take a current survey of what sportsman want. No one wants this terrible idea.

---

**Larry Wynia**

**Yankton SD**

**lcwynia@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Let's just do this. Try this for three years. I'm all for seeing more people have an opportunity to get a deer tag. We keep going as we are now, we will continue to lose hunters. The game hogs will win.

---

**Benjamin Stucke**

**Aberdeen SD**

**quaz1971@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Stop trying to let more non-resident hunters in!

You are going to kill off resident west river hunting. Its hard enough to get a Black Hills tag now. West River is my backup to not getting a Black Hills tag. If I have to choose one place to hunt West River businesses will lose my hunting trips and business.

---

**Charles Hamre**

**Canton SD**

**Hamrec27@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

How many time do people have to keep email you guys before you listen. No body wants this change. Stop trying to use the youth as your shield to pass this garbage. Talk to the ranchers out west . They are sick of the out of staters running all over and so are the residents. I kill deer and fill my freezer for the year to feed my family. So when your cutting me down to 1 or 2 tags that's not enough. Are you going to give me money to feed my family when I run out of deer meat. Residents deserve the deer more then out of staters. This all boils down to greed and money. The more non residents tags you sell the more money you make. What happens when the deer population comes back and more tags are available? That means more tags for non residents. How many for you on this commission are born and raised in sd? And how many of you are from Minnesota with family over there? That want them to get more tags. I could go on and on but I know it's a waste of time because you don't want to hear what the people of sd are trying to tell you. That this is garbage.

---

**Stacy Vrchota**

**Mina SD**

**Svrchota@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I think the current system is already fair. This proposal only hurts the avid hunters that really enjoy deer hunting enough to apply for tags all over the state.

---

**Jacob Maras**

**Crooks SD**

**Jcbmaras@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Lumping east river, west river, and muzzleloader drawings into 1 does not allow me to plan my deer hunts ahead of time. The odds of drawing will be much more random. Please revise.

---

**Mike Mattson**

**Davis SD**

**Sgtmike573@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I'm pretty sure the hunters of South Dakota already made it clear to leave the draw system as is.

---

**Barry Erickson**

**Salem SD**

**ericksonb44@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

The commission's new proposal is virtually unchanged from the first one that drew criticism from hundreds of hunters. Who is really the driving force behind this? Perhaps it's time to listen to the majority???

---

**Eric Nesheim**

**Baltic SD**

**eric\_nesheim@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

As an avid hunter I strongly oppose change to the current deer draw.

---

**Jarred Gasal**

**Jamestown ND**

**gasalbros@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

You need to provide non resident land owners a guaranteed license to hunt on there own land. We would be willing to pay a fee for the license and be restricted to hunt on our land. But it is ridiculous that we are not guaranteed to hunt on our own land.

---

**Brendan Matthew**

**Sturgis SD**

**bub0452@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I don't understand why you have to change anything. Currently, I am able to hunt deer every year, either in the Black Hills or during the West River Season. I fear that under this new proposal, I may only be able to rifle hunt every other year. In the current scheme, I can hunt every year (west river deer), while I acquire preference points to hunt in the Black Hills or the Muzzle Loader season. When I get enough preference points, I end up with multiple tags. I don't understand what is wrong with this? I think you are catering to people who are upset that they have to accumulate preference points to hunt the seasons they really want. In the end, I think you are going to find you have a mess with a lot of upset people.

---

**Chad Paklin**

**Sturgis SD**

**Comment:**

Leave it alone



---

**Douglas Monzat**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**monzatdouglas@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I Think it needs to keep it like it is . But one thing is there is not alot of deer out there . and trying to get on land is very very hard to .

---

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

**Comment:**

For the 3rd time, I am 100% opposed to this HORRIBLE proposal. The system is not broken. Stop trying to fix it! What a joke to try and now wrap this in the blanket of helping youth draw a tag more easily! You could have done this without any change to the draw system. This will be fought in the legislature if you continue on this crusade that 90% of the hunting public oppose and have loudly and clearly voiced to you over and over!

---

**Don Hantzsche**  
**Summerset SD**  
**Tlwdah@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I still have not seen any data that proves this proposal will do anything but harm South Dakota hunters. What you are really doing is limiting every hunter to a single tag. If you don't get drawn for your first choice you won't get a tag that year. None of the descent units ever have tags left after the first draw. Only units like Meade county where 99% of the land is private have tags left. These people who think they will get their preferred tag every year are misguided. More like every other year. I would love a hills tag every year but I usually get it every other year so I put in for 39A so I have a good chance of getting a tag every year. This change in the draw will eliminate that. Also putting muzzleloader into the rifle pool doesn't make sense. If you want to group it with another season group it with bow season. For the good of all hunters in South Dakota don't change the draw. Instead educate hunters on how to use the current draw system to get a tag annually.

---

**Halle Kuck**  
**Aberdeen SD**  
**Smkuck@abe.midco.net**

**Comment:**

Please do not change the deer license system. I works fine the way it is.

---

**Hannah Kuck**  
**Aberdeen SD**  
**Smkuck@abe.midco.net**

**Comment:**

I am opposed to the deer license draw system. It is not in need of change and we hunters do not want it changed.

---

**Ronald Smith**  
**Deadwood SD**  
**rgsmith2@live.com**

**Comment:**

I am an older (age) resident deer hunter in the Black Hills. Under current regulations my Non-Resident Sons are lucky to get 1 tag every 3+ years. I'm concerned that the new rules will eliminate them from getting a license to hunt with me at all, let alone my Grandchildren in the future! I think given the price they pay for a tag \$300, they should have a chance for a percentage of the 1st draw tags, yes, a chance even before East river hunters get 2nd or 3rd tags!  
Ron Smith

---

**Michael Kroger**  
**Bridgewater SD**  
**Krogermi@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

This is the same as proposed before, but glitterfied to Target the young Hunter. All it will help is getting their first deer tag. But not really make any difference in the long run.

---

**Clark Baker**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**clarkbaker27@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

This new plan will ruin the chances for hunters that want to hunt more than one season...Leave the Draw alone.....

---

**Raymond Oyen**  
**Lead SD**  
**rayoyen@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

We need to get this done and I hope the committee lets it go through

---

**Andy Miller**

**Bruce SD**

**e4millerad@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

The bonus point for the youth is a great idea and I support that portion of this proposal.

However, I vehemently oppose the combined draw portion.

---

**Lee Kinney**

**Onida SD**

**kinneyl@icloud.com**

**Comment:**

I don't know anyone who thinks this is a good idea. I grew up in Brookings county and still own land there. Nobody that I know of back there supports this idea either. Leave the drawing the way it is. Don't understand how you think this is a good idea. Please get people on the commission that listen to the voters and have common sense.

---

**Mark Smedsrud**

**Hartford SD**

**smedsrud@unitelsd.com**

**Comment:**

I support this proposal as I did the original one. I know of many people who are discouraged because they can only draw their preferred deer license every 2 or more years. You will not keep people involved in a sport if they can only participate that infrequently. It's discouraging that some hunters put their own selfishness above what is fair.

---

**Dan Bridenstine**

**Lead SD**

**dbridenstine@live.com**

**Comment:**

I think this would help give us who live in the black hills a lot better chance on getting a tag

---

**Lester Roggenbauer**

**Elk Point SD**

**roggenbauer@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

A few thoughts to ponder:

1. Why not offer ANY first time hunter a preference point?
2. Since Indian reservations are considered sovereign and charge South Dakota residents much higher fees to hunt "their" land, why not have a reciprocating fee for tribal members hunting state land?
3. States like Wisconsin have a law that basically says if a farm receives taxpayer funded subsidies, they MUST allow public hunters at the rate of 2 per 40 acres. Why not something similar in SD?
4. Personally, I like the existing draw system. It gives me opportunities every year to hunt with my sons, albeit we don't draw every year. My concern is being forced into trying to hunt areas where we have no familiarity and limited scouting time available. This year I got both East & west river tags, my youngest only got a west river and my middle son didn't draw either (but we did archery hunt). It's not perfect, but I am concerned the proposal will make it worse.

---

**Brady Wilkins**

**Atlantic IA**

**Comment:**

It appears you are looking at limiting non-residents to 1 West river deer license in drawings 1 - 4 and then an option for leftovers if there are any. If I only have the possibility of drawing one license, then I will not even apply and I will deer hunt elsewhere. I was previously stationed at Ellsworth AFB and I am still active duty military and currently on a 1 year tour in Afghanistan. My state of legal residence is not SD, however the military moves me every year or two and it makes it very difficult to find new areas to hunt. I have been returning to SD for the last 6 years, whether from Louisiana, Italy, NW, and Afghanistan - it looks like I will have to look elsewhere for next fall. I hunt for meat for the freezer and love SD, but I will not make the trip and spend money in SD for one license. In this case a career of service in the military doesn't have benefits when it comes to hunting.

---

**Reid Rasmussen**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**reidb1959@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Sounds like a win for the majority of deer hunters getting their first choice

---

**Scott Scheele**

**Carver MN**

**scott.scheele@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I don't understand why a landowner has such a hard time drawing a license ! We pay all the taxes and provide the deer food and cover all year and yet we can only draw a license every third year at best !!!

---

**Travis Rude**  
**Aberdeen SD**

**Comment:**

I like to hunt east and west river deer and if you get lucky some seasons you get a Muzzleloader Deer tag with your proposal I will have to pick one tag per year because by the time it comes for leftover tags all the any deer tags will be taken more then likely leaving you with one tag a year and if you get your way and pass this after it was already turned down I will have to sell my muzzleloader because I will never get that tag again because I will not put in for that tag for first choice and there will not be left overs that was always a bonus tag if you got it that is probably the hardest season to hunt lot of good deer are all ready shot and it is late in the season depends on the year could have lots of snow I would like to see the deer hunting stay the way it has been for years

---

**Thiess Lindsay**  
**Elizabeth CO**  
**Thiesslindsay@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

The proposal talks to combining the draws but does not speak to what will happen with people existing preference points. If someone has several points for BH and WR are they combined?

---

**Craig Ellman**  
**Salem SD**  
**Crellman@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Better but Problem with system is not addressed. Landowner preference is illegal under article six of s.d. constitution. Why are half the licenses reserved for landowners owning over 160 acres?? Why does gfp policies favor millionaire landowners. Why do I get calls every year from Sioux falls friends to hunt my 6 acres in mccoock county when I can't get license to hunt my own land!!!! Read article 6!!!

---

**Raymond Ruff**  
**Spearfish SD**  
**rayruff@midco.net**

**Comment:**

I thought there was sufficient opposition to this and it was determined to leave it alone. Why is it being reintroduced or does public opinion not matter.

I don't think it is broke and should be left alone.

---

**Paul Wiedenhaefer**

**Alexandria VA**

**paulwiedenhaefer@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I applaud the effort to get more new youth hunters involved, and give residents priority. But do believe the extreme limits on out of state hunters is short sighted. I say that based on the fact that I spend between \$4500 and \$5,000 per year in the state of South Dakota to come hunt deer. When I do draw its for a West River Special Buck, which I can only utilize on private land. That is a lot of revenue that is lost to the state, local business, and land owners. Strongly recommend you not be so restrictive to out of state hunters for Special Buck tags.

---

**Daniel Kuyper**

**Madison SD**

**dan.kuyper@kibbleeq.com**

**Comment:**

add these 3 points to the current rules and leave them alone  
we as sportsmen have opposed rule changes and you have been shut down by SD law makers  
please stop shoving this issue down our throats - we do not want it changed !!!!!!!

---

**David Buck**

**Mitchell SD**

**bucks\_2005@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Youth can get a deer license at a young age now. Changing the preference point will not get any more young hunters involved. Combining the draws for Erd, Wrd,Bhd and Md is only making the majority of hunters mad. You will soon be loosing the older generations who hunt more than one season.

---

**Gene Brockel**

**Mobridge SD**

**ebrockel@abe.midco.com**

**Comment:**

Every hunter I have talked to in the Mobridge area is not for a change in draw system. I'm a landowner and wondering if this will affect me with having erd and muzzle loader tags

---

**James Nauertz**

**Vermillion SD**

**jim-joannauertz@qwestoffice.net**

**Comment:**

I have been hunting in South Dakota as a resident for the past 20 plus years and have always appreciated the simplicity of our way of doing things. I understand there is a need from time to time to tweak or adjust things to fit current demands and needs in our ever changing world. Yet, this is far too complex for the average hunter to understand and digest and is discouraging many away from deer hunting all together in the state of South Dakota.

The deer draw system has been adjusted already to the point that its still simplistic and effective. Why put into place this very, very complex way of doing the deer draw that is in reality only going to benefit the few.

---

**Chris Solum**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**csolum@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

East river should be included also. As a resident I should get preference over a non resident. I understand they pay more for the tags. I would consider a small tag fee increase to try and cover that but again I think residents should get prefere

---

**Jim Brewer**

**Pierre SD**

**jim.brewer09@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I support the OLD system, whereby we made separate applications (and 1st & 2nd choices) for EACH big game season. I strongly OPPOSE your new proposal, even though it's appearing that you intend to implement your new system, regardless of public opposition!

---

**Jeffrey Nelson**

**Centerville SD**

**jeffjan@hcinet.net**

**Comment:**

With this proposal, you are actually making the chances for me or my family getting a license harder. We apply for different licenses first choice so we have a chance of getting one. Leave the system alone but I do like the part of giving kids extra points.

---

**Dennis Engel**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**marcia.denny@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

would not want to apply for preference points for second or third or fourth draw when all good places taken in first draw. Leave as is as everyone has same chance of getting a license.

---

**Ben Meyer**

**Huron SD**

**meyerauctions@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Please leave the current draw system the way it is. I oppose the change.

---

**Seth Warner**

**Gettysburg SD**

**sdw15magnum@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

If the states goal is to get more hunters in the field, then the management of the deer population has to change. If a person is getting a mentored or apprentice license they should not be eligible for the regular season drawings. This year was ridiculous trying to find deer, the numbers are down from years past and the states response is to target youth hunters. I did not get my first choice again this year and I get no preference points, next year I will not work as hard as I did just to get a doe this year, I have 5 children, and as much as I like to hunt, if things do not change in the way tags are given out and the management of the deer population then I will not be taking them out. You guys can continue to target the youth in our state but if you continue to push the older generation of hunters out, your going have fewer hunters.

---

**Shane Muller**

**Crooks SD**

**SHANEMULLER543@GMAIL.COM**

**Comment:**

I feel the current lottery system is fair and gives everyone the same opportunity to choose what season they want to hunt.

---

**Dan Kaup**

**Mitchell SD**

**dskaup@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Good idea to allow more hunters an opportunity to hunt in SD. I do not think you should have to buy preference points...those should be automatic when first choice is not successful.



---

**Donald Hinson**  
**Jacksonville FL**  
**dphinson@comcast.net**

**Comment:**

As a landowner of over 1500 acres I try to enhance deer habitat and responsibly manage the deer herd. i pay property taxes in south dakota and contribute to the local economy through the farming operation on the property. Due to family committments elsewhere i cannot reside in South Dakota at this time. As the non-resident opportunity to draw tags continues to shrink i would like the commission to consider allowing non-residents with land holding above a certain acreage to qualify for landowner tags. Thanks for your consideration.

---

**Robert Dirose**  
**Watertown SD**  
**radirosejr@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I have hunted the the East River season with the same people for a long time and have never had a problem getting tags. I also started hunting muzzleloader when SD first began this season. I have invested a lot of money in a custom ML and now I have to choose between the two seasons if your proposal is adopted. The way I look at it you are making me give up the Muzzleloader season and I don't want a doe tag. I can always pick up an extra doe tag during the main rifle season.

---

**Bradley Brockhouse**  
**Keystone SD**  
**bradley.brockhouse@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I agree with limited non residents licenses but strongly disagree with the new proposal, where we have to choose just one 1st choice.

---

**Fred Carl**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**fkcarl@rap.midco.net**

**Comment:**

I really wish you could alter the draw system for custer state park firearm elk. People applying steadily for 30 plus years are soon going to be physically at the point where they can't do it. Seems the limited licenses should be drawn only from this pool and others can still buy their point every year. Let's support those who have been loyal to the system for a very long time

---

**Mike Hoelsing**  
**Aberdewn SD**  
**Mhoelsing@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I am much happier with the way the drawing works now. I understand most we against the change so why is GFP still going to make this unpopular change?

---

**Shannon Miller**  
**Sioux Falls SD**

**Comment:**

there is nothing to serious with the way we get our license now Every year you people are changing something just leave the way things are now. I hunt west river and have seen a lot of changes out there. putting more people out in the field would not increase our chance on getting on private land and would just flood public land

---

**Randy Smith**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**rsmith@sio.midco.net**

**Comment:**

The current system seems fair to me

---

**Dan Axlund**  
**Spearfish SD**  
**dkaxlund@spe.midco.net**

**Comment:**

I must speak in partial opposition to your current deer licence draw proposal. Specifically to the early accumulation of youth preference points, doubling of preference points for youth and the no fee for preference points. I believe this is only creating another opportunity for adult parents to successfully get a sought after tag for themselves.

As a first year hunter the parent/ adult should be teaching legal and ethical hunting not trophy hunting with much sought after "any" and "buck tags" in hard to acquire units more experienced hunters wait for with many years of buying preference points while unsuccessfully acquiring such tags. This proposal is encouraging illegal and unethical tag acquisition by unethical hunters. Youth hunting for doe harvest ethically, is what they need to be taught.

The fees for preference points need to be collected as all hunters pay. Otherwise I see this as discriminating against elderly,veterans, crippled etc. who may not be able to afford the fee and don't have parents to pay the fee. There cannot be exclusions of this type to fund future opportunity of hunting in So. Dak.

Please consider this opinion in your final proposal. Thank You

---

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

**Comment:**

The majority of hunters, want this to go away. We want the process to stay the same. We adamantly oppose this. If you change this you may get some new hunters but push the long time supporter hunters away. And we spend a LOT of money during the season in the state of South Dakota.

---

**Luke Gorecki**  
**Taunton MN**  
**Luke.gorecki75@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Under the new proposal you will not allow nonresidents to get a tag until after 4th drawing. I don't understand the logic that residents can apply for leftover tags for 4th drawing even if they have already received tags but nonresidents cannot. Last year I was not able to come rifle hunting in SD because I did not get drawn for a tag in any of the drawings and there were no leftovers. One of the SD residents I hunt with received his first choice for tags where we hunt and then was able to get drawn for 2 more doe tags so he ended up with 4 tags and I ended up with zero. SD lost out on revenue (food beverage hotel and stop at Cabela's) from me not coming on my hunting trip because of how this is done. I would propose that after 2nd or 3rd drawing whatever tags are left are fair game for residents and nonresidents to apply for and anyone who applies that has received no tags should get tags before someone else that has tags gets additional tags.

---

**Tim Klein**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**23tlklein@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I oppose this plan. I have several years of preference points for both east, west and Black hills set up for the 2019 season to spend with my boys. Please do not take this opportunity away. If you do I'd like a refund for the several years of prefere

---

**Rick Sommers**  
**Aberdeen SD**  
**rsommers7@abe.midco.net**

**Comment:**

Not that these comments appear to make any difference, but do you really believe by throwing a bone about youth preference points is getting anybody to change their opinion? Your customers oppose this change by a vast majority, as do I, but yet you persist. And why do you ask for comments when no matter how overwhelming the opposition is, you still make the change, a change that has nothing to do with game management. Same on you all

---

**Chris Ericks**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**chrisericks@ymail.com**

**Comment:**

I do NOT support the extra treatment for youth! They already have youth tags and mentor tags and extended seasons. If anyone at all gets special treatment, it should be the older tax-paying residents, with decreasing amounts of hunting years left in their life. And non-residents should only be able to apply for leftovers, starting with the 3rd draw!

---

**Josh Kearin**  
**Madison SD**

**Comment:**

This isn't what deer hunters want. This doesn't improve any deer hunters chance of drawing, who apply for more than one area. Currently I apply for a BH tag and a Lake county tag. I average 2 tags every three years one in the BH and one in Lake County, plus it gives me an opportunity to hunt different areas of the state. You haven't changed anything with this new proposal, just making my chances of drawing a tag less. If your worried about amount of rifle hunters cap bow hunters and provide more rifle tags. This proposal has a lot of hunters upset and wondering why nobody is listening to us.

---

**Michael Vandemore**  
**Hudson SD**  
**magoob@alliancecom.net**

**Comment:**

There was nothing wrong with the way we applied for deer tags in the past!!!! If it aint broke don't fix it!!!!

---

**Jon Haverly**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**haverly@sio.midco.net**

**Comment:**

I urge you to reject this misguided proposal that unnecessarily complicates the deer drawing.

---

**Douglas Symonds**  
**Spearfish SD**  
**bettysymonds1@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Under new system days in the field are greatly reduced ,fewer hunters in the field hunting and a increase in folks who unable to get any license in areas close to home.

---

**Nick Jung**

**Pierre SD**

**WALLEYE04@HOTMAIL.COM**

**Comment:**

PLEASE KEEP THE DRAW THE WAY IT WAS BEFORE.

---

**Stephen Turner**

**Rapid City SD**

**smtturner60@rap.midco.net**

**Comment:**

Look @land owner tags, some are not hunting the ground they own

---

**Mark Lambrecht**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Comment:**

You are trying to add 3800 more people to hunt. public land hunters already have to much pressure .out west you have school ground land with no access .east river and west river in high pheasant hunting areas have so much pressure from out of state hunters there's no deer on them pushed out by pheasant hunters .

---

**Lawrence Wold**

**Armour SD**

**larry@atailfortales.com**

**Comment:**

I thought the petitions were clear... Overwhelmingly we don't want one drawing for all deer seasons- we want them separate, as in the past, so we can plan separate hunts. These are separate seasons, at separate times and should be handled as such.

---

**Rick Downes**

**Frederick SD**

**Rsdownes@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Will be less hunting opportunities for everyone with combined east & west

---

**David Diede**  
**Sioux Falls SD**

**Comment:**

By forcing one to choose west or east as 1st choice & then just hoping that there are left-over tags is a crock. The seasons have been split for years & allows one to hunt mule or whitetail . Ther's no mullys east river except along the missouri river hills. I think your going to lose hunters instead of increase. The split is great & working so why change something that is'nt broke. Just another way for the gov. to mess up a good thing & piss alot of hunters off but as a dedicated deer hunter what would I know.

---

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

**Comment:**

I am still not in favor of the new proposed deer allocation plan. Trying to "sweeten" it up by throwing the youth into it and moving non-resident leftovers back one round does not fix the main reason most people oppose this plan. Using the youth to pass the proposal after it has already been rejected by the legislature is WRONG and LOW. Now if people oppose this proposal we are "anti-youth". This is not the case and youth hunters already get plenty of advantages to get into deer hunting. The problem with this and the original proposal is still there and that is that is limits hunters from getting more than 1 QUALITY tag by giving most hunters only one chance on getting their preferred tag rather than 3-4 chances as before. In my situation my odds may go up slightly 1 year to get my preferred tag and my chances almost go completely away to get my 2nd and 3rd preffered tags and the next years my odds go way DOWN to get my preffered tag. So for me, and many other deer hunters, our net result is LOWER odds on our preferred deer tag in a multiple year period because of the odds reduction on drawing special buck tags with the new plan on the likely special buck applicant increase.

The deer hunters of South Dakota do NOT want this and we DO understand the last and current proposals. We are not confused and uneducated as the commission claims we are when they say we do not understand the new system and how we would want it if we only understood the proposal.

I'm NOT in favor of the new changes like 90% of the deer hunters in SD so if this change is supposedly for hunters then listen to the hunters and swallow your pride and cut your losses on your research the last 2 years. Your research found a new way to do the drawing but it also found that most people do not want it. It has already failed once in the legislature and popular vote so leave it alone and stop trying to push it through until you finally get that results you want.

---

**Tom Derby**  
**Spearfish SD**  
**Tom.derby@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

GFP is screwing those of us that utilize this tag. I have been Paying \$175 for a tag for a long time and I am the one sho is going to get screwed on this. Every easy river hunter that wishes to apply east river in the opening draw will apply for this tag now. It will ultimately make this tag nearly as tough to draw as an elk tag, maybe tougher. There is not any good explanation for the removal of this tag from the proposal. I support your proposal other this fact. If you're going to do this, do it right across the board. Don't pick and choose; make it fair for all.

---

**John Sayles**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**jsayles@rushmore.com**

**Comment:**

why don't you stop with the overmanaging, just leave things alone,

---

**Terry Carlson**  
**Canova SD**  
**Tkcarlson32@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I have not talked to anyone that is In favor of the proposed licence drawing. The legislature finally stopped it the first time. Why don't the gfp listen

---

**Paul Pitlick**  
**Pierre SD**  
**pdp1946@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

leave things as they have been . these extra hunters can apply like everyone else and have the same odds of drawing as everyone else. what could be more fair than that.

---

**Guy Bennett**  
**Rapid City SD**

**Comment:**

This is the best thing we could do for hunter recruitment and retention

---

**Ed Wilson**  
**Canton SD**  
**bladeofgrass@vastbb.net**

**Comment:**

been hunting in SD for 25 plus years and if these changes take effect we will be going to other state for hunting this includes several other hunters that we know. we don't think this change will benefit anything. also it is bad enough as it is that there are public hunting areas that are not even worth hunting.

---

**Tim Melton**  
**Salem SD**  
**tdm63@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Why is the Bow Hunting season left out of this?????? If muzzle load is included, so should the Bow hunting. Why are they allowed multiple tags???

---

**Rich Forstner**  
**Afton MN**  
**rforstner@mavo.com**

**Comment:**

The public hunting opportunity provided in the BH is a true treasure. In a day and age when large tracts of public land are being converted to private, I'm hopeful the BH remain public. Public lands are one of the best tools to maintain current hunting numbers and attract future generations to an activity we care so much about. Thanks for listening.

---

**Jeff Berg**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**jeberg@smithfield.com**

**Comment:**

I believe the current system is fair and it allows everyone the same opportunity to choose the season they want to hunt. Just because you are making a change doesn't mean it will be better. What we have works well. If it isn't broke, don't fix(change) it.

---

**Marlys Hanten**  
**Hartford SD**  
**marlyshanten@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I'm not opposed to the full changes. I do not think that muzzleloader should be included as an either/or in drawings. That is a completely different hunt and style and should be kept separate.



---

**Douglas Traub**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**traubdm@icloud.net**

**Comment:**

The legislative rules committee had the right idea in sending the GFP back to the drawing board. The resulting ruse (free preference points for kids, and less opportunity for our family members that live out of state) that GFP has added is shamefully just propaganda meant to tug at the heart strings of the uninformed to try to get this monstrosity passed. A couple of questions and some points for your consideration:

1) Why lure the kids with guaranteed tags and preference points now at age 10 to 15? They will turn 16 someday and be subject to the situation that adults would have to suffer with your new plan - no rifle deer tags most years, just preference points and no hunting. I have taken 6 different kids out for their first deer hunt over the years, so I am not against young hunters - they are the future of hunting, but I feel it is better to continue their positive experience with a dose of reality, so they cherish the opportunity to hunt for years to come. They need to find out what we all know - your opportunity to harvest a deer is not reliant on one's marksmanship, equipment, or woodsmanship, but rather is totally out of our control and is the luck of the draw.

2) You have buffaloed one member of the commission (Gary Jensen). He was quoted as saying that the new plan promotes family hunting.

This is another ruse. This new plan will further disable our family hunt (that we use to enjoy annually) with my brothers and I and our friends on the ranch. No tags - no hunting, no family get together.

3) Repeatedly Mr. Robling is quoted in the press that over 3,000 more hunters will draw their tags than before. What he doesn't acknowledge is that 15,000+ more hunters (the ones applying for more than one season) will have less chance to draw and get to hunt. So, realistically, 12,000 less deer hunters will have no chance to rifle hunt each year in the future.

4) You continue to mislead the legislature, the public, and the GFP commission by insisting that you know how the hunters will change their application patterns with the new system, when indeed, you have no way of predicting. I don't know what patterns for applicants will be seen next year either, but for you to "sort of" promise that everyone (or at least the vast majority) is going to draw their first choice is propaganda, not the truth. It is propaganda, because you do not allow for or explain what is really going to occur for the 15,000+ hunters that used to apply for 2 or more seasons. Like me, they managed their preference points, knocked on doors to seek permission to hunt in strange new places and applied for several tags, just for the slim chance to hunt rifle deer somewhere, if not their first choice.

I would ask three things from Mr. Robling and the GFP: 1) Honesty. What really is behind the proposed change? Too many phone calls complaining that someone can't get their favorite tag? An admission that no one has a clue what is really going to happen to hunter application patterns in the new plan would be a refreshing change also.

2) End the propaganda. Why not admit what the perceived problem is, and phase in a less onerous plan (perhaps just with two seasons, not four) instead. Tell what is really going to happen to the 15,000 applicants that will lose chances to apply and hunt. (not just the rosey picture you paint for the 3,000 hunters who get to hunt in their favorite county).

3) Consult with other state GFPs. I have to think that other states have changed their deer hunt application plans before, so why only this plan, when one that worked in another state could be tried instead? I have questioned 12 men and women in other states, and their system is not like the one proposed here.

I would be happy to volunteer for any forum that would allow public input and some other ideas.

Respectfully  
Doug Traub

---

**Clayton Van Balen**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Dakotaarcher@sio.midco.net**

**Comment:**

First, I do not think there should be an ability to buy unlimited licenses. The other issue I have is with the proposed method of pooling all licenses and only applying for one. I think current method has worked well, so why change.

---

**James Kotab**

**Dante SD**

**gordos@hcinet.net**

**Comment:**

a lot of the people I talk to tell me that its all about the money ,,were people actually complaining they did not get a tag ?? ive had 4,5 and 6 years in a row where I never got a tag its tough but is there really a need to change it ,, its a luc

---

**Jeremy Stulken**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**jjstulken@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

These changes are not addressing the core issues with this proposal. This proposal will affect the ability for friends and families to experience the different types of hunting this state offers. If providing youth hunters more opportunity is the g

---

**Richard Carosone**

**Idaho Falls ID**

**poormanslam@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

The new proposal spreads opportunity out for all applicants. It is a better process than what currently being used.

---

**Adam Golay**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**adamgolay@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I have yet to meet, know or talk to 1 person, no not even 1 that is in favor of changing the way deer tags are issued in South Dakota. I think the cat is out of the bag on this one. The only people in favor of it are the game, fish & parks. They are going to use this to get more out of state hunters in here so they can sell tags to them for top dollar. It's not about getting kids into hunting. It's about money. They want to sell your (SD residents) tags to non residents for more money.

---

**Jeff Lambert**

**Brandon SD**

**jeffalambert@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

The purpose of the proposal is to:

Increase deer hunters' chances of getting their preferred license more often

Hunters will still apply for the hardest to get seasons first. The net affect is hunters will either give up on hunting because some drawings will continue to have the most applicants or they will only go hunting once every three years when they are almost guaranteed a license with points. The only case where it will guarantee hunters getting their preferred license more often is in less popular counties.

Getting more people out deer hunting every year.

Applicants will still apply for their first choice first which will be the hard to get drawings. If they do not get that choice they will likely not go hunting because they will need to wait for a later drawing with no licenses. I believe the net affect will be less hunters.

I'm all for encouraging youth and first time hunters. I think it would be beneficial to give them advantages noted but not change the existing drawing structure.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Steven Johnke**

**Garretson SD**

**stevejohnke@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I feel the current system allows everyone the opportunity to apply for whatever season they want.

---

**Roger Inman**

**Pierre SD**

**Rogerinman@mncomm.com**

**Comment:**

I know of instances where a person would get alltags applied for, while another person gets none. All emotion aside, it appears to be more fair to more hunters

---

**Willie Werdel**

**Hurley SD**

**WILLIE@SIGNATURECOMPANIES  
LLC.COM**

**Comment:**

I would like to see the Muzzle loader season left out of the pool and pool the East, West and Hills together.

---

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

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Miles Clark**  
**Oacoma SD**  
**miles\_clark@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

why not have it so people that live in the county's where they hunt get 1st choice of the tags

---

**Chris Duklet**  
**Watertown SD**  
**cduklet@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Adding special benefits to kids does not change your proposal. If you want more residents to draw rifle deer licenses you should do three things: 1) Encourage residents to try other parts of the state besides the one or two counties they want to hunt in and 2) Limit the number of licenses(especially buck licenses) any one person can draw in the state, no matter what type of license(rifle, archery, special buck, muzzleloader, etc.) or part of the state(East River, West River, Black Hills, Refuge, etc.) and 3)Limit the number of non-resident archery deer hunters(antelope too) and have them draw from a limited number of tags like rifle.

What I see is that hunters just don't want to leave 'their spot' and don't see what else is available to them. Try sell some in state tourism and get people out seeing their own state.

Does one hunter need East River Archery, West River Archery, one east or west river rifle tag and maybe a Black Hills tag. No! Make these people pick one and let the tags go to other residents. This is what you want to accomplish.

If you go out west all you run into is non-resident archery hunters, both in the Hills and outside it. I understand this brings in money(and this is possibly why you don't want to do this) but South Dakota resources belong to it's residents. Less archery kills means more rifle deer tags for residents. I saw this first hand as my son had a Black Hills elk tag and we ran into more archery deer hunters, wearing orange, than elk hunters. Combine this with the fact that the season opened September 1st and it was the biggest zoo I have ever seen in a big game hunt. Even the Conservation Officers in the Hills commented to us on how much of a mess it was for them with everyone using the same resource. It was a poor way to run what should be the premier big game hunt in the state.

---

**Calvin Cooper**  
**Whitewood SD**  
**clcoop35@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I think it would really help on drawing a preferred tag.Can't hurt to try it!

---

**Thomas Harnois**

**Pierre SD**

**inmanswater@mncomm.com**

**Comment:**

Questions??? Do you submit one application with your 1st drawing , 2nd drawing , 3rd drawing, ect? Can you select up to 3 different counties?? Will the drawing be completed in a timely manner? Will the season be the same of different? What will the application look like?

---

**Matthew Bolie**

**Colome SD**

**matthewbolie@ffb-sd.com**

**Comment:**

I am not opposed to change, but I don't think the current proposal will do enough to make any noticeable changes. In regards to the youth changes, it helps them obtain their first deer tag, but then they go back into the general pool and compete with the general public once again. It may take them 3 years to draw their second tag. How is that helping to retain young hunters? Maybe there should be a special drawing for minors, which would then increase their odds year in and year out. The other problem I see is most of the East River residents will still apply for either West River or Black Hills deer as their first choice due to the availability of public land, because they know there is not near the demand for the East River tag and will then apply for the leftover East River tag enabling them to still double dip. The number of East River residents applying for West River or Black Hills units far exceeds the amount of West River or Black Hills residents applying for East River units. I think this still puts West River or Black Hills residents at a disadvantage and will not increase their odds of drawing their preferred tag one bit. Maybe each resident should only be allowed one tag per year? Maybe the first drawing should only be open to residents of each unit? This would increase the odds of drawing a tag close to your home. I also believe the Muzzleloader season should not be included in the first choice process. Very few people will choose Muzzleloader over a rifle opportunity during the peak of the rut. If you want more people to partake in Muzzleloader hunting or make it more enticing, change the season dates to coincide with the West River, East River, and Black Hills season to correlate with the rut. If you are not going to level the playing field for everyone, then I recommend leaving it alone and let the draw process work as it has been. In summary, I am not opposed to change but I am opposed to this proposal. I do not feel it is doing enough to change the current situation. Thank You

---

**Paul Carroll**

**Rapid City SD**

**paul-hunter@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Need to just leave the system alone! The hunters have already showed they don't support this ! Its amazing that our residents and hunters are who pay the wages for our GFP ! Yet they don't care what our opinions are and just do what they want! Still very disappointed with this!

---

**Gary Saathoff**  
**Watertown SD**  
**gsaathoff6@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Maybe I am missing something here. You only give out so many license, so how are you going to put more hunters in the field? I have been putting in for these license and some years not drawing any of them. All the public meetings you have had the vast majority of people are against it. Yet you passed it. Only thing me and my friends can figure out is there is some big dollars behind the proposal. hunters voice does not matter.

---

**Rod Melinsky**  
**Aberdeen SD**  
**rock.e.sky@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

how about a way for disabled veterans to obtain a buck license each year. maybe roll us in with the landowner draw? or allow us to purchase bonus points before the draw? its not worth the struggle to get out hunting just to shot a doe.

---

**Bradley Beavers**  
**Jeffersonjefferson SD**  
**brad@dakotamechanical.com**

**Comment:**

I think it is unfair to non-residents to put them in the 5th drawing pool. There are a lot of outfitters that depend on non-residents for hunting clients and income. Non residents spend a lot of money when they visit our state. South Dakota residents can go to virtually any other state in the union (for a price) and hunt deer.

Why not allot a certain percentage of licenses for non-residents and charge them a premium price for this opportunity? I feel the state is missing the boat on income potential and a lot of resident outfitters are going to feel the crunch from this decision.

THINK ABOUT THIS!!!

---

**Kyle Cutts**  
**Sturgis SD**

**Comment:**

I dont like this because i usually get Westriver and Blackhills tags and we use deer tags as one of our primary food options.

---

**Norman Larson**  
**Stockholm SD**  
**normlarson@sstel.net**

**Comment:**

do not include the muzzleloader draw that is a state wide draw not a east , west or county draw.

---

**Tim Page**  
**Brookings SD**  
**paget@itctel.com**

**Comment:**

I support this because it will also improve my chances of getting a 1st choice.

---

**Darrin Hofmeister**  
**Watertown SD**  
**dhofmeister@live.com**

**Comment:**

The livelihood of communities throughout the state relies on hunter spending for their income. The hunters who are very avid travel and spend time and money on their adventures. They build relationships with landowners that develop into deep friendships. It is the promise of coming back even it means building preference. By only choosing one unit at a first will never give you the preference for the other current opportunities. Thus no more spending and out of state opportunities will be looked at.

All my best and I pray the right decision will be made.

Darrin

---

**Auston Schultz**  
**Watertown SD**  
**auston.schultz@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Cory Beasley**  
**Hilton Head Island SC**  
**cbeasley@lgstores.com**

**Comment:**

Your regulatory tactics both new and old are hurting your state and your fine landowners financially. Nonresident hunters book hunts then can't draw and have to cancel on the landowner. At that point it is too late for the landowner to get another hunter. I hunt all over the country and SD is the most backwards and most difficult state in which to obtain a license. You are specifically keeping out wealthy individuals who want to travel to your state to spend money. We stay for over a week and bird hunt as well. The group I have been coming with for close to 15 years struggles each year to draw, with several guys not drawing, etc. because of the antiquated regulations. If you want to keep nonresident hunters and the revenue out of South Dakota, you are doing a great job!! Otherwise, change your regulations. Look at other states and what they are doing.

---

**Aaron Holguin**  
**Corsica SD**  
**wheelwrightsales@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

It would be great if you worked for us, the hunters. And please stop pushing bad ideas.

---

**Michael Cook**  
**Rapid City SD**

**Comment:**

Changes to Deer Draw proposal. The legislators sent it back to you to get rid of it. Not make senseless changes, but then again you haven't been paying attention to the majority for years.

---

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

**Comment:**

While I support the effort with the youth hunter changes, I cannot agree with the rest of the proposal. This is what will happen west river people will apply for west river and east river people will apply for east river and black hills people will apply for hills tag Nobody will apply out of their comfort zone. This means that some SD residents will never experience other deer hunting the state has to offer. With the current system you have a chance to draw other tags out of your comfort zone and see if this is something you would like to pursue in the future as well, with enough preference to draw every so often. This new draw would ensure that east river people would ever hunt the hills, this is not a good idea as I for one have gotten a couple of hills tags in the last 6 years and would like a chance of getting one or two in the next 6 years with this drawing change that would be impossible. You are creating drawing silos and anybody in business knows silos are company killers. Do not change the draw structure you can add the youth changes but nothing else, change just for the sake of change is not healthy. Change for the better is and this is not better.



---

**Mark Herman**  
**Ipswich SD**  
**mherman187@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Is this how the Game and Fish operates, the original proposal was shot down and now make minor changes and keeping trying to get it implemented? The proposal was denied once, leave the the drawings the way they are!

---

**Terrance Dosch**  
**Pierre SD**  
**tladosch@dakota2k.net**

**Comment:**

Although I appreciate the added overtures, I remain stridently opposed to the proposed changes. Bundling four different seasons is too big of a step. I am convinced that the proposal will result in diminished deer hunting opportunity for me...based on the units that I typically apply for...and will result in serious impediments to my ability, and those of others, to plan for hunts with family and long-time hunting companions. If you must block seasons for a first draw, I suggest that you exempt muzzle-loading and Black Hills seasons from this cluster, and block ERD and WRD. While I believe this would still represent a major compromise to my hunting opportunities, I would regard this to be a more logical and incremental approach to test the actual end results. I will otherwise remain an opponent. Thank you.

---

**Jarrett Perry**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**perry.jarrett9@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I think that you guys should do more research before you make a decision because I think this is a horrible idea to change the draw. There is many other ways we can make south dakota better like general units and limited draw units, private land tags and public land tags that we you can control the hunting pressure on public. You guys are doing depredations hunts right now why cant these tags be handed out during the actual hunting season and tell those landowner that if they want help from the state then let people hunt. You guys can create more units too. I think sgdgfp can do other things to make sure hunters have a chance of getting tags and it may not be that hunters preferred tag but that's how she goes if you want to hunt in any other state. General units would be a great idea because it would give hunters more access.

---

**Brian Wolf**  
**Montgomery MN**  
**Wolfba@lonstel.com**

**Comment:**

I purchased points for first draw not 5th draw.  
Will you be refunding the money for these point

---

**Milo Hansen**

**Mitchell SD**

**hansen5@mitchelltelecom.net**

**Comment:**

Old system is better for youth. They can already get a youth antlerless tag every year. Also using the point system youth can draw multiple antlered tags first draw currently. With new system they can get only 1 antlered tag 1st draw. Adding the preference point bonus for youth is a good idea, especially if the current system is kept. This would guarantee a youth many years of as much hunting they desire.

---

**Ross Swedeen**

**Rapid City SD**

**reswedeen@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I strongly support this proposal. I supported the last proposal as well. This proposal has only been improved upon. I know nothing can be done about it at this point. However, special buck should have remained in this proposal. We are allowing people that draw the special buck license the opportunity to double dip. Double dipping is what got us into this whole predicament to begin with! That person could potentially receive 2 first choice deer licenses while everybody else only receives 1 first choice license. Why is a resident that purchases a special buck license afforded that extra opportunity?

---

**Tom Melick**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**tmpayup@sio.midco.net**

**Comment:**

In 1974 I drew my first deer tag I was ecstatic to draw a doe tag. Sure I would have liked a buck or any deer tag but a tag was an opportunity to hunt. Hunting season 2018 my son and I had any deer tags in Brule county after a two year preference and not hunting the area due to low deer numbers and EHD. My son shot a Nice mule deer Buck and I shot a mature mule deer doe. My son stood up and said these are great hunts dad ! Not because he shot a buck but because it was an opportunity in the field to hunt with his father. Lets get back to great hunts not great Buck boasting . If you have a love of the outdoors the opportunity to be there is is the great hunt.

---

**Tim Page**

**Brookings SD**

**paget@swiftel.net**

**Comment:**

Just to let you know, I am in favor of the proposed changes. I have not drawn a tag for east river whitetail deer in my home county for 2 years. For that reason, I think the system needs to change. I don't believe that I should have to drive west river to shoot a deer.

Thank-you for your time.

---

**Dale Weber**  
**Salem SD**  
**daleweber@triotel.net**

**Comment:**

Hello Everyone,

I would like to congratulate the GFP commission for receiving the national honor of being a great commission. I am proud of you guys.

Another note is to once again express my desire to leave the deer application proposal as is. My family really enjoys hunting WR and ER deer. We are now 15 strong and will be increasing with more grandkids in the near future.

Thanks for your consideration in support of thousands of deer hunters in SD that wish to keep the application process as is.

---

**Perry Cole**  
**Birmingham AL**  
**pncolecpa@aol.com**

**Comment:**

Dear SDGFP:

I am a nonresident landowner and your regulations for me are so unfair! I have owned 480 acres in Tripp County for about 18 years and have paid my property taxes there every year. But because I am a nonresident I have to compete with all nonresidents for a deer license every year. I feel it is unfair and unjust for me to be considered a nonresident since I own property in your state.

Please consider allowing nonresident landowners the same license privileges as residents. I probably pay much more in annual property taxes than most homeowners there and I do not use any municipal services.

---

**Jim Twamley**  
**Parker SD**  
**jltmotors@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

My History:

My name is Jim Twamley and I live in Parker, South Dakota. I am 67 years old and a lifelong resident of South Dakota. I started "Bird Dogging" for my Dad and Grandfather at the age of 5 in 1956. I have been involved in hunting in South Dakota ever since. When I was 11 years old I got to carry an old single shot unloaded 410 shotgun with the adults in my family making sure I followed all the safety and proper gun handling techniques before I was allowed to take my Hunt Safe course that next summer which was in 1963.

I drew my first deer License in Hanson County in approximately 1965 (14years of age) and have been deer hunting ever since. Back in those days it took 3 years of preference points to draw a license (which was at that time a true preference point system) and then you had a 3 year waiting period after drawing a tag before you could apply again. When I drew my next license (1974) I was serving in the Marine Corps and went hunting while on leave. Before I was eligible to apply again I was out of the service and living in Chamberlain where I was introduced to West River Deer Hunting in Lyman County where you could apply for tags every year. Since that time I have been deer hunting ever since.

Depending on how lucky I was in drawing a license, some years I got to hunt both East and West River Any Weapons seasons; but usually I was lucky in drawing only one tag. I have also hunted in the Black Hills on 2 occasions that took a minimum of 3 years preference to draw a license and I currently have 8 years preference trying to draw a Black Hills Any Deer Tag. As for Black Powder tags, I testified in favor of a muzzleloader season, which at that time was for does only, and originally it was a primitive weapons season. As the conditions changed and the deer populations remained in good standing the addition of a Statewide Any Deer Tag was added to allow for taking more deer. With this being a Statewide license and the Department moving away from the "Primitive Weapons" terminology, hunters saw this as a way to be able to hunt in their local area where drawing a tag was taking up to 3 years preference. Thus, it now takes 3 to 6 years to draw the Black Powder Any Deer license.

Since I moved to Parker in 1991, I was a Hunt Safe Instructor for 20 years and was also one of the Original Bowhunter Education Instructors that was certified in 1993. I mention this because the Number One issue mentioned by the students and parents of the students attending the Hunt Safe Course and Bow Hunter Education Courses was that of Access to land to hunt on, whether it is pheasants or big game. Not once did I hear of a complaint about the Big Game Drawing System, other than the Mandatory requirement of Bowhunter Education. Which in my opinion was removed due in a large part by misinformation that was presented by GF&P Staff to the Commission concerning classes that were being or not being held?

Where we are and Why:

As I stated above, the the most limiting factor of Big Game Hunters (old timers and new hunters) is Hunter Access. What limits hunter access is a multitude of issues but primarily game populations and Publically Controlled suitable habitat to support these Big Game animals. This public access is the Corp issue why the West River counties that border the Missouri River get such a great amount of hunting pressure from those of us living East River. This is the same for the Black Hills and National Grasslands; where there is access to the General Public they will apply for these areas. This is also why there is always left over tags in West Lyman County as there is not any great amount of deer habitat that is Public accessible.

As I only hunt the Public Shooting Areas around Chamberlain / Oacoma, 45B, I can only speak to that. However in the not too distant past, those Game Production Areas were managed for all wildlife to include food plots that would support deer year round. Byre Bottom for example was over 50% covered by food plots, along with willow thickets, grass strips, and good bedding timber. Now it has less than 10% of property with poor quality food strips and another 60% to 70% short grasslands, with very little cover out of the river bottom for bedding grounds. This is true for all the public grounds, whether you are talking about the Carpenter, Kiowa, Gammon, Lindley, Reis's Bottom, or the Mouth of White River. Without a reliable food source, deer in those areas have to go to private property to survive. This brings up the next issue leading to poor hunter recruitment.

At Commission and other GF&P staff meetings that I have attended, the number one factor in setting population goals for all big game is not the "Carrying Capacity" of that area, but land owner tolerance of having big game using their property. This is doing a disservice to the Public and to the animals themselves but, unfortunately is a fact of life that I do not believe the Department has the fortitude to change. The easiest way, in my opinion, would require that any Depredation Payments made to land owners be tied to Hunter Access. Also landowner's, who receive these payments, must use the money received to prevent further damage. I know of farmers whose normal farming practice is to pile shelled corn on the ground, with no fencing around to protect it, and then complain that deer are destroying that corn pile by urinating and defecating on it which they are known to do. If that farmer/rancher receives GF&P funds because of that, then that person should be required to use that money to protect that corn pile. That fencing should be used from that time forward and not be an annual recurring expense to the Department.

Another concern of the Department and the Commission should be is where the antlerless deer specific tags are being harvested each year by hunters who hold Statewide Antlerless tags. While there are county specific restrictions on where Bowhunters and Black Powder hunters may harvest does, there is not such a restriction on Youth or Mentored individuals. If you use the GF&P from last year, there were 2314 antlerless deer harvested in the State that cannot be figured deer harvest data that should be used when setting seasons for the upcoming year. These numbers could be critical as those animals will almost assuredly come from the same land that has the most Public Access. Though I fully support Youth and Mentored Hunting in the State, their harvest numbers should be included in setting the County Specific quotas.

Concerning deer populations and management practices, the question should be asked why are Antlerless permits being issued where there are low deer numbers known to be in that area. It is a known fact that in an undisturbed population of whitetail deer that disease, predators, and hunting are controlled; that original mating pair can be responsible for 49 offspring within 7 years. As everyone should know, that to increase the population deer, you need to have does, as buck will breed several does during the at least two rut phases that happen each year. With deer populations are being managed at an already low level, mainly due to land owner tolerances, when EHD or other disease strikes, it takes several years to overcome. In order to aid in the population recovering, all tags should be, in my opinion, "Buck or Bull" only until the population is again at Carrying Capacity. It should be remembered that Carrying Capacity is determined by all factors affecting the

geographic area in question. Another benefit I may add in dealing with EHD or other illness, if you have 100 deer in a geographic area and lose 50% you only have 50 left but in that same area if there are 200 deer and you lose 50% you have a 100 deer remaining to repopulate and in turn allows for increased opportunity to hunters who fund GF&P.

As stated above, the most limiting factor in Hunter Retention and Recruitment is access to land that has hunt able big game populations. This lack of accessible land is directly responsible for hunter recruitment of young hunters. If parent becomes disinterested in hunting, mainly because of access, they will not get their kids involved. Without the support of these adults, there is no reason for a kid to get enthused about hunting. This fact was readily apparent when I talked to the moms and dads who brought their kids to Hunt Safe Courses that I used to teach. If you talk to older hunters who no longer participate in hunting, it isn't the physical factors that cause them to quit, its loss of reasonable access in areas that carry a hunt able population of Big Game. With this being said, offering a free Preference Point to young hunters is not going to increase their participation as \$5.00 is not the limiting factor. I am sorry, but the issue is no access to hunt able areas that hold deer in most counties of South Dakota without having to pay for access.

Possible Solution to Current Draw System

Option #1.

I propose that the current draw structure stay in place as it is the most fair to everyone who enters it with the following system change: the Department goes to a true preference point system; those with the most points draw a tag each year. This way you do not have someone with 0 points drawing a tag while someone with 5 points does not. This is a particular problem with Hunters I talk to in Turner County as it is with any elk hunter you are likely talk to. The only people who are against this are the Department and those who are lucky enough to draw with minimum points. I again point to the historical facts that when I first started deer hunting I had an automatic 6 years between having licenses.

Option #2

I would suggest that you fashion a deer drawing like is already in place for elk; all seasons are submitted at the same time. Drawing will be season specific, West River, East River, Black Hills, Muzzleloader, and Refuge. The applicant can submit for any season but once he draws a tag he is out of the pool for the following draws. Thus if choose to put in for 345B Lyman County West River and I draw that license, I am removed for the pool for all other 1st round drawings. If I do not draw that tag and have an East River application in; I would be included in that drawing and each subsequent drawing until I either drew a tag or not. A Preference Point would still be issued for all unsuccessful applications during the first drawing sequence. After the first round the applicant would be able to put in for left over tags like he does now.

By doing it this way, no one would have 2 Licenses before you enter the Second Round, they would still get to choose which season (s) they want to draw with the ability to select as they do during the elk draw. This way, you still giving me, as someone who puts in for 4 seasons with the hope of maybe drawing one, a chance at one of my preferred tags; but once I draw I am out of the other draws and can only have the one license for the first round. For at least the 2nd round, I would recommend that I can only have 1 license for that season, then during the 3rd round if needed would go "First Come first Served"

Non Residents would only be able to apply for West River Licenses and be limited to either 5% of resident tags for that Hunting Zone and be able to apply in 3rd round of leftover tags. The non-resident would also be allowed to buy a Landowner Permit at twice the cost of a resident permit and is only good on the landowners property that signs his application. The numbers of the permits should not exceed 10% of resident licenses for that hunting unit.

Option 3:

Leave existing system as it is and follow the wishes of the majority of the public and written testimony received during the original proposal along with limiting the Non-Resident West River licenses to 5% of Resident tags for that individual hunting unit.

Closing Statement:

From my standpoint, neither the Proposal that was sent back by the Legislature nor the current one the Commission is proposing is fair to experienced big game hunters in this State of South Dakota. You are basically putting the interests of the minority over the majority of the hunters who took the time and energy to respond during the Public and Written Comment portion of the process. Also the pretense of getting more youth in the field by the current proposed changes is not going to happen. If you have adults who are becoming disenfranchised and empathetic with GF&P, as the Commissioners have commented on in the past, who is going to take these youth out? I personally have gotten all three of my daughters, two of my Grandchildren and my non hunting wife into big game hunting but with the changes I see being proposed I can see where their participation will diminish because of my having to choose whether to hunt with them or hunt where I have finally built up Preferences that will allow me to hunt another season. I agree that getting youth along with women, for that matter, involved in hunting is important but you also need to consider the experienced hunters who must pass on this heritage to these individuals.

In closing, please consider the fact that when you ask for Public Opinion and Comments on a Proposal, that the time and energy of those who took the time and effort to respond, deserve to have their comments heard and acted upon accordingly. Whether they are for or against a proposal the Majority should always be considered and, without other outlying legal factors, should be followed.

---

**Bob Whitcraft**

**Andover MN**

**bob.whitcraft@comcast.net**

**Comment:**

SD GF&P,

I was very disappointed after reading my latest email update, "GFP News: GFP Commission Modifies Deer Proposal; Focusing on Youth and Putting Residents First" (AKA putting nonresidents last).

Yes, I'm a nonresident who loves western SD and eagerly applies for licenses and purchases preference points in the hope of getting drawn. Now you're moving the goal post for me again. Seems as if SD is yet another western state that wants to discourage nonresident hunting. Hopefully the commission realizes that further restricting nonresidents also includes demotivating their investments in other forms of hunting, tourism, conservation, and social programs. My wife and I travel to SD quite often for conservation volunteering, hiking, and biking. We are also significant donors to The Nature Conservancy, "Western SD Programs". I call BS on the Commission's logic! Stop sugar-coating the message and just say, 'We've decided to put nonresidents last' or 'nonresidents, you're not welcome to deer hunt here'. If I've misunderstood the Commission's intentions, please enlighten me.

---

**Scott Townsend**

**Berkley MI**

**stownsend@sesnet.com**

**Comment:**

I was wondering if there has ever been discussion about implementing some sort of landowner preference for those that own land but do not live in-state for big game licenses? With the number of licenses available to out of state hunters being so few, it can be very difficult to get tags on a consistent basis. I totally get that it should be severely limited, like one tag per every 160 acres or something, and even prefacing it by saying that the deer must be taken from the property that is owned.

I don't mind paying the cost of the out of state tags, but would just like a little better odds at pulling a tag and being able to hunt our own property on a consistent basis. I am just getting my son interested in hunting and he came with me this last fall and spectated. I am really excited about the prospect of him hunting as well, but with the odds being as they have been, it will be 2 maybe 3 years before we get a chance to hunt our own property. It just seems like there should be a better system in place for this.

I am mainly looking at deer hunting, but this would apply to any other big game as well, especially turkey.

I have also recently heard that there might be changes to the draw system that would put a preference for residents and limit non-residents to the 5th draw. The odds of drawing would go drastically down and I would seriously emphasize the need for a landowner preference. Owning property for multiple generations, and paying taxes and not being able to regularly share that with my son and the next generation would be severely disappointing.

---

**Aaron Erickson**

**Watertown SD**

**Aaron.erickson89@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

This is another terrible idea! Nothing is changed except for allowing kids a preference point.....I am in favor of giving the kids a point to help them draw but leave the rest of the tags alone! Nothing is wrong with the current lottery system, not sure why you are trying to change something that works!!! The problem will only shift to the new people getting their tag they want but do not have permission to hunt anywhere, so this will create an even bigger problem! TERRIBLE IDEA, BAD FOR SOUTH DAKOTA RESIDENTS! Stop catering to only a few people and start listening to the majority of South Dakota sportsmen and women!!!  
Thanks

# Other

---

**Alex Mayer**

**Pierre SD**

**alexjmayer7@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I appreciate the opportunity to provide insight surrounding this important topic. My name is Alex Mayer and I am a resident of Pierre, as well as an avid waterfowl hunter. I recently attended the department's public comment period on 12/4/2018, which was held in Fort Pierre. While the intent was to elicit comment from the public surrounding the 9 criteria developed to address future refuge determinations, this was simply not the focus. The public took control of the meeting providing anecdotal accounts of waterfowl hunting along the Missouri River. As a result, I am writing this letter to the commission.

The intent of this letter is not to criticize the public comment period or the department's handling of the meeting, instead this is to provide insight surrounding the approach to leveraging data to make informed decisions impacting the states waterfowl population. Currently, the survey of waterfowl alone is simply inadequate in its collection of information due to the way in which it is carried out. As of today, the department makes weekly flights of sections of the river throughout the hunting season, in addition to a single Mid-Winter Survey around the first week in January. However, as described by the department's resource manager and biologist these flights do not fly regularly. In fact, it was mentioned that these flights may go 10 days before occurring again due to weather and other constraints. Waterfowl are impacted by climate, often making large flights ahead or during such storms. Furthermore, waterfowl may have short staging periods in areas for similar reasons. The current data collection by GFP is simply inadequate to make informed decisions surrounding this critical resource.

Worrisome is the fact that this imperfect science would provide the data which would be utilized by the GFP Commission to make decisions regarding waterfowl refuges along the Missouri River. As a state administrator I understand the fiscal and human resource constraints by the department. The state is simply unable to fiscally fly the river on a daily or bi-weekly basis. Further, the limited employee resource of the department makes it impractical to leverage drone technology to fly the sections of the river by respective staff on a daily or bi-weekly basis. However, a central reporting page for hunters to report waterfowl data to the department would assist in the departments effort in collecting accurate reliable data regarding the status of waterfowl migration, sure up gaps in periods where data collection is not being collected by the department and increase transparency between the department and the public. Ducks Unlimited, an international waterfowl conservation organization, which I am sure you are all familiar with. That said, the organization has a report submission platform allowing hunters to submit data regarding what they are seeing in the field.

There are several approaches the state may take in leveraging the insight of its hunters to improve its data collection on state waterfowl. I would suggest the most effective and cost appropriate option would be to expand the use of the form used by hunters when completing their yearly license process. During a license completion the hunter is asked questions surrounding harvest. The department could leverage a similar form asking for harvest information, but also for survey information of what hunters are seeing around the state as they are out hunting. There are countless other options, but this would be a proposed solution leveraging what the department already has, but simply expanding its use in this space.

I would also like to add that the GFP Commission should consider peer reviewed research surrounding waterfowl refuges as a component of the criteria. While state specific information is important, research specifically identifying the effectiveness and nuances of waterfowl refuges is equally as important. In future decisions I would suggest review of this information to compliment the information provided to the Commission by the state.

I want to thank you for taking the time to review this comment and would offer any assistance I can provide to the department in moving this proposed idea forward. You can contact me by email at alexjmayer7@gmail.com or at (253)341-6006.

Regards,

Alex Mayer

---

**Kelly Kistner**



## **Mccook Lake SD**

**iwlasdpresident@outlook.com**

### **Comment:**

January 2, 2019

South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks  
523 East Capitol Avenue  
Pierre, SD 57501

Re: SD IWLA Comments on the Draft Statewide Strategic Fisheries Plan

The South Dakota Division (Division) of the Izaak Walton League of America appreciates this opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Statewide Strategic Fisheries Management Plan (plan) by the South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks Department (GFP). We respectfully ask your consideration on the following topics.

#### **Water Quality**

Angling is very important to many people, including League members, in South Dakota. The state ranks 4th in the nation in the percentage of its citizens that fish. The Division believes to have quality fishing we must have clean water. The plan refers to the amount and the importance of intermittent streams to the state's fisheries. The plan states that the West River Fisheries Management Area has more than twice as many intermittent stream miles then all the other management areas combined.

The plan also references the many dams and ponds constructed on intermittent streams. These water bodies provide an important water source for livestock and they also provide significant fishing opportunities. The loss of Conservation Reserve Program acreage, and other land use changes across the state is impacting water quality and aquatic habitats with higher levels of sediment and nutrients.

The Division urges the GFP to strongly oppose the Proposed Replacement Waters of the U.S. (WOTUS) Rule released on December 11. We believe intermittent streams and isolated wetlands are critically important for water quality and for the health of South Dakota's fisheries for current and future generations. Currently there are many impaired waters within our state. We need to find ways to reduce the number of impaired waters not add more to the list. Supporting the existing Clean Water Rule will help accomplish that.

#### **Aquatic Invasive Species**

The Division believes Aquatic Invasive Species are an extremely dangerous threat to the overall health and future of the state's fisheries. We support the GFP's continued sampling to detect the spread of AIS. We also urge increased education and outreach plans with residents, nonresidents and all water users to inform them about the threat and how the spread of AIS can be prevented. We also encourage the GFP to continue communication with other states and governmental organizations so staff stays informed and up to date on this complicated issue.

The plan states that preventing the spread of AIS is costly and time consuming. We believe the spread of AIS will cost the state much, much more. The plan notes boat wash facilities are lacking in South Dakota and funding for AIS management is insufficient. We support the GFP finding more ways to fund the installation of clean out facilities at infested water bodies. This will enable boaters, anglers and other water users to prevent spreading AIS to other water bodies in South Dakota or surrounding states.

#### **Angler Access**

The Division agrees that large rip-rap areas limit safe access to tailwaters, dam faces, and to some shoreline fisheries. We support the strategy in the plan to gather ideas from other states and design areas that allow safe angling access on rip-rap areas. We also support the GFP identifying and prioritizing the best sites for access development.

We agree that terrestrial and aquatic vegetation limits shoreline access, especially on some small impoundments and urge actions to improve fishing opportunities. Also access signage in some areas is insufficient to provide information needed by anglers this needs to be improved.

We support the formation of angler work groups around the state to develop and rank access ideas in the

different management areas. This was done for the Missouri River and it should be done in the other areas. The Division supports exploring the feasibility of a special stamp to help fund and maintain projects to enhance fishing access and habitat.

Also in regards to angler access, the Division again voices our disappointment in GFP's support of legislation giving a few landowners control over the public's non-meandered waters. The legislation was, and still is, billed as a "compromise". However, a compromise by definition is an agreement or a settlement of a dispute that is reached by each side making concessions.

In reality this legislation was written by legal counsel representing a few individuals. There was no input on the final language from anglers or groups representing anglers. We feel the legislation greatly reduced the public's opportunity to fish waters that were improved or enhanced with funds generate from anglers. Yet anglers had no final input on the language subsequently passed by the Legislature. We fear the legislation establishes a class of citizenry that can now profit from the use of, or at the expense of, what we believe is a public resource. GFP supported the legislation as an opportunity to negotiate with landowners for public benefits of these waters. To date we believe few reasonable agreements have been made. We ask for much broader stakeholder involvement to improve this legislation in the future.

#### Research

The Division supports continued research on the state's fisheries, access and angling opportunities. We agree that the results of this research should be shared with the general public through presentations with angling clubs and/or civic organizations. We also encourage more communication and outreach to the public and especially with youth groups and organizations. That will enable young people to be informed on angling opportunities available to them. This will help recruit new anglers.

#### Angler Surveys

The Division supports GFP's efforts to survey anglers annually and every 3-5 years to ascertain angler satisfaction with the state's fisheries. We support the GFP's objective to identify and implement more cost-effective and precise creel survey methods. We also encourage the GFP to share angler survey and fish populations with anglers and other interested groups.

#### General Comments

The Division would like to see the GFP develop or enhance fisheries located in, or close to, cities and towns across the state. We support expanded angling opportunities for people of all ages. We believe this effort would increase recruitment, retention and reactivation (R3) in South Dakota. We need to make it easier for people to fish the waters of the state whether that be from the bank or shore, through the ice or by boat.

Also we encourage the GFP to place trash cans and/or dumpsters at every public access and shore fishing site. This provides a way for people to properly dispose of litter and trash. We ask the GFP to work with county and local entities so the cans will be maintained and emptied on a regular basis. Sadly litter and trash is a very serious problem at many of our public sites. Litter affects the aesthetics of the location and people's enjoyment of that site. Litter and trash can also impact water quality and the health of a fishery.

The South Dakota Division thanks you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Statewide Strategic Fisheries Plan. We look forward to continuing to work with you on the many issues facing our fisheries in the future and ask that we be informed on future progress on the plan.

Sincerely,

Kelly Kistner  
National President and President of the South Dakota Division  
Izaak Walton League of America  
603 Lakeshore Drive  
McCook Lake, SD 57049  
605-232-2030 – 712-490-1726  
iwlasdpresident@outlook.com

---

**Kent Hillery**

**Peosta IA**

**kent.hillery@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

As a non resident who has applied and received SD licenses for many years, thank you for seeking comments.

From the Springfield boat ramp, it is supposedly illegal to launch a boat if not everyone in the craft is in possession of a SD WF license. As the ramp is built with at least partial funding from the federal government, and that US Citizens are protected by the Constitution to travel where they wish within the boundaries of the country by any means available, I feel that the regulation is illegal and unsupportable. This regulation offends me very much and I have not seen or heard of anything like it anywhere else.

Permanent blinds are banned on the Mississippi River completely. Your failure to eliminate them also on the Federal waterways under your jurisdiction is a significant failure in the fairness department. Allowing decoy spreads to remain out over night is lazy on the hunters part and the Dept of Game Fish and Parks particularly. I know of one non resident who is wealthy enough in terms of time and treasure to have built and says to have claimed four permanent blinds, though perhaps with his hunting partners. I don't know the specifics.

In Wisconsin, the regulations do not allow you to place your decoys more than 200 feet from the hunters location and of course, not over night. I have seen unattended decoy spreads at Niobrara, that when seen from the duck's eye view must look pretty good.....300 decoys or so. Sets like that control the flight patterns for at least five or ten acres around them, and more ethical hunters are left to wonder why they cannot get birds to come to them.

All of these things leave a bad taste in my mouth due to their unfairness. Fair chase is all that we ask, but these regulations stack the deck against the non residents, which I think is your intention, not to mention the ten day license which says a lot about your hospitality.

A reply with some reasoning from your end would be appreciated.

---

**Rodney Brase**

**Omaha NE**

**rodney@braseelectrical.com**

**Comment:**

Hello, I am a member of a Nebraska bass club. We have been coming to fish Roy lake and the surrounding lakes for over 20 year because of the quality and SIZE of the bass. There are also other Nebraska clubs that are fishing Roy lake also for the same reasons. I / We are very concerned with your recent rule change that removed size restrictions on BASS. This will damage the size of the fish we catch. We drive six hours to fish in the Marshal county because the fish are large. We believe that it will only take a short time before the large fish are harvested. Please consider on changing the size restriction rule back on next year's agenda.

# Public Comments

## Deer License Allocation

---

**David Gesch**

**Mound MN**

**dsgesch@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

As a hunter that lives in MN but hunts almost entirely in SD (by choice), I'd love to have SOME chance at drawing an occasional deer tag in Spink County. Under the current system, I only get drawn about once every 4-5 years. As someone who LOVES the state of SD and prefers to hunt with my family, who are residents of SD, I find it disappointing that I may never have that chance again. I've hunted pheasants in SD every season since 1990, and willingly spent 1000's of dollars to do so. I began antlerless deer hunting in Spink County in 1998 and had my best days afield in your great state, hunting with my brother & nephews. I was randomly drawn this season (after 5 years of unsuccessful draws), and I'd hate to think it was my last! I "passed" on dozens of smaller or running does I could've taken, never fired a shot all season, and had the time of my life- just because I actually had the chance to harvest ONE doe if I chose to do so. PLEASE reconsider that proposal that would eliminate any chance for non-residents like me to participate in my favorite hunt of my year... deer hunting in SoDak! Thank you for your time & God Bless, David Gesch.

---

**Jeff Jundt**

**Lake Orion MI**

**Comment:**

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 and doesn't have too much time left. In fact, this is the first year (in past 30) 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. This upcoming year the land will be transferred over to me upon my mother's death and I had hoped to continue rifle hunting on our property for decades to come. 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 after the fourth 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. I guess that is only if it is pheasant hunting. All other hunting, a nonresident 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 a license 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 may have to switch to elk hunting out farther west of SD or down south from here on out, I would 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'm not sure I want to continue giving the SD GF&P my money any longer. I've even brought a good friend out for pheasant and turkey hunting in the past 3 years. I was looking to get an upland bird dog this coming year but if I'm no longer coming to South Dakota to hunt pheasant then I don't really see the need and will probably get myself a dog for waterfowl hunting in Michigan.

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

---

**Ross Swedeen**  
**Rapid City SD**

**Comment:**

Esteemed SD GFP Commissioners,

I will try to save you all from a book this time! I hope you all had a wonderful Christmas and a happy New Year! I sure did. Aside from the quality time I got to spend with my family, I watched my oldest daughter harvest her first deer. That was truly the highlight of my hunting "career"! I had the opportunity to hunt deer 17 days for myself all over this great state. I was fortunate to harvest 3 great deer on public land with the 3 first choice licenses that I drew (ER, WR & MZ). One of them being the most mature deer I have ever harvested. He was a old brute of a warrior! Now it is back to a different type of grind. One not so enjoyable, work!

Once again, I would like to thank you for tackling this very contentious topic. I was honestly shocked when you voted unanimously to approve the previous proposal. That showed what you all truly care about! You separated the facts and statistics from all the emotion and rhetoric. Something rarely found in today's political climate. Point in case, the Legislature Review Committee's ruling on this same topic. On the contrary, I understand change is very slow in governmental bureaucracies. No matter the branch, department, etc.

The original proposal of having all the deer licenses in one "bucket" was a far better proposal. It would have allowed even more SD residents to draw a deer license. At the same time, it would have had the greatest positive impacts on the drawing odds. The special buck licenses should have remained at the very least. A person that draws a special buck license can potentially receive 2 first choice deer licenses, while the remaining hunters only have the chance for 1 first choice license. We are allowing people that draw a special buck license the opportunity to double dip. Double dipping is what got us into this situation to begin with!

Why is a resident that purchases a special buck license afforded the extra opportunity? Did removing those licenses out of the "bucket" make the proposal more palatable for the uninformed masses and/or selfish hunters? Is it because they have private land to hunt? Is it because they are willing to spend the extra money needed for the special buck license? In my opinion, none of those are valid reasons to justify giving a group of hunters additional opportunities at first choice licenses over another. I would be interested in the honest answer. At the same time, I do understand the politics behind that decision as well. Wrong, right, or otherwise.

Secondly, I predict that more hunters will now apply for the special buck license for the option of double dipping. All the while, potentially tanking the future drawing odds for the special buck licenses. Unfortunately, human nature can be inherently greedy. I believe "hate the game, not the player" applies here.

Lastly, I predict it will also increase the amount of people that abuse the special buck license by not having private land lined up to hunt. Not that I am all knowing, nor that I even have a lot of friends; but I have never heard of the SDGFP checking the legitimacy of the private land permission from any of the special buck applicants that I personally know. The SDGFP doesn't have the time or resources to spend validating every special buck license holder, or rather, understandably those limited resources are better spent elsewhere. It is more of a honor system than anything. I understand there is nothing you can do at this point regarding the special buck licenses. None the less, I wanted to share my two cents. Time will tell the tale!

I supported the last proposal, and you have only improved upon it! I fully support this proposal as well. This proposal will allow a increased number of individual deer hunters the opportunity to enjoy the great outdoors each fall in South Dakota. This proposal will give more opportunities to our youth hunters. At the same time, this proposal will also undoubtedly increase drawing odds. Please prove YET AGAIN why you were awarded the Commission of the Year by supporting this proposal as well.

In closing, I want to thank each of you for taking on the responsibility and commitment of such a thankless position. I'm sure this topic has reinforced the thanklessness of the masses. I would venture to say the NR topic you will be tackling next will be even worse. I wish you the best in making the very difficult decisions yet to come!

---

**Quintin Biermann**

**Rapid City SD**

**Quintin.biermann@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

With all the opposition the first go round please take a hint and let this die. We south dakotans want the opportunity to enjoy as many resources as we can on a yearly basis. I am all for youth involvement but there is a better way to go about it

---

**Dan Doyle**

**Colman SD**

**Icefisherdan@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I attended the state fair forum and watched South Dakota Focus on public TV regarding the proposal. At both events it was asked how the proposal was doing approval wise. At both events the hunters who opposed the proposal outnumbered those in favor of it. At the state fair Tony Leif stated several times that hunter satisfaction was the main priority of the gfp. Since then hundreds of emails against the proposal have been sent, and the legislative committee turned your proposal down. You're proving that you don't care what the people you represent have to say, and hunter satisfaction is the least of your concerns. I'll ask this? Why can't you take no for an answer, rather than keep going until you've shoved this down every hunters throat in the state? Just to say "we win"??

And if your amendment to the proposal is giving kids preference points so they can shoot bucks, you've all lost what hunting is about and the principles behind it. Shut off the outdoor channel and listen to the people signing your paychecks. Prove me wrong, and leave the system alone.