



Public Comments

Comments provided by the public between
June 5, 2023 at 12:00 pm CST to July 17, 2023 at 12:00 pm CST.

Nonresident Waterfowl

Dylan Herr

Huron SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

To many the way there is, don't need more in the state with the limited about of water this year. Ever year there is fights over hunting the same birds and it's nonresident causing the problems such as trespassing. Don't need nonresidents going to farmers doors durning their busy harvest.

Comment #10396: 7/14/23 at 9:55:53 PM

Ashton Brown

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I believe that nonresidents should not have to apply for waterfowl tags.

Other

Comment #10398: 7/16/23 at 12:42:34 PM

Dana Rogers

Hill City SD

Position: support

Comment:

This is in support of the petition to remove the crossbow as an approved weapon for paddlefish for ALL. Crossbows are allowed for handicapped individuals that can NOT draw the minimum weight requirements for big game. No reason it should be different for bowfishing.

To allow someone to have a shoulder fired, trigger operated weapon that's already loaded and cocked back with a telescopic scope is a huge advantage over a bowfisherman that has to see the target, draw the bow, aim and release. It's also asking for accidents to have a loaded, cocked weapon (at all times) ready to fire on a boat.

If you want to keep them legal for handicapped bowfisherman (ala archery deer) that's absolutely fine. But, just know that bowfishing weights are rediculously low compared to game hunting draw weights.

Keep crossbows as handicapped weapons please.

Comment #10389: 6/5/23 at 1:59:42 pm

Roger Dekok

Mount Vernon SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

10. Petition #192: Restricting Crossbows for Paddlefish . I am in support of this petition and oppose the use of crossbows for bowfishing without a disability permit. If SDGFP allows this for bowfishing then a precedent is set to allow them in other archery activities. Archery needs to be kept a primitive sport. Also for those that use a crossbow COs need to make sure there are no battery operated devices or magnified optics. This technology shouldn't even be used with a disability permit or during other seasons ie firearms.

Comment #10390: 6/6/23 at 7:47:55 AM

Wyatt Skelton

Bryant SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Oppose crossbows in archery paddlefish seasons. Unfair advantage and potential safety concerns waving loaded projectile launcher around.

Comment #10391: 6/6/23 at 10:59:24 AM

Jim Dahlberg

Hot Springs SD

Position: other

Comment:

Crossbows do not belong in any archery season. They are made with a gun type trigger and stock. They fire a projectile that is similar but NOT an arrow. Part of using archery equipment is the act of drawing, aiming and physically releasing the string of the bow. A cross"gun" is loaded and ready to shoot exactly the same as a firearm. They should not be allowed in the archery paddlefish season or any other archery season except for those people with doctor recognized physical issues which would limit their ability to use traditional archery equipment.

Thank-you for your consideration.

Jim Dahlberg

Comment #10392: 6/6/23 at 11:06:21 AM

Sara Parker
Sioux Falls SD
Position: other

Comment:

I am writing to request that links/details to any items that will be voted on in that month's Commission meeting be online (on the Current Meeting Overview page) no later than 6 days prior to the meeting. This will give the public 3 days to review the details and submit a comment for the public record if desired.

When links to the items to be voted on aren't put online until AFTER the public comment deadline, the public does not have the opportunity to review the details and submit a written comment for that month's meeting.

This happened when the Nest Predator Bounty Program for another 4 years at January's meeting and has happened again with a proposal to renew the River Otter trapping & hunting season for another 2 years.

???????? ?????????? ??? ????????????? ?????????????????????? ?????? ??????
????????????????????????? ?????????? ?????????????????????? ??? ?????????????????????? ????? ??
????????? ??? ?????? ?????????????? ??????????????.

Comment #10393: 6/8/23 at 10:19:10 AM

Michael Sherwood
Chamberlain SD
Position: support

Comment:

The Custer state park rifle elk drawing was completed, again I was unsuccessful in drawing a once in a lifetime tag, now I have 33 years preference, and now have only one leg to stand on, people with all these years of preference should have some type of way to possibly get an elk tag before they die !!

Is there anyway a special allotment for people with over 30+ years of unsuccessful drawing a tag can be put into a different pool???

Thank you

Michael Sherwood

521 S. Sanborn

Chamberlain South Dakota 57325

Comment #10394: 6/16/23 at 4:45:22 AM

Douglas Prisbe
Watertown SD
Position: oppose

Comment:

"It is very exciting to see the next generation out trapping and getting involved in wildlife management," said Kevin Robling, GFP Department Secretary. "Youth participation continues to increase each year of the program, and we are so proud to see more youth and families getting outdoors." This is NOT wildlife management! Instead you are promoting a lack of respect for wildlife and introducing children to a cruel and violent activity. I also resent the "required field" of "support" or "oppose". With the way that SD government works all the "oppose" comments are automatically deleted.

Comment #10395: 7/10/23 at 4:02:21 PM

Yankton SD**Position:** oppose**Comment:**

Turkey proposal, good for SD GFP's pocketbook, bad for SD residents

To commission members, listeners and all those SD residents who plan to turkey hunt during next year's 2024 spring season,

The proposal: Modify administrative rule to restrict the number of applications a person may submit during the third draw for Prairie Spring Turkey, Fall Turkey, and Prairie Antelope.

To be blunt, this latest proposal hurts SD Resident opportunity to draw a turkey tag by giving nonresident better opportunities to draw single tags. Right now, approximately 2/3 of the turkey tags in the third draw go to nonresidents. Limiting this draw cuts out even more SD residents that enjoy traveling throughout the state to hunt.

This proposal looks, feels, and smells like an easy cash grab for SD GF&P. If SD resident opportunity is limited, more opportunity to nonresident become available. Selling tags for \$100-\$125 to nonresidents by cutting out opportunity from residents that pay \$25-\$35 is an easy way for the state to make money while promoting "more opportunity for unique hunters."

Looking at the data, approximately 301 out of 1,480 nonresident applications came back successful in the first and second draw. Compare that to the third draw where 1,051 out of 1,242 nonresident applications were successful.

Looking at residents, 4716 applications out of 5652 were successful in the first two draws, and 643 out of 1053 resident applications were successful.

The reason I bring up this, per the data given in the proposal: "During the 2023 third draw for Prairie Spring Turkey, 297 hunters were successful in two or more of their applications, resulting in 556 total hunters with two or more licenses through 3 draws and 1,279 hunters still without a single license.

A quick dive into those stats gives the appearance that a majority of the 1,279 hunters without a tag were one of the 1,179 nonresidents from the first and second draw that simply didn't apply in the third draw as the unit they preferred to hunt was simply sold out and not available, which changing this rule by definition would not have any true advantageous outcome as the tags sell out in the first draw, or if any additional tags are leftover would stack the odds very unfavorable, as is with the example of unit 17, where 60 resident applicants tried their luck for 5 available tags, or unit 58 where 110 nonresident applicants went for 1 tag, a .009% chance of drawing. Most turkey hunters hunt local, don't travel throughout the state for turkeys, and honestly trying to sell the appearance that that the 297 hunters were to blame in the third draw for 1,279 not having a tag is simply not the case.

We need to make proposals that are fair but respectful to #1 the animals, #2 benefit SD residents, THEN after #2, #3 our nonresident friends.

As we see with deer, antelope, etc... when we don't manage our wildlife in that order, we start to have BIG issues. If we truly are for the residents of our state, we need to provide them with better opportunity. We shouldn't operate where everyone gets a golden star. As we're seeing in so many states throughout the US where nonresidents are continually getting smaller quantities (and more expensive) tags, we should be following in suit. Example is Nebraska that limited their Nonresident turkey tags this past spring because of the overhunting and low populations of turkeys that has taken place in their state over the last several years.

Last, this proposal being introduced with an Antelope change that has not gone to third draw within the past decade is unwarranted and looks like the state is trying to push the agenda based on the perception of our low antelope number situation. These are separate issues, keep them that way.

I would propose one of three modifications to this proposal:

1: No change in the current third draw license arrangement. Keeping it as stated in current draw management.

2: Propose that "Resident and Nonresident licensed are pooled. Residents may submit up to five (5) applications. Four (4) applications if previously successful. Nonresidents may submit up to two (2) applications. One (1) application if previously successful."

3: Propose that "Resident and Nonresident licensed are pooled. Up to Three (3) applications. Two (2) applications if previously successful."

Thank you for your time and consideration

Foster Bartholow

ATTACHMENT INCLUDED

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Turkey proposal, good for SD GFP's pocketbook, bad for SD residents

To commission members, listeners and all those SD residents who plan to turkey hunt during next year's 2024 spring season and beyond,

The proposal: Modify administrative rule to restrict the number of applications a person may submit during the third draw for Prairie Spring Turkey, Fall Turkey, and Prairie Antelope.

Opening Argument: To be blunt, this latest proposal hurts SD residents by putting more tags in Non-Residents hands while SD GF&P makes more revenue from selling these tags at a higher premium to out of staters. Right now, approximately 2/3 of the turkey tags in the third draw go to nonresidents. Limiting the third draw to one tag per applicant cuts more SD resident opportunity that enjoy traveling throughout the state to hunt.

This proposal is an easy cash grab for SD GF&P. If SD resident opportunity is limited, more opportunity to nonresident become available. Selling tags for \$100-\$125 to nonresidents by cutting out opportunity from residents that pay \$25-\$35. Using the phrase "more opportunity for unique hunters" is partly accurate, but looking into the details, the "unique hunters" primarily consist of Non-Resident hunters.

Looking at the data, approximately 301 out of 1,480 nonresident applications came back successful in the first and second draw. Compare that to the third draw where 1,051 out of 1,242 nonresident applications were successful.

The reason I bring up this, per the data given in the proposal: "During the 2023 third draw for Prairie Spring Turkey, 297 hunters were successful in two or more of their applications, resulting in 556 total hunters with two or more licenses through 3 draws and 1,279 hunters still without a single license.

A quick dive into those stats gives the appearance that a majority of the 1,279 hunters without a tag were one of the 1,179 nonresidents from the first and second draw that simply didn't apply in the third draw as the unit they preferred to hunt was simply sold out and not available after the first two draws.

Looking at residents, 4716 applications out of 5652 were successful in the first two draws, several of those unsuccessful applicants going for hard to draw tags.

Changing this rule would not have any true advantageous outcome on helping more tags become available as several units in the first and second draw are sold out by the time the third draw becomes open.

A perfect example of this is unit 17, where 60 resident applicants tried their luck for 5 available tags in the second draw, or unit 58 where 110 nonresident applicants went for 1 tag, a .009% chance of drawing in the second draw.

Closing statement:

We need to make proposals that are fair but respectful to #1 the animals, #2 benefit SD residents, THEN #3 our nonresident friends.

If we truly are for the residents of our state, we need to provide them with better opportunity over nonresident.

Pay attention to what other states throughout the US are doing, limiting access to non-residents so the population can grow while giving their residents better opportunity is at the forefront in discussions and actions. As a nonresident that has hunted other states such as WY, NE, CO and MT, they are continually giving smaller quantities (and more expensive) tags, we should be following in suit. A prime example is Nebraska that limited their Nonresident turkey tags this past spring because of the overhunting and low populations of turkeys that has taken place in their state over the last several years because of allowing excess nonresident access.

I would request an amendment to this proposal, this can be done in one of four ways:

1: No change in the current third draw license arrangement. Keeping it as stated in current draw management.

2: Propose that "Resident and Nonresident licensed are pooled. Residents may submit up to five (5) applications. Four (4) applications if previously successful. Nonresidents may submit up to two (2) applications. One (1) application if previously successful."

3: Propose that "Resident and Nonresident licensed are pooled. Residents may submit up to Four (4) applications. Three (3) applications if previously successful. Nonresidents may submit up to Two (2) applications. One (1) application if previously successful."

4: Propose that "Resident and Nonresident licensed are pooled. Up to Three (3) applications. Two (2) applications if previously successful."

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Comment #10399: 7/16/23 at 9:57:34 PM

Taylor Bartholow

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am submitting my comments on the Turkey proposal

The proposal: Modify administrative rule to restrict the number of applications a person may submit during the third draw for Prairie Spring Turkey, Fall Turkey, and Prairie Antelope.

Opening Argument: To be blunt, this latest proposal hurts SD residents by putting more tags in Non-Residents hands while SD GF&P makes more revenue from selling these tags at a higher premium to out of staters. Right now, approximately 2/3 of the turkey tags in the third draw go to nonresidents. Limiting the third draw to one tag per applicant cuts more SD resident opportunity that enjoy traveling throughout the state to hunt.

This proposal is an easy cash grab for SD GF&P. If SD resident opportunity is limited, more opportunity to nonresident become available. Selling tags for \$100-\$125 to nonresidents by cutting out opportunity from residents that pay \$25-\$35. Using the phrase "more opportunity for unique hunters" is partly accurate, but looking into the details, the "unique hunters" primarily consist of Non-Resident hunters.

Looking at the data, approximately 301 out of 1,480 nonresident applications came back successful in the first and second draw. Compare that to the third draw where 1,051 out of 1,242 nonresident applications were successful.

The reason I bring up this, per the data given in the proposal: "During the 2023 third draw for Prairie Spring Turkey, 297 hunters were successful in two or more of their applications, resulting in 556 total hunters with two or more licenses through 3 draws and 1,279 hunters still without a single license.

A quick dive into those stats gives the appearance that a majority of the 1,279 hunters without a tag were one of the 1,179 nonresidents from the first and second draw that simply didn't apply in the third draw as the unit they preferred to hunt was simply sold out and not available after the first two draws.

Looking at residents, 4716 applications out of 5652 were successful in the first two draws, several of those unsuccessful applicants going for hard to draw tags.

Changing this rule would not have any true advantageous outcome on helping more tags become available as several units in the first and second draw are sold out by the time the third draw becomes open.

A perfect example of this is unit 17, where 60 resident applicants tried their luck for 5 available tags in the second draw, or unit 58 where 110 nonresident applicants went for 1 tag, a .009% chance of drawing in the second draw.

Closing statement:

We need to make proposals that are fair but respectful to #1 the animals, #2 benefit SD residents, THEN #3 our nonresident friends.

If we truly are for the residents of our state, we need to provide them with better opportunity over nonresident. Pay attention to what other states throughout the US are doing, limiting access to non-residents so the population can grow while giving their residents better opportunity is at the forefront in discussions and actions. As a nonresident that has hunted other states such as WY, NE, CO and MT, they are continually giving smaller quantities (and more expensive) tags, we should be following in suit. A prime example is Nebraska that limited their Nonresident turkey tags this past spring because of the overhunting and low populations of turkeys that has taken place in their state over the last several years because of allowing excess nonresident access.

I would request an amendment to this proposal, this can be done in one of four ways:

1: No change in the current third draw license arrangement. Keeping it as stated in current draw management.

2: Propose that "Resident and Nonresident licensed are pooled. Residents may submit up to five (5) applications. Four (4) applications if previously successful. Nonresidents may submit up to two (2) applications. One (1) application if previously successful."

3: Propose that "Resident and Nonresident licensed are pooled. Residents may submit up to Four (4) applications. Three (3) applications if previously successful. Nonresidents may submit up to Two (2) applications. One (1) application if previously successful."

4: Propose that "Resident and Nonresident licensed are pooled. Up to Three (3) applications. Two (2) applications if previously successful."

Thank you

Comment #10400: 7/16/23 at 10:04:29 PM

Justin Eisma

Orange City IA

Position: oppose

Comment:

The proposal: Modify administrative rule to restrict the number of applications a person may submit during the third draw for Prairie Spring Turkey, Fall Turkey, and Prairie Antelope.

Being a non-resident, I strongly oppose this proposal.

I've been blessed to visit your state for several years, and would hate to see this proposal go through.

In all reality, the state should be worrying more on looking at the science to keep a healthy turkey population compared to what's happening in the Black Hills. Several friends have hunted the hills with no luck the last few years, no luck finding turkeys after miles of walking, calling and locating.

Their only ability to find a turkey has been on the prairie... if anything limit us nonresidents to help like several other states are doing.

Comment #10401: 7/16/23 at 10:36:10 PM

Owen Perry

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The proposal: Modify administrative rule to restrict the number of applications a person may submit during the third draw for Prairie Spring Turkey, Fall Turkey, and Prairie Antelope.

I oppose this proposal.

I feel like this takes away opportunity from residents and gives it to nonresidents, while bringing in extra income as an added benefit.

If the state wanted to give more hunting opportunity to hunters, they would start first by limiting nonresident with a cap and giving that opportunity to residents.

Again, I strongly oppose this proposal and feel like there are better ways to manage turkey tags.

Comment #10402: 7/16/23 at 10:41:33 PM

Jason Kral

Yankton SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am writing this to oppose the restrictions of the number of applications a person may submit during the third round. I just want to make sure that the commissioners are aware that this proposal is not going to increase opportunities for resident hunters but only for nonresidents hunters for turkey hunters. Not even sure why antelope is on here as the majority of their licenses are sold in the first round and no buck tags make it to the 3rd round! If you look at the draw statistics from last year if you know how to apply for a lottery tag and are willing to travel you are pretty much guaranteed a turkey license in the first two rounds. As a resident I would just hate to see yet another license being catered to nonresidents at the expense of the residents.

Comment #10403: 7/17/23 at 8:40:08 AM

Jason Kral

Yankton SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Turkey applications proposal, good for SD GFP's pocketbook, bad for SD residents

To commission members, listeners and all those SD residents who plan to turkey hunt during next year's 2024 spring season,

The proposal: Modify administrative rule to restrict the number of applications a person may submit during the third draw for Prairie Spring Turkey, Fall Turkey, and Prairie Antelope.

To be blunt, this latest proposal hurts SD Resident opportunity to draw a turkey tag by giving nonresident better opportunities to draw single tags. Right now, approximately 2/3 of the turkey tags in the third draw go to nonresidents. Limiting this draw cuts out even more SD residents that enjoy traveling throughout the state to hunt.

This proposal looks, feels, and smells like an easy cash grab for SD GF&P. If SD resident opportunity is limited, more opportunity to nonresident become available. Selling tags for \$100-\$125 to nonresidents by cutting out

opportunity from residents that pay \$25-\$35 is an easy way for the state to make money while promoting “more opportunity for unique hunters.”

Looking at the data, approximately 301 out of 1,480 nonresident applications came back successful in the first and second draw. Compare that to the third draw where 1,051 out of 1,242 nonresident applications were successful.

Looking at residents, 4716 applications out of 5652 were successful in the first two draws, and 643 out of 1053 resident applications were successful.

The reason I bring up this, per the data given in the proposal: “During the 2023 third draw for Prairie Spring Turkey, 297 hunters were successful in two or more of their applications, resulting in 556 total hunters with two or more licenses through 3 draws and 1,279 hunters still without a single license.

A quick dive into those stats gives the appearance that a majority of the 1,279 hunters without a tag were one of the 1,179 nonresidents from the first and second draw that simply didn't apply in the third draw as the unit they preferred to hunt was simply sold out and not available, which changing this rule by definition would not have any true advantageous outcome as the tags sell out in the first draw, or if any additional tags are leftover would stack the odds very unfavorable, as is with the example of unit 17, where 60 resident applicants tried their luck for 5 available tags, or unit 58 where 110 nonresident applicants went for 1 tag, a .009% chance of drawing. Most turkey hunters hunt local, don't travel throughout the state for turkeys, and honestly trying to sell the appearance that that the 297 hunters were to blame in the third draw for 1,279 not having a tag is simply not the case.

We need to make proposals that are fair but respectful to #1 the animals, #2 benefit SD residents, THEN after #2, #3 our nonresident friends.

As we see with deer, antelope, etc... when we don't manage our wildlife in that order, we start to have BIG issues. If we truly are for the residents of our state, we need to provide them with better opportunity. We shouldn't operate where everyone gets a golden star. As we're seeing in so many states throughout the US where nonresidents are continually getting smaller quantities (and more expensive) tags, we should be following in suit. Example is Nebraska that limited their Nonresident turkey tags this past spring because of the overhunting and low populations of turkeys that has taken place in their state over the last several years.

Last, this proposal being introduced with an Antelope change that has not gone to third draw within the past decade is unwarranted and looks like the state is trying to push the agenda based on the perception of our low antelope number situation. These are separate issues, keep them that way.

I would propose one of three modifications to this proposal:

1: No change in the current third draw license arrangement. Keeping it as stated in current draw management.

2: Propose that “Resident and Nonresident licensed are pooled. Residents may submit up to five (5) applications. Four (4) applications if previously successful. Nonresidents may submit up to two (2) applications. One (1) application if previously successful.”

3: Propose that “Resident and Nonresident licensed are pooled. Up to Three (3) applications. Two (2) applications if previously successful.”

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Comment #10404: 7/17/23 at 11:14:44 AM

Comment #10399: Foster Bartholow on 7/16/23 at 9:57:34 PM

Turkey proposal, good for SD GFP's pocketbook, bad for SD residents

To commission members, listeners and all those SD residents who plan to turkey hunt during next year's 2024 spring season and beyond,

The proposal: Modify administrative rule to restrict the number of applications a person may submit during the third draw for Prairie Spring Turkey, Fall Turkey, and Prairie Antelope.

Opening Argument: To be blunt, this latest proposal hurts SD residents by putting more tags in Non-Residents hands while SD GF&P makes more revenue from selling these tags at a higher premium to out of staters.

Right now, approximately 2/3 of the turkey tags in the third draw go to nonresidents. Limiting the third draw to one tag per applicant cuts more SD resident opportunity that enjoy traveling throughout the state to hunt.

This proposal is an easy cash grab for SD GF&P. If SD resident opportunity is limited, more opportunity to nonresident become available. Selling tags for \$100-\$125 to nonresidents by cutting out opportunity from residents that pay \$25-\$35. Using the phrase "more opportunity for unique hunters" is partly accurate, but looking into the details, the "unique hunters" primarily consist of Non-Resident hunters.

Looking at the data, approximately 301 out of 1,480 nonresident applications came back successful in the first and second draw. Compare that to the third draw where 1,051 out of 1,242 nonresident applications were successful.

The reason I bring up this, per the data given in the proposal: "During the 2023 third draw for Prairie Spring Turkey, 297 hunters were successful in two or more of their applications, resulting in 556 total hunters with two or more licenses through 3 draws and 1,279 hunters still without a single license.

A quick dive into those stats gives the appearance that a majority of the 1,279 hunters without a tag were one of the 1,179 nonresidents from the first and

second draw that simply didn't apply in the third draw as the unit they preferred to hunt was simply sold out and not available after the first two draws.

Looking at residents, 4716 applications out of 5652 were successful in the first two draws, several of those unsuccessful applicants going for hard to draw tags.

Changing this rule would not have any true advantageous outcome on helping more tags become available as several units in the first and second draw are sold out by the time the third draw becomes open.

A perfect example of this is unit 17, where 60 resident applicants tried their luck for 5 available tags in the second draw, or unit 58 where 110 nonresident applicants went for 1 tag, a .009% chance of drawing in the second draw.

Closing statement:

We need to make proposals that are fair but respectful to #1 the animals, #2 benefit SD residents, THEN #3 our nonresident friends.

If we truly are for the residents of our state, we need to provide them with better opportunity over nonresident.

Pay attention to what other states throughout the US are doing, limiting access to non-residents so the population can grow while giving their residents better opportunity is at the forefront in discussions and actions.

As a nonresident that has hunted other states such as WY, NE, CO and MT, they are continually giving smaller quantities (and more expensive) tags, we should be following in suit. A prime example is Nebraska that limited their Nonresident turkey tags this past spring because of the overhunting and low populations of turkeys that has taken place in their state over the last several years because of allowing excess nonresident access.

I would request an amendment to this proposal, this can be done in one of four ways:

1: No change in the current third draw license arrangement. Keeping it as stated in current draw management.

2: Propose that "Resident and Nonresident licensed are pooled. Residents may submit up to five (5) applications. Four (4) applications if previously successful.

Nonresidents may submit up to two (2) applications. One (1) application if previously successful.”

3: Propose that “Resident and Nonresident licensed are pooled. Residents may submit up to Four (4) applications. Three (3) applications if previously successful. Nonresidents may submit up to Two (2) applications. One (1) application if previously successful.”

4: Propose that “Resident and Nonresident licensed are pooled. Up to Three (3) applications. Two (2) applications if previously successful.”

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Comment #10403: Jason Kral on 7/17/23 at 8:40:08 AM

Turkey proposal, good for SD GFP's pocketbook, bad for SD residents

To commission members, listeners and all those SD residents who plan to turkey hunt during next year's 2024 spring season,

The proposal: Modify administrative rule to restrict the number of applications a person may submit during the third draw for Prairie Spring Turkey, Fall Turkey, and Prairie Antelope.

To be blunt, this latest proposal hurts SD Resident opportunity to draw a turkey tag by giving nonresident better opportunities to draw single tags. Right now, approximately 2/3 of the turkey tags in the third draw go to nonresidents. Limiting this draw cuts out even more SD residents that enjoy traveling throughout the state to hunt.

This proposal looks, feels, and smells like an easy cash grab for SD GF&P. If SD resident opportunity is limited, more opportunity to nonresident become available. Selling tags for \$100-\$125 to nonresidents by cutting out opportunity from residents that pay \$25-\$35 is an easy way for the state to make money while promoting "more opportunity for unique hunters."

Looking at the data, approximately 301 out of 1,480 nonresident applications came back successful in the first and second draw. Compare that to the third draw where 1,051 out of 1,242 nonresident applications were successful. Looking at residents, 4716 applications out of 5652 were successful in the first two draws, and 643 out of 1053 resident applications were successful.

The reason I bring up this, per the data given in the proposal: "During the 2023 third draw for Prairie Spring Turkey, 297 hunters were successful in two or more of their applications, resulting in 556 total hunters with two or more licenses through 3 draws and 1,279 hunters still without a single license.

A quick dive into those stats gives the appearance that a majority of the 1,279 hunters without a tag were one of the 1,179 nonresidents from the first and second draw that simply didn't apply in the third draw as the unit they preferred

to hunt was simply sold out and not available, which changing this rule by definition would not have any true advantageous outcome as the tags sell out in the first draw, or if any additional tags are leftover would stack the odds very unfavorable, as is with the example of unit 17, where 60 resident applicants tried their luck for 5 available tags, or unit 58 where 110 nonresident applicants went for 1 tag, a .009% chance of drawing. Most turkey hunters hunt local, don't travel throughout the state for turkeys, and honestly trying to sell the appearance that that the 297 hunters were to blame in the third draw for 1,279 not having a tag is simply not the case.

We need to make proposals that are fair but respectful to #1 the animals, #2 benefit SD residents, THEN after #2, #3 our nonresident friends.

As we see with deer, antelope, etc... when we don't manage our wildlife in that order, we start to have BIG issues. If we truly are for the residents of our state, we need to provide them with better opportunity. We shouldn't operate where everyone gets a golden star. As we're seeing in so many states throughout the US where nonresidents are continually getting smaller quantities (and more expensive) tags, we should be following in suit. Example is Nebraska that limited their Nonresident turkey tags this past spring because of the overhunting and low populations of turkeys that has taken place in their state over the last several years.

Last, this proposal being introduced with an Antelope change that has not gone to third draw within the past decade is unwarranted and looks like the state is trying to push the agenda based on the perception of our low antelope number situation. These are separate issues, keep them that way.

I would propose one of three modifications to this proposal:

1: No change in the current third draw license arrangement. Keeping it as stated in current draw management.

2: Propose that "Resident and Nonresident licensed are pooled. Residents may submit up to five (5) applications. Four (4) applications if previously successful.

Nonresidents may submit up to two (2) applications. One (1) application if previously successful.”

3: Propose that “Resident and Nonresident licensed are pooled. Up to Three (3) applications. Two (2) applications if previously successful.”

Thank you for your time and consideration.