

Public Comments

Archery Deer License Allocation

Wayne Huebert

Sioux Falls SD

waynewhitetail@gmail.com

Comment:

I think the state is doing a good job with our hunting seasons, but if you choose not to limit the number of nonresident archery hunters like every other state then charge them double what they pay now. If I choose to go hunt another state I know the high cost and that is a deciding factor for me. I am not saying they are bad people just that we should take resident views first. I also believe the number of Black Hills archery hunters should be limited on the mule deer not sure how this would be done but we need to preserve the mule deer population. Thank you for your consideration and the job that you do.

Justin Broughton

Sioux Falls SD

justin.broughton@premierbankcard.com

Comment:

The changes to the NR archery deer license process do not address the issues brought forward by SD bowhunters. This proposal will simply spread the pressure to unlimited LAU's such as the Black Hills, Hill Ranch, Little Moreau, and others public pieces further exacerbating the problems resident archers face. This also does nothing to reduce the burgeoning archery mule deer harvest which has doubled in only the past 5 years. We must address the issue of NR archery now by limiting the number of any deer licenses available to NR archers similar to ND and by placing a cap on total NR archery licenses available. This cap and change would improve the archery experience for residents and NR's alike while only having a minimal effect on revenues. The reduction in revenue could be more than overcome by increasing the NR tag price to be competitive with neighboring states. Please consider strengthening this proposal as requested multiple times by resident archers. Thank you.

Justin Murphy

Lyons SD

justintmurphy@outlook.com

Comment:

The current proposals for nonresident archery tags do not do enough in my opinion. The state needs to put a cap on nonresident tags as well as have an earlier deadline for applications. The state should look at having limited entry units and offer whitetail only tags west river rather than any deer. Our mule deer populations are on the decline and the early season opener will only further push those numbers down. The commission should also look at raising nonresident archery tag prices. My last proposal would be to further push the nonresident opener back farther to the third Saturday of September. Please consider being more aggressive with these changes so we don't have to readdress them in a couple years when the problem persists. Thank you for your time.

Justin Murphy
Lyons, SD

Sam Kezar
Lennox SD
sam@aspenarbo.com

Comment:

I feel this is a good start to a long needed change. However, some of the items in this proposal I don't feel do the right thing.

First, a 5 day head start for residents to hunt vs non-residents isn't much of a change. I'm not really interested in that portion, but just doing 5 days just makes the residents more upset since its such a short period of time.

Secondly, the limited permits for the LAU areas is a good thing. But giving 20% to non-residents is absurd. Since when do non-residents get such a preference to a highly sought after area let alone at all. Could you imagine trying to offer the same split to residents in a rifle draw? I like the idea, but I think the proportion of non-resident tags should be capped at a lower percentage like the rifle draws.

Third, and this can incorporate changes within my second point. August first is not going to do anything to prevent South Dakota from being a state of last resort. All western states that have application deadlines for non-resident tags are done by May. An August first deadline to get a non-resident tag will still be the last resort for anyone looking to do an out of state, western style archery hunt. The date for applications should be moved back to early April to coincide with the Special Buck draws. Then, non-resident hunters would have to choose to apply here based on preference points and their desire to hunt other western states. This type of early spring draw could also coincide with the limiting of LAU permits. If done that way, a higher percentage could be awarded (10-15%) for those areas because demand would be there.

Lastly, I feel this issue would be best resolved to break up the public land tags and private land tags. Without the push back from the outfitters and guides, I feel the initial Option 2A proposal would have been acceptable to most. So why not look at providing a capped number of non-resident outfitter archery tags that can be applied for and a second set of capped public land archery tags that can be applied for? You could then also have restrictions that the public land archery tags are not valid for the LAU areas unless they applied specifically for that unit and a special draw.

I feel the LAU units should be a limited draw license for residents and non-residents across all weapon and season types. For a true trophy quality hunt, those areas should be limited to archery, rifle, and muzzleloader seasons.

Limiting access to hunting these areas is possible and does not restrict anyone in regards to it being National Forest. Every other state already highly regulates the hunting access on all federally manage public lands without issue. Limiting hunting access to public land is not a crime or problem, everyone can still go there and recreate, just not take an animal unless the state provides a license.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cole Kosmala
Rapid City SD
Cole.kosmala@yahoo.com

Comment:

Definitely support limiting out of state Bowhunters. Crazy pressure on most west River public I go to. Need a cap on permits like 2,000 total out of state Bowhunters. Definitely in favor of SDBI petitions. Need firm early draw date like April and later out of state start date like Oct 1 to help residents.

Dana Rogers

Hill City SD

dana.rogers.1@hotmail.com

Comment:

Commissioners and Staff,
SDBI petitioned for cap and draw changes based on our current NR % allocations used for Black Hills, Refuge and West River firearms allocations.

We showed from GFP data the significant increases in NR archery pressure from 2014-2018. It also clearly showed the disproportionate mule deer and overall harvest by NRs. The GFP staff biologist even presented you with a powerpoint slide showing disparities in mule deer harvest in Harding county, Black Hills, National grasslands units and along all counties bordering the Missouri River.

Thus far, that scientific data has not seemed to convince some on staff and the commissioners to move on these issues.

This current proposal is a START and I appreciate that. Given the timeframe here with summer and fall seasons upon us, we need to get this first step moving to build more data points for future years.

On the NR publicly accessible permit deadline, I would ask that be changed to July 1st for 2019. From the other states drawing deadlines I provided, you should clearly see that we would still be the LAST RESORT. A July 1 NR public land deadline should reduce the pressure some though. We won't know how much effect it will have until it's passed. Please adjust that date in the proposal and vote to pass.

On the NR publicly accessible archery permit start date of 1st Saturday after Labor day. That will only give resident archers Sunday Sept 1 and Monday Sept 2 (Labor Day) as weekend dates ahead of NRs. I would ask that this NR start date be pushed BACK a few more weeks to a 4th Saturday in Sept or even Oct 1. That would give residents a few weekends with less pressure to enjoy their bowhunting opportunities without the excessive pressure seen in many past years. Please adjust that start date for NRs back and PASS the proposal.

Regarding the final item of Limited Access Unit permits on the Custer National Forest (35L for rifle). As this is the only LAU mentioned and would cut the pressure on that unit from over 1,000 permits last year to 500 this year, I believe that unit will be positively impacted by this measure. The distribution of 400 LAU permits to residents and 100 to NRs is (on the surface) a fair compromise. I have to point out though that the 8% allocation normally used SHOULD only allow for 32 NR LAU permits instead of the 100, which is actually 20%.

Given the tight window of opportunity to get this moving in 2019, I ask that the two dates be adjusted and this proposal passed. We can then see what the data returns for 2019 show and if there was adequate improvement or not.

Thank you all for your time and efforts on all of these issues. SD resident sportsmen live here and we very much appreciate being considered prominently when weighing your decisions.

Jerry Ohman

Glenham SD

jaohman@valleytel.net

Comment:

Sounds like it would be very hard to enforce.
Just have an application deadline.

Wyatt Skelton

Bryant SD

wyattskelton@hotmail.com

Comment:

I would like the commission and staff to make some substantial changes to these issues. The data shows significant increases in nonresident tags and muledeer harvest. I believe living in this state ought to have some benefits over those not living here. So to keep the residents hunting a quality experience, I'd like the nonresidents archery deadlines be moved to a July 1 this year for deer and antelope and March 1 next year. Also nonresident start date on the 4th Saturday of September or October 1 for deer. Also for next year, since it is "not possible" for 2019 a hard cap of 8% of resident archery licenses for deer and antelope. With a set limit of muledeer permits for those deer tags. Thank you.

Arnold Veen

Milbank SD

arnieveen@yahoo.com

Comment:

I do support that changes to NonResident archery licenses are in order and support your current proposal with the following modifications;
Proposal #1 Less than a week is not much of a improvement here I would suggest a Nonresident starting date of Oct 1st.
Proposal #2 A change of the August 1st date to a July 1st application deadline for Nonresident would be better.
Proposal #3 Very good idea to lower the pressure on this area and I do support this. On other areas that we hunter have to request access permits to hunt should be considered also to limit excessive hunting pressure.
Thank you for your consideration.
Arnold Veen

Wes Wingen

Whitewood SD

Wrwingen@yahoo.com

Comment:

I appreciate the effort to address the issue of non-resident archery hunters in South Dakota. I am in favor of the cap on access permits for the Custer National Forest. I am also in favor of the earlier non-resident archery application deadline of August 1st. While I support a later season start date for non-residents, I would encourage you to consider moving it back from the proposal for the first weekend after Labor Day. Even one or two weeks would be a great improvement over the current proposal. I view having non-residents afield as a barrier to more residents enjoying a pasttime that is priceless. A longer non-resident opener delay would be a great step toward further promoting archery hunting as an activity for more South Dakota residents to enjoy, while not impacting the non-resident license revenue stream. Thank you for your work on these important changes.

Caleb Walters

Aberdeen SD

caleb.walters@state.sd.us

Comment:

I oppose the change to make a limited number of Archery licenses available for Unit 35L. This unit is already limited to the amount of rifle tags only allowing people to get a tag every 5 years or so. I have been told that they limited the amount of licenses to create a trophy area, which I am fine with. Bucks in that area are already extremely wary from being hunted and it is very hard to hunt them with a bow in this area. What information do you have supporting issuing a limited amount of archery permits??? Is this based on surveys from who was successful in the area last year?? Also with all the proposed deer lottery changes don't you think you are going to negatively affect all the west river outfitters, hotels, gas stations, etc who count on the hunters traveling to those areas every year. Have you ever considered instead of a limited number of licenses, a point minimum for bucks, such as a 4 point or better law on one horn. That would allow everyone to hunt, but protect the smaller bucks so they can grow.

Dale Singer

Spearfish SD

singerinthedesert@hotmail.com

Comment:

Please do not limit archery tags to Whitetails, There are large huntable, numbers of Mule deer in western South Dakota.

Dan Leffelman

Onalaska WI

dleffelman@gmail.com

Comment:

Non-resident tags account for big \$\$\$ in the state of South Dakota. The success rates are still ultra low for archery hunters, and south Dakota has been a destination for my family for many years and has made some excellent memories. These changes would so limit participation from nonresidents like myself and maybe even make South Dakota a 3rd rate Destination. There are plenty of deer that can be saved by limiting resident tags and not deterring non-residents from hunting the great state of South Dakota. Please leave the non-resident archery regulations unchanged.

Lance Latvala

Deer River MN

Lancelatvala@Gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Levi Bertolotto

Blackhawk SD

levi.bertolotto@gmail.com

Comment:

I feel that archery hunting puts significantly less pressure on a deer herd especially if they live in a landscape like the Custer national Forest where they have terrain and cover.

Justin Oosterbaan

Battle Creek MI

JUSTIN.OOSTERBAAN@GMAIL.COM

Comment:

This would deter me from archery hunting in South Dakota. The possibility of hunting for deer in velvet is the only draw to hunt in SD compared to other states if I am going to travel. I archery hunted last year on public land during the first week of September, there was almost no one out hunting. I saw one Hunter in 3 days in 4 different public areas. I can't imagine it's a pressure issue.

Brandon Jochem

Eau Claire WI

Bjochem@charter.net

Comment:

I dont have a problem with the later start date as I do not hunt that early anyway. The issue that I have is with the deadline for purchase of a license. South Dakota is one of my all time favorite places to hunt. One of the great things is that I can buy a license as my schedule allows. I may not know my fall plans until 2 weeks before i leave. Taking that option away would likely keep me from even purchasing a license in South Dakota.

Ryley Thill

Johnstown CO

ryley_thill@hotmail.com

Comment:

It's funny that 8% of your tags go to nonresident and 100% of your issues are due to piss poor management over the last 20 years. Out of state hunters should have the same time frame as residents so they can hunt with their friends and family at the same time. Either that, or come up with a mid solution for prior residents like Montana has done. I think the only thing this will accomplish is making residents who hunt with out of state family more annoyed by your bs. As far as the application date, it was always nice to be able to by a tag whenever, so you could purchase after you know you would be able to hunt and make the trip out. I mean if you guys as a state are turning into anti-hunting, just say it so no one has to wonder where all of the idiotic agendas are coming from. Either that, or stop listening to the "buddies" that the gfp have on a personal level and continue to cry and complain until they get the state to change things for them. It's about the many, not the few, pretty sure you saw that with the last moronic proposal you had last year.

John Weber
Edgemont SD
weberjohn1@live.com

Comment:

Gfp needs to take a realistic look at the limited areas and changes need to be made to all of them. unlimited archery hunters on the hill ranch on 27L has decimated the heard. The quality of the hunt is very poor for anyone hunting that unit, especially for the "Limited" rifle hunters that apply there. It is no longer Limited anything with the hundred plus bow hunters that hunt there. Another change would be to close the archery seasons on the limited areas during rifle season. You have created an ultra high pressure hunt in an area that's supposed to be limited.

Steven Gisi
Ipswich SD
bow103hunter1@yahoo.com

Comment:

Does this mean that this area (35L) will be a separate season/license fee than from the West River archery tag? What is the reasoning behind this proposal?

Chris Ericks
Rapid City SD
chrisericks@ymail.com

Comment:

OK, I understand if the game-count quantifies a limit on access permits to Custer Nat. Forest. But, tax-paying SD residents should get all 500!

Josh Ihnen
Omaha NE
ihnen.josh@gmail.com

Comment:

Commission members,

I respectfully oppose the delay to the start of the non-resident archery deer season for several reasons. First, like Nebraska, SD offers one of the few opportunities to hunt velvet bucks, which is where some of the appeal lies in hunting the first week of September. Second, for those DIY sportsmen with limited time off from work, SD offers several weeks where antelope and deer can be hunted concurrently. Taking time away from this season overlap hurts non-resident hunters. Third, BLM and national grasslands are federal lands, and I don't believe it is right that a state agency can limit my opportunity on these lands. I love hunting in SD, but you are quickly changing my mind.

Thank you.
Josh Ihnen

Joel Messick
Rochester MN

Comment:

I strongly oppose establishing a deadline for public land nonresident applicants. As a nonresident, some years I don't decide to go on a hunt until the last minute when I get time off from work. Establishing a deadline would make it very difficult for those in my same situation to be able to hunt in South Dakota. It seems like this is just another effort to privatize hunting.

Ryan Conley
Lakeville MN
rmconley@gmail.com

Comment:

Why would you prevent a hunter from hunting on public lands if the license is purchased over the counter after August 1? This is silly, and I don't understand who it benefits. All it's doing is adding another irrational regulation to an already confusing system and is not encouraging more people to get out and hunt. I don't know who is being surveyed, or what the motives are, but I deer hunt public land every year in SD for 6 consecutive days in October, and I'm lucky to encounter one other hunter in the field. So if the motives are to provide more access and opportunity for resident hunters I'd say this is a made up problem. I have ZERO issues with delaying the non-resident season by one week, if I was a resident I'd love to have that. But this license change is just silly.

Victor Limacher
Milesville SD
victorlimacher@hotmail.com

Comment:

Gentlemen,
As complex as the deer season tag and season dates are already, I question just you are attempting to accomplish by this? This proposed season date change will just serve to complicate matters further adding confusion to an already complex system. I would suggest that if you are going to make this change, just change the entire archery season dates to the first Saturday after Labor Day, and then leave things alone for awhile. Again what exactly are you trying to accomplish here?
Adding the deadline date for non resident archery hunters seems to again just complicate things.

Andrew Schlader
Carver MN
Aschlader09@gmail.com

Comment:

I archery hunted public lands in South Dakota at the beginning of the season a couple years ago and had a great time. The first week or two of the season give opportunities to non residents to hunt before seasons in surrounding states are open. I was planning on returning for a hunt this September for opening week. If you take away the first week from non residents I will not be returning to this state to hunt and will hunt North Dakota instead. We pay high license fees as non residents. Also much of the public lands are federally owned not state so we should have the same opportunities on them as South Dakota residents. Thank you

Matthew Sadler
Rapid City SD
msadler822@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose the proposed lottery for access permits to Custer National Forest (Unit 35L) during Archery season for South Dakota residents. As a South Dakota taxpayer, it is already bad enough that I am not guaranteed an annual West River deer rifle license or a Black Hills deer rifle license. In addition, SD residents have to wait an average of 15 years for an Elk rifle license. SD residents/taxpayers should not have to be further subjected to a lottery system for Archery access in order to hunt in the Custer National Forest. My recommendation is to keep the current State-wide Archery system in place for SD residents and limit the number of access permits in Custer National Forest for non-residents only.

Mikkel Haugen
Saint Peter MN
haugen.mikkel@gmail.com

Comment:

Great Idea. Please look into a cap on non-resident archery deer hunter license numbers.

Mikkel Haugen
Saint Peter MN
haugen.mikkel@gmail.com

Comment:

I think federal lands such as BLM, National Forest, or National Grasslands should be excluded.

Plus, I already took vacation.

Darron Mcdougal
Antigo WI
darronmcdougal@yahoo.com

Comment:

I totally oppose these changes. It's so difficult for nonresidents to pull off an enjoyable and potentially successful road-trip bowhunt to another state. In the past, South Dakota has always made it easy to plan an on-the-whim road-trip hunt. I could always buy the archery license anytime throughout the season (I don't always know by Aug. 1st if I can hunt South Dakota), and there weren't any stupid delayed starts or anything like that. And, I've always been satisfied with animal numbers and trophy potential. I think that delayed-start proposal is absurd. Quit goofing with details, or you'll lose nonresident license sales and the revenues that we as nonresidents have been bringing to South Dakota all these years.

Skyler Arent
Brookings SD
skyler.arent@gmail.com

Comment:

I believe resident hunter opportunity should not be limited in the Custer National Forest in Harding county. After hunting on the National Forest the past two years, running into non-residents has been the issue that my hunting partners and I have faced. Last season during opener I saw out of state trucks at nearly every access point I was around, totaling over 20 vehicles. I saw two resident hunting parties the whole weekend.

Also, with the deer herd in mind, I believe resident hunters are typically more selective in what they harvest, while non-residents are simply attempting to fill their tag in the limited window they have to hunt. A potential solution to this would be to limit access permits to non-residents like what is proposed, and reassess after several years to see if an impact has been made. If no change in hunter satisfaction or deer herd quality has occurred, further discussion about limiting resident access should be made.

The other aspects of the proposal I agree with, and if there was a small change so that limiting resident access wasn't part of the proposal, I would support it fully.

Thanks for giving me a platform to speak about my opinion.

Skyler Arent

Jake Pechacek
Maplewood MN
radke066@umn.edu

Comment:

Hi,

I wanted to take a minute to oppose the new proposal for delaying the start of the archery deer season until the weekend after Labor Day. I understand it will be more crowded with both residents and nonresidents chasing public land deer, but isn't that the point of having public lands? The big issue for me is the national holiday that could be used hunting, and the opportunity to shoot a public land velvet buck, something that is high on many hunters bucket list.

Thanks for hearing my input.

Gregory Peterson
Beresford SD
huntinsodak@gmail.com

Comment:

The lottery for Custer National Forest where 400 residents receive permits and 100 non residents seems to greatly favor non residents. Twenty percent seems ridiculously high.

Cody Sonnenfeld

Saint Francis MN

csonne8466@gmail.com

Comment:

I do not think that it is a good idea to limit the out of state hunters on access to the public lands. Most of the lands I hunt are NATIONAL GRASSLANDS it is not OK to limit another American's access to a nationally public lands. Also do not limit when people can buy tags as that will only result in less tags sold and a similar amount of deer shot.

Joel Barnosky

Mount Clare WV

bowtech302@yahoo.com

Comment:

I feel that this is a bad decision by the SDGFP. As a nonresident who enjoys hunting in SD, I think this is a step backwards. The opportunities in SD are limitless and I see no reason to arbitrarily punish nonresident hunters who are already willing to pay much higher license fees and access the same lands. Nonresident license revenues will surely go down should this happen. I am TOTALLY OPPOSED to all changes proposed and as a nonresident who will be directly affected, I feel that my voice should have some importance on this issue. Thank you for your time.

Heather Kammerude

Onalaska WI

Eather19@gmail.com

Comment:

Non resident harvest of deer and mule deer in particular are well under projected harvests especially in 35L. There were only 29 mule deer bucks taken by non-resident archers in 2017 in 35L when the state projected 39 and a total of 67 deer. There are no changes needed. These changes don't make fiscal sense for the state and they hurt non-resident opportunity. No changes should be made

Dan Kes

Savage MN

Drkesconcrete@yahoo.com

Comment:

I've said in other surveys. This should not apply to hunters that have been buying tags for multiple years in a row, until they don't Have some loyalty to the non res hunters that love South Dakota!

Dave Sobczak
Carlton MN
dsobczak66@gmail.com

Comment:

Please keep us Non residents in mind on changes, as a non resident we do bring in money to the state as well.

Jim Gruber
Estelline SD
jgruber148@yahoo.com

Comment:

rules, rules and more rules... would someone like to explain to us the value in having all archery deer licenses in by August 1st? this only goes one more additional threat greedy resident lic. holders who want it all for themselves... as a land owner i am opposed to any of these new requirements.

Jalen Pietig
Morgan MN
jcpietig@gmail.com

Comment:

I know as a current nonresident that I likely don't have much say here, but I will mention that I went to school in SDSU and have bought hunting/fishing licenses in your state every year since I was 18. I archery hunt both 35L and 35A in Harding County every fall, and strongly oppose the proposal to limit archery licenses in 35L to 400 residents and 100 nonresidents. I do not oppose this selfishly so that I can still hunt 35L. I oppose this because as a hunter of 35A as well, I understand the immense hunting pressure this proposal would bring to the public areas that surround 35L. Since 35L is dense forest habitat, it can generally be hunted by a larger number of hunters. When you restrict that, the hunters venture over to the lands next door, which consist of much more open terrain. With a decent set of binoculars and today's rifle scopes, a hunter can pinpoint deer on this "prairie" type land from miles away, thus meaning it takes less hunters per square mile. In my experience, allowing people to hunt both 35L as well as surrounding public lands simultaneously keeps hunting pressure at bay and spreads both hunters and deer out in a way that everyone can enjoy.

Andrew Martin
Mesa AZ
andrewpmartin64@gmail.com

Comment:

I grew in the Piedmont South Dakota area hunting the Black Hills since I was 10 years old (1974) until joining the military and moving away. Since then I have held a non resident tag for nearly all of those years. I was excited to see the season opening change to the Labor Day weekend and have a group of 3 and possibly a 4th already lined up for that opening weekend. Vacation is scheduled with our employers, and flights are booked. If you make the change, which I hope you don't, so I can continue to make use of using less vacation days in the future, please start the delayed next year. I am sure we are not the only group that has already made investments in the 2019 archery hunt. Some of us "out-of-stater's" are residents at heart (my family is still there) and we would also like to enjoy the earlier opening.
Thank you for the consideration

Zac Everard
Luxemburg WI
Zeverard1@gmail.com

Comment:

As a resident who enjoys the use of FEDERAL public land in the state of South Dakota, I strongly oppose the proposed limitations to non resident archery deer hunting. My family had hoped to make your state a part of our family tradition, but this would ruin that chance.

Neil Johnson
Hibbing MN
nljbooks@gmail.com

Comment:

I came out there last year with my kids and hunted the CNF in Harding County. I had a great time and we never ran in to many other hunters. I am trying to understand why with all the decline in youth hunting states are constantly making it harder to participate in these activities.

Anthony Pantaleo
Fremont MI
adpantaleo@gmail.com

Comment:

While I do not oppose a later start date for non resident archery I do oppose starting the proposal for this year. Many non resident hunters have made plans and preparations for this year's hunt based on the already published season dates. It would be very unfortunate to lose prospective non resident hunters who have already made these plans.

Anthony Pantaleo
Fremont MI
adpantaleo@gmail.com

Comment:

While I do not oppose a drawing date for non resident archery I do oppose starting the proposal for this year. Many non resident hunters have made plans and preparations for this year's hunt based on the already published season dates. It would be very unfortunate to lose prospective non resident hunters who have already made these plans.

Tyler Pearce
Carbondale CO
track.elk@gmail.com

Comment:

It seems like the hunting opportunities for SD residents abound. Not sure why you would choose to push non-resident bowhunters to other states? I love bowhunting in SD, but, I'm happy to invest my money into the state economies of Nebraska or ND instead. Sounds to me like SD doesn't want non-residents there. It sure doesn't feel like the welcome mat is out for us anymore. We've run into a few resident hunters the last few years who have had bad attitudes towards us. It's unfortunate, it's a great state.

Continuing to push non-residents out is only going to hurt your reputation and revenues - sporting goods, hotels, gas stations and restaurants...the local businesses.

David Drummond
Marysville OH
davidedrummond@gmail.com

Comment:

I think it is extremely unfair to change the regulations for nonresidents in the current year. Many of us have or could hunt other Western States but it is too late now to draw permits in any other state. Delaying the start of the season and limiting access to Custer National forest could just about ruin our planned hunt. We hunted this area of South Dakota for the very first time last year. We've been hunting Colorado for 30 years until last year. Second, I think limiting hunter access to national forest land based on whether or not you are a resident of the state is unconstitutional. I pay lots of federal taxes and have for years. In my opinion I have as much right to access federal land in South Dakota as a resident. Nonresident hunters depend on public land access on most western hunting trips....probably much more than residents. We really like South Dakota and would like to come back but these changes might make that unlikely. Finally on access to Custer National forest, I'm not sure what the objective could be. When we were there the first week in October there was essentially no hunting pressure on Custer National Forest land in Harding county. We were there every day for a week and never saw another hunter in the field. We only saw 3-4 trucks with hunters in the area the entire week.

Sam Sebastien
Deridder LA
Sas8049@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose Late start for nonresidents.

Tyler Debauche
Pulaski WI
ty_6_22@hotmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Lee Lustfield

Lake Benton MN

lee.lustfield@outlook.com

Comment:

My son and I really enjoy being able to hunt early we really don't see many hunters on the ground we hunt. Hope you don't make the changes. Thanks, Lee

Larry Mckay

Miller SD

lefty1mck@midco.net

Comment:

why do you constantly punish the non resident hunters who pour money into the economy.

Scott Brassard

Dunbarton NH

Comment:

I enjoy hunting this area with a group of friends as well as camping on location. Not being able to hunt and camp in the area would greatly decrease the quality of experience we have enjoyed.

Scott Brassard

Dunbarton NH

Comment:

The lack of a deadline is what brings people to SD, it allows you to have an option should other tags not happen.

Also pushing back non residents to a later start date would not allow for any opportunity to hunt velvet deer.

You are creating a state that will become unattractive and drive away out of state hunter business which helps to drive parts of the economy.

David Bosmoe
Star Prairie WI
dbosmoe@yahoo.com

Comment:

As a non- resident I would opposed the law requiring non- residents to wait an additional week to begin hunting (on public lands).

Now that you changed it me and my friend who hunt out there spend the entire first week out there because it is Labor Day weekend we can use less vacation days to come out. Also it would take away an additional week of being able to hunt bucks that are still in velvet. And believe me that is a big deal to many whitetail hunters.

If I can not come out labor day weekend and that first week in September we wouldn't come until November.

And that is an additional full week of revenue the small town we stay in would lose. And I am sure other non-residents would ignore the early season hunt as well.

My other option would be to just stop hunting in South Dakota. And I have been hunting out there for 30 years. Please don't adopted that regulation.

I oppose the new proposed non resident regulations.

James Strachan
Chancellor SD
jamesstrachan2105@gmail.com

Comment:

I dont see the purpose to change it one week doesn't make a difference, I'm beginning to think you just change things to change them. What's next preference points for archery too you'll never get a deer license but every 3 or 4 years like rifle season. Most out of state archery hunters are after a big buck I'm willing to bet there success rate is not to good. all you're doing is losing revenue. Also alot also combine it with opening of dove season so you will loose that revenue to. I have been fortunate enough to have hunted in many states in my years of hunting yes its expensive but they let you hunt. S.D if fast earning the reputation of why evan try to hunt there you cant get a license for anything but pheasant preserve hunting which I'm not getting into.

Peter Zach
Saint Francis WI

Comment:

oppose

Robert Feldhaus
Huron SD
robertfeldhauss@gmail.com

Comment:

Thank you for giving us residents a little time before opening archery season up to all. I support and appreciate this idea.

Todd Peterson

Elmwood WI

Tpeterson1066@gmail.com

Comment:

Please consider synchronized start dates for archery hunters regardless of residency. With nonresident fees being a significant investment for hunting in South Dakota, and an economic impact for your state and Game and fish department, it will be a deterrent to many. I would be glad to pay the fees if I can start the same day as a resident.

Todd Peterson

Elmwood WI

Tpeterson1066@gmail.com

Comment:

35L is an amazing landscape that is a privilege to spend time in. With a low limit of tags, specifically nonresident, it will be difficult to spend time with friends enjoying the outdoors in a place we enjoy in South Dakota

Todd Peterson

Elmwood WI

Tpeterson1066@gmail.com

Comment:

The Commission also proposed to establish an application deadline of August 1 for nonresident archery deer hunters. Any nonresident archery application received after that date would result in the license being valid only on private land; not including

Bradley Koenen

Little Falls MN

joannakoenen@gmail.com

Comment:

I can only hope that neighboring states begin to reciprocate with SD. I pay substantially more than residents for my right to hunt and fish there, only hunt public land, yet your state's sportspeople continue to bash and limit non-residents even though our financial support for public lands far outweighs what residents pay. What an amazingly selfish proposal. Next time your sportspeople travel out of state and hunt public land I hope they are looked upon as the selfish people they seem to be. How very sad.

Derek Bazell

Ironton OH

Bazelld@hotmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Bryan Vyhldal
Harrisburg SD
bvyhldal@yahoo.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Tyler Haats
Kenmare ND
Haatsie@hotmail.com

Comment:

As I read this today I was disappointed South Dakota gfp wanted to go this route. I head there every fall to catch up with college buddies and take my father on a week trip bow hunting because we enjoy the hunting and camping South Dakota has to offer. I lived and went to college in Mitchell for 2 years and know there is a target on the non residents backs and living in North Dakota I understand where South Dakota is trying to go. Locals feel like there is too many non residents hunting and there is no room for the both of us. Well how many of them locals hunt out of state? Pretty quick to judge. On another note why limit archery tags for Custer national forest? I've hunted there the past few years and don't run into that many people. Lots of ground to hunt and the odds of taking a deer out of there is slim. Kind of upsetting that the state is trying to limit tags on federal public land that is owned by the tax payer. Take my opinion for what it's worth but if this is the route South Dakota wants to take I will find elsewhere to hunt and will not support this state any longer.

Randy Hultgren
Raymond MN
rkhultgren@hotmail.com archery

Comment:

I am a 64year old farmer from mn. I own a house in Akaska sd. I would love to hunt dear with a bow, but can't pull it back and shoot ethieclly anymore. I use a crossbow in mn. I would buy a nonresident tag license. Thanks

Dan Leffelman
Onalaska WI
dleffelman@gmail.com

Comment:

This is so late in the application season that any changes should be considered for the 2020 season. I can see some changes need to be made but some guys are counting on this hunt....have flights and hotels booked already. Please consider changes for next year

Brian Buchanan
Wentzville MO
blb078@yahoo.com

Comment:

This is completely unnecessary. This is all due to a handful of residents complaining about non residents having "better success" than them. Well if a resident spend the amount of money on a tag, time off work, driving miles, etc, etc that a resident spent they would probably work as hard as a Non resident and have just as good success.

What are you all going to do if these changes are implemented and the non residents are still having the same success? A good portion of your funds come from Non residents and now you want to take away some of that just because some residents are complaining that they can not get any deer? That makes no sense what so ever.

Maybe if you compare the resident hunters that put in the same amount of time and effort that the non resident hunters put in the numbers won't look so skewed. But when you throw in the resident weekend warriors or road hunters of course it is going to look like the non residents are having better success.

If either of these two passes you can count of 3 less non resident tags, hotels, food, etc coming to SD anymore.

The third proposal about Custer access permits for NR we have no opinion on either way.

Brian Buchanan
Wentzville MO
blb078@yahoo.com

Comment:

This is completely unnecessary. This is all due to a handful of residents complaining about non residents having "better success" than them. Well if a resident spend the amount of money on a tag, time off work, driving miles, etc, etc that a resident spent they would probably work as hard as a Non resident and have just as good success.

What are you all going to do if these changes are implemented and the non residents are still having the same success? A good portion of your funds come from Non residents and now you want to take away some of that just because some residents are complaining that they can not get any deer? That makes no sense what so ever.

Maybe if you compare the resident hunters that put in the same amount of time and effort that the non resident hunters put in the numbers won't look so skewed. But when you throw in the resident weekend warriors or road hunters of course it is going to look like the non residents are having better success.

If either of these two passes you can count of 3 less non resident tags, hotels, food, etc coming to SD anymore.

The third proposal about Custer access permits for NR we have no opinion on either way.

Jay Kobriger
Eyota MN

Comment:

The changes this commission is proposing to implement seems to fly in the face of a welcoming attitude towards non-resident hunters. I don't understand the rationale behind this idea of starting the non-residents after the residents archery season. Keep things like this up and soon you guys will have the entire state to yourself and wonder how you are going to afford all the things that need to be done.

Thanks
Jay

Todd Mcrae
Castle Rock CO
todd.mcrae@imacorp.com

Comment:

Delaying the start of the archery deer season for non residents by 6 days doesn't make any sense when the season is 90+ days long. How is that going to impact the hunting season? All it will do is cost the state money because families won't come to SD for Labor Day if they had wanted to hunt. They will now go elsewhere.

Greg Berg
St. Cloud MN
gregberg@midco.net

Comment:

The archery rules changes only make licensing and season structures more confusing. I have hunting SD archery deer for 15 years and have enjoyed the opportunities. As non-resident hunters we pay a large license fee and should not have privileges and opportunities removed. Please consider keeping the license and season structure the same without changes.

Tate Glader
Rapid City SD
Tate.glader@zbdavis.com

Comment:

I am in favor of the proposed changes. They will give SD resident hunters first crack at our public land and is a step in the right direction to limit the ridiculous amount of archery pressure in 35L. I think the commission also needs to consider limiting the number of Mule deer archers can harvest in the black hills. Do a lottery "Mule deer stamp" for black hills. We could have a fantastic resource there if we manage it.

Aaron Miller

Pierre SD

aaron.miller@state.sd.us

Comment:

I fully support delaying the season on public lands for non-resident hunters, establishing an application deadline (for public lands) and for limiting applications in unit 35-L. All of these initiatives will improve the quality of the experience for all hunters. There is currently too much pressure on public hunting ground. Public hunting ground requires specific management tools to protect the resources. When it is over used, the opportunities for a quality experience diminish.

Dan Baker

Littleton CO

b1rcr@yahoo.com

Comment:

I am a South Dakota native currently residing in Colorado. I fail to see a benefit to the state of SD, its residents, or the wildlife by imposing a requirement for non-residents to apply for an archery deer tag by Aug 1 or be required to hunt private lands. This appears to be a targeted effort to 1- reduce or eliminate non-resident hunting opportunities in the state, 2-reduce or eliminate non-resident hunting opportunities on public properties in the state.

As a hunter for over 45 years, I have seen the systematic elimination of hunting opportunities for both residents and non-residents through changes in license pricing and allocations in multiple states. Each reduction in opportunity reduces the chances for new hunters to be introduced and mentored in this great sport. Of greater concern to that with this proposal is the targeted effort to reduce the number of non-residents on public properties, much of which are federal properties that non-residents have equal rights to utilize in the state. Of the public land in SD, 5-6% is federally owned, and less than .01% (90k acres) is owned by the state. This change in the licensing requirements clearly and unfairly targets non-resident use of federally owned property.

As a non-resident SD native who returns to SD to visit family and introduce my children and others to this great state, it is often challenging to know exactly when and what opportunities to return will be. The fact that under the current licensing structure I can purchase an archery license short notice is of great value to me. It allows me to capitalize on short notice opportunities to return to SD and enjoy the great state I grew up in.

Ken Steiner

Pierre SD

tbfus@hotmail.com

Comment:

Why make the non-resident wait a week for the start date on public grounds. The pheasant is the same which tells non-resident that we care more for residents. We are asking non-residents to let us shoot the pheasants first and now the deer that are on public lands. What happens when a resident wants to hunt with a non-resident companion? Leaves that hunter with a choice to wait or break up the group. That is not what hunting is about. This proposal makes zero sense to me as a South Dakota resident. I would rather we allow everyone the same opportunity to hunt the state of South Dakota at the same time. The non-resident hunters all have an economic impact throughout the state in one way or another. I know when I hunt out of state it is more expensive when you factor in food, fuel, and lodging. Most non-residents have places to stay and may not even visit the local grocery stores.

Tom Dice

Mitchell SD

tom@dicefinancial.com

Comment:

I am in favor of adding archery options that would permit hunting provided this license does not eliminate the option of a West River Archery permit also during the regular archery season.

Kenneth Robertson

Newalla OK

kenneth_robertson@ymail.com

Comment:

I oppose this measure based on the fact that nonresident license fee dollars are used to lease or purchase lands for public use. Limiting nonresidents to private lands is unfair.

Nathan Line

Sault Ste. Marie MI

nateline78@gmail.com

Comment:

As a NR, I hope to be successful in the WR deer draw this year. If not, I plan to purchase an archery deer license. If the proposed archery changes went into effect this year, I'd have to wait until Aug 1 to find out if I drew my WR tag. Then, if it was unsuccessful, I'd have to buy archery tag on Aug 1 by the end of the day. That gives me a very short window of notification. Hope this makes sense. At least make the archery app cut off Sept 1.

Steven Haugen

Tracy MN

shaugen@iw.net

Comment:

For many years my hunting party of 4 hunted the west-river firearms deer season in Harding County but have not been able to draw a license for the last four years due to the limited non-resident licenses available. As an alternative, two years ago my son and I purchased archery licenses and obtained the proper access permit so we could hunt in the slim butts. Now you are once again proposing a change to further limit non-resident access to Custer National Forest. Why is South Dakota so committed to limiting non-resident hunters?

Larry O'malley
Hayfield MN
lmomalley32@yahoo.com

Comment:

I am opposed to the delay start of the non residents on public lands! I hunt with a resident and we plan a opening day trip every year this will greatly impact both of our schedules and hunting opportunities. Delaying non resident archery hunters is a joke,like we have some big impact on public land hunting. I've been hunting SD for almost 10 years now and can say that on public lands I have rarely seen more than a couple others hunting! This will discourage many. Why delay only those which hunt public ground? There is no good reason for the delay as I know there aren't that many non residents flooding into your public areas as to cause issues that the residents aren't having ample opportunities. Non residents are there for a week maybe 10 days at most and are gone not to return. I am against this part of the proposed changes!! As for the application of license I am all for that but make it across the board not just those who hunt public that can not hunt if not filed for application in time. Thank you

Cole Adams
Louisville KY
cole.adams@ymail.com

Comment:

I don't think it is a good idea to delay opening day for non residents or have an application deadline. My experience archery hunting on public land in South Dakota was that there's wasn't many people hunting. I seen very few hunters so I don't see how this change would have any benefits. There aren't many states that give you the opportunity to hunt velvet deer and this change would result in the loss of tag sales. I'm also against the application deadline. South Dakota is one of the few western states offering over the counter archery deer tags. With my work schedule I'm not always sure I can take a trip out west in the fall and knowing South Dakota has otc tags gives me an opportunity to enjoy hunting the west. I would be pleased if the guidelines stayed the same. Thank you.

Mike Starling
Newcastle WY
Alaskahunter2002@yahoo.com

Comment:

Why? More restrictions, deadlines in August? What purpose does this serve and why implement more when we're trying to promote hunting and the outdoors

Rodney Hughes
Harrisburg SD
rhughes@q.com

Comment:

The current system allows the resident archery hunter to change their mind and submit for an archery tag on line. By eliminating that option you are negatively impacting those of us that may have been too busy or forgotten to submit for rifle season, but we know that we can submit anytime for archery. As an avid Archery shooter and hunter I am opposed to a deadline for Resident Archery tags. I like to be able to have my son's say 'Hey Dad... let's go hunting' then I simply go online and get my Archery tag. Leave it the way it is please.

Justin Cummings

Marshall MI

justincummings12@gmail.com

Comment:

Hands down I would rather put in for a draw than never have the opportunity to hunt deer in velvet. Not giving me the opportunity to hunt deer in velvet means I am going to focus my money and time in states that will allow me the opportunity.

Joe Arbach

Hoven SD

joe.arbachins@venturecomm.net

Comment:

I think there should also be a limit on non resident general archery tags issued. I had a landowner tell me that his out of state pheasant hunters get an archery tag and use a rifle to harvest them. As we know once processed no evidence of weapon used. Or no non resident archery until after second weekend of pheasant season. Probably not a lot of this done and very hard to catch I know.

Michael McNally

South Haven MI

mk1434@hotmail.com

Comment:

why not let crossbow hunting on private property.

Adam Yoder

Walhonding OH

adamyoder3000@gmail.com

Comment:

I'm from Ohio and we get a ton of nonresident whitetail hunters. We don't change the dates for them why should you do so for us?? It would greatly affect our hunting since we hunt a week on the opener then go to Colorado for elk. Please don't pass this unfair law. As nonresidents we already pay way more for our licenses and tags. Thank you Adam

Michele Rogers

Hill City SD

michelerogers02@hotmail.com

Comment:

I support the current proposal to limit Non-Residents to 100 access permits on the custer national forest. The early draw deadline and a later start date for them on public land as well.

A better scenario would actually be a cap on non-residents a far earlier draw date and an even later start date to bowhunt. We see a lot of out of state plates when bowhunting and in many cases they far outnumber people who live here.

Dillon Lermeny

Reva SD

Comment:

Thank you. Living in the area, I strongly support this.

Rusty Schmidt

Rapid City SD

rschmidt@rvsd.com

Comment:

Disagree with limiting slim buttes archery hunters to 400 resident. My family and I camp there every year for archery for the last 20 years. Yes there is more bow hunters now, but that is only during September and a lot of them were out of state, make nonresidents archery start in mid October they dont stay but a week at most. Whom wants this restriction, the land owners around slim buttes or other bow hunters. If its land owners then they have their agenda and if it is other bow hunters complaining then they just need to walk farther then where the majority congregated. I know the limit idea has nothing to do with the high archery success in the slim buttes. Thanks

Casey Holloway

Baraboo WI

caseyhollows@gmail.com

Comment:

I have been hunting South Dakota with a bow for the last 5 years and absolutely love it for two main reasons. The first is the quality of deer that I have found is very high in my opinion. Second is that I hardly ever see another bowhunter on the majority of the public land that I hunt. I can understand backing the start date for nonresidents on some of the more highly hunted areas (Custer, Black Hills, ect..) but I ask you please do not make this a state wide rule. As a nonresident it is very encouraging to come out on the first week of archery season and be able to hunt non pressured deer. I hunt mostly walk-in areas and private leased lands leased by the department. On these spots in the last few years I can count on one hand how many other hunters I have ran in to. I have also noticed that the majority of the local land owners in these programs have been kind and helpful in giving info on where I can and cant hunt. Maybe you could have a sign up sheet for some of these spots that are getting crowded and limit the number of hunters per piece. I hope you take this into consideration, I look forward to coming out every year and hope this proposal doesn't deter me from coming this year.

Tony Peterson

Andover MN

Comment:

The nationwide trend is that hunters are giving up and our numbers are dwindling. This revenue source that the G & F dept. is so dependent on isn't going to last forever, and moves to punish hunters because they live across state lines, will come back to haunt us. When you decide that decisions will be based simply on social factors, such as the griping of resident hunters who want easier hunting for themselves, then you're going down a path that sets a precedent which won't be undone. These moves aren't about the resource, they are about placating a certain group of hunters to the detriment of another group of hunters. Eventually NRs will figure out that Nebraska or ND or OK offers a more hospitable atmosphere and they'll take their money there. It's already happening with pheasants, and is only going to be more pronounced in the upcoming years as ringneck populations come on strong in several states. What's worse, while you're making decisions based on a group of hunters and their complaints, you're saying that the local businesses we frequent don't matter a whole lot. I'll bet if you reach out to the woman who owns the Bonesteel Motel and ask her if driving away nonresident hunters is a net positive for the state, she won't agree. I'm already seeing my colleagues in the outdoor media paying attention, and calling out, which states are actively punishing nonresidents because they can get away with it. Other states, like Nebraska, are taking note and welcoming nonresidents. For a while you'll be able to raise prices, but the elasticity in hunting license cost isn't going to stretch forever. Instead of traveling to your state, people will simply stop traveling altogether or go somewhere else. You might not see it for a decade yet, but it's coming. And eventually we'll look back at these moves and realized we diminished an amazing revenue source and robbed our fellow hunters of great experiences through short-sighted actions. I realize it's a tight-rope walk, but SD has done a good job of squeezing nonresidents for a long time already, and still the residents aren't happy and the nonresidents are becoming less happy. These latest moves to punish a tiny group of people who have no significant impact on the resource will further solidify the believe that SD cares solely about placating the residents while creating a system where NRs get screwed while footing a larger portion of the bill. This is something that probably doesn't end well...

Carson Weimer

Spearfish SD

**Carson_weimer_2015@hotmail.co
m**

Comment:

support

Brad Abramowski

Ham Lake MN

brad.abramowski@gmail.com

Comment:

I find it very alarming that the hunting community is seeing an every decreasing number of participants, there is a growing outcry from within the community that we want to continue to grow and develop our sport, and yet states and organizations are going far out of their way to limit possibilities and opportunities for hunters. The two proposals to the non-resident archery deer application process and season dates do nothing but limit your freedoms as an American citizen to access your own public land and pursue wild, public game.

The idea that resident hunters are having their opportunities encroached upon is falsely linked to non-resident hunters, and the data does not support that narrative. In 2017 there were 25,512 resident archery licenses issued, and only 3,800 nonresident licenses issued. Nonresidents only account for 12% of archery licenses sold, and only accounted for 19% of the total projected harvest (1,487 NR harvest, 6,135 R harvest).

I archery hunted SD for 10 total days over the opening weekend and a weekend in October, all of it on public land. Over these 10 days, covering several thousand acres, I only encountered 3 other hunters, all from out of state (MN and WI). As a nonresident archery hunter, I did not negatively affect any resident hunter's experience. I didn't "steal their spot", there were no residents to even compete with. I was alone out there. So what does limiting my capacity to hunt there help accomplish?

The biggest problem I have with these new proposals is limiting my ability to hunt on my public land. For you to give me a tag and say good luck go hunt, but you can't access PUBLIC land to do so, completely violates the principles that Teddy Roosevelt used to establish public grounds in the first place. To tell any single paying class of individuals they are not allowed to experience a public location, while not limiting every non-paying class of individuals for the same time frame is the framework for a dangerous totalitarian governance which will not have the backing of the people, and will not succeed.

In summary, I wholeheartedly oppose the proposed changes to the SD nonresident archery application process and access restrictions as they are founded in false believe systems and extremely flawed ideologies. I would fully expect anyone voting on these measures to see the unsound shortcomings of these proposals and vote them down.

Paul Thielen

Wheaton MN

pthielen@frontiernet.net

Comment:

I was disappointed to see the proposed changes that will make it even more difficult to bow hunt the land I own and have spent 18 years developing for wildlife habitat. I purchased land that straddles the border in 2001 and own about 100 acres in SD. Not only does it cost me over \$1000 a year to take my sons hunting on our own land, now they have to apply before they are sure they can get the time off to come home. I live 4 miles from the SD border, own a buisness in Sisseton and Wheaton, MN and pay over \$6,000 in SD property taxes annually. we have planted over 23,000 trees and restored 4 wetlands, but the state of SD makes it more expensive to recreate every year and even more difficult to leave a conservation legacy for the next generation. It is little wonder why so many of my patients sell their land to the local Native American tribe.

Over 200 deer winterd on my land last winter, how unfortunate for those habitats to be lost forever.

Kevin Clemmons

Choctaw OK

theclemmons@cox.net

Comment:

Kevin Clemmons, Choctaw Oklahoma
Feedback On
Proposed Changes to South Dakota's Archery Deer Season

I've deer archery hunted in South Dakota as a non-resident in 2015, 2016, and 2018. I am opposed to the proposal to delay the start date of deer archery season on public lands for nonresidents. In 2017 nonresidents purchased 3,800 archery tags at a potential* total cost of \$1,086,800. The same year residents purchased 25,512 archery tags at a potential* total cost of \$1,020,480. The majority of deer archery tag sales funds are being generated by nonresidents, as nonresidents pay at a rate of over 7 to 1 compared to residents. I do not have data that shows how exactly all of these funds were dispersed, but some percentage of the funds are used to purchase/lease public access hunting lands. With nonresidents generating the majority of the funds used to purchase/lease public hunting lands, they should not have this "total days afield" restriction placed on them. (* calculation based on all tags being for "Any Deer")

I am also opposed to the proposal to establish an application deadline of August 1 for nonresident archery deer hunters, with applications received after that date resulting in the license being valid only on private lands. My opposition is based on the rationale explained above, nonresidents are providing the majority of the total archery tag revenue which helps fund the purchase/leasing public access hunting lands. If this restriction is imposed, the cost for this restricted nonresident archery tag should be reduced to equal the resident tag price. Charging a nonresident full price but not allowing them to hunt the lands those funds would be supporting would be questionable at best. I also oppose this based on the current (17 May 2019) unavailability of Archery Deer applications. Currently there is less than 2 ½ months till 1 August, what is a reasonable period of time for submitting the application? Implementation time should be considered if this proposal is approved.

I am also opposed to the limit proposed for archery access permits for the Custer National Forest (Unit 35L), at this time. The proposal states that if implemented these changes would impact nonresident archery hunters for the 2019 season. As of today, 17 May 2019, the Archery Deer application isn't available. Also unavailable at this time is a means to apply for one of the proposed 100 limited access permits for Unit 35L for nonresidents. I believe it is unrealistic to implement this proposal in the timeframe given. As currently presented, a lottery process would have to be created and made available and advertised to the public. Would a nonresident archery tag have to be purchased to enter the lottery? If not, would the drawing results be available in time for selected nonresidents to apply for and purchase their tag prior to the other proposed 1 August deadline. Seems to be a few logistical issues that need to be worked out in a more methodical manner than the perceived rush approach being proposed.

Up until 1994 the state of Kansas did not allow nonresident deer hunters to hunt in their state. The great state of Oklahoma was happy to reciprocate that restriction and refused the sale of any deer hunting license to residents of states that didn't allow nonresident hunting opportunities to Oklahomans. After many years, common sense prevailed and now hunters from both of these states are afforded some deer hunting opportunities as nonresidents. It seems two of the three proposed changes to the South Dakota Archery Deer Season are a return to time in the past where wildlife management wasn't the true focus of state game laws. Hopefully the South Dakota GFP will evaluate these proposals from a wildlife management perspective and implement them accordingly.

Ted Haeder

Wolsey SD

tedhaeder@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose the proposed restrictions on non-resident archery hunters to access public lands because they introduce unnecessary confusion as to when and where non-residents can or cannot hunt. We punish our non-resident guests enough with a license fee that is 7.15 times higher than the resident fee. Please - don't subject them to another unneeded layer of regulatory bureaucracy.

I do support the proposed limit of 500 licenses in Custer National Forest (Unit 35L).

Thank you.

Ted Haeder
Wolsey

Ben Warnimont

Continental OH

greathornet69@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please do not change the start date for nonresidents , we travel out to SD each year from Ohio to bow hunt and stay with our friends. We hunt the cave hills each year and enjoy our time however with the limited access permits we possibly would not get drawn because the outfitters are going to have there clients put in for this permit even if they don't need it just to limit the amount of hunters.

Jamesn Parent

Fort Ripley MN

imharley10@gmail.com

Comment:

I have purchased a non resident archery tag every year for over 35 years, even when my wife was dying and I knew I could not hunt. Last year I added a west river tag even though I had no intention of going there. I spend a considerable amount of money in SD on my hunts.

your new proposals probably do not affect me very much as I turn 80 in July but I am deeply saddened by the fact that those hunters coming behind me will not be able to enjoy the great experience that I have over the years.

For me, forgetting to apply before August 1 and then not being able to hunt public land probably would result in my not hunting SD. It is hard to understand how that rule helps anyone and indeed targets the elderly and the poor who must wait till the last minute.

It really is sad that we have come to this.

Joshua Nelson

Lennox SD

jlnsd41@gmail.com

Comment:

YES! As a resident of South Dakota and avid archery hunter, it is time to limit the out of state access to our public lands. I agree with an application deadline for non residents. I feel the delayed start should be at LEAST a month. I feel the out of state tags should be limited all together. 30 years ago bows shot 20 yards and it was relatively harder to harvest a deer. Bows today shoot well past 60 yards and are much more advanced, due to this alone licenses should be issued at at premium NOT unlimited for non residents. I also feel our tags are too cheap for non residents, the price should be raised until the number of LIMITED tags stops receiving apps..supply and demand. For example, during WR Rifle season the parking lots for walk in areas are overflowing (over 50 vehicles) of which majority are out of state bow hunters. ARCHERY TAGS SHOULD BE LIMITED, ISSUED AT A PREMIUM, AND MORE RESTRICTIVE FOR NON RESIDENTS. Thanks for your time. I am not saying no non residents should ever hunt in SD. It's an industry, I get it.. I am saying the opportunity for non residents to hunt in our state on public lands should be placed AFTER the residents of our state. Side note: the GFP commission vision used to say something regarding.... representing the people of SD....It doesn't anymore. That concerns me as an avid outdoorsman in SD. R/

Harry Grams

Zimmerman MN

harry.grams@co.anoka.mn.us

Comment:

Why is this happening? Our group has been hunting the Slim Buttes park since 1992 and now we have to go to a lottery system to hunt this specific area? Why is this 35L being identified as the only lottery section? I feel that as a hunter that has contributed to your economy, those that have hunted the Slim Buttes in the past should have some preference. I know that it is highly unlikely to happen. But this lottery consideration is a slap in the face to someone that has hunted your state for so many years. I recommend that previous non resident hunter are on a "preference" basis when the selection process occurs. Regardless, the whole thing is truly disappointing.

Greg Brecka

Baraboo WI

gbrecka@gmail.com

Comment:

I do not support the delayed start for out of state hunters and the application process for archery. We've traveled from Wisconsin to South Dakota every year to archery hunt deer since 2012. During that time we've hunted private and public lands. We've never had an issue with other hunters while on South Dakota's public lands. We've never seen another archery hunter on walk in land in the high plains. The only time we've hunted parcels with other hunters was in the black hills. If there are issues with over crowding or over harvesting in certain areas, I agreed that those areas should be in a draw. Why limit any hunter if no issues exist? An out of state hunter generates 10 times the revenue compared to the same in state hunter. Why limit the revenue that can be used to pay for additional leased lands, habitat work, and conservation. Requiring a draw will also limit out of state hunter's flexibility to make unscheduled trips. At least two of our trips hinged on extraneous circumstances that would allow for us to put into a draw. While I feel these changes may appease in state hunters, I feel that revenue will drop with these changes which could limit opportunities for our future hunters. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Justin Allen

Pierre SD

Comment:

Please put more restriction on NR bow licenses. The proposal is fine but is a small Band-Aid on a huge ever growing problem. Living in Pierre and waiting 3-5 years to successfully gain a any deer firearm tag in Hughes, Sully and Stanley but Joe for MN, IA, wherever can hunt with a bow for 4 months every single year is a slap in the face to gun hunters and residents. Raise license fees of NR big game hunters and further restrict areas tag can be used and also an over cap on NR licenses numbers.

Randy Thoreson

Sioux Falls SD

Firefighter285.rt@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Kris Mcgee

Cresco IA

Mcgeekris@hotmail.com

Comment:

This is a joke. I thought South Dakota had more integrity than this. You have been doing such a good job managing your lands and wildlife for nonresidents. This has no substance other than somebody in state government attempting to benefit from it. Somebody in government who propose this obviously hunts early season archery deer and does not want non-residents conflicting with them.

Dylan Latvala

Deer River MN

Dylanlatvala@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose Delayed non resident archery

Vance Patrilla

Toddville IA

kilramc@yahoo.com

Comment:

Why such a restrictive deadline and then a punishment of restricting us to private lands only? I am now able to come out to South Dakota and obtain a tag if my schedule opens up. Such a rule would eliminate this option and put South Dakota out of reach for bowhunting. Another rule to limit our bowhunting options.

Jason Taylor
Fort Pierre SD
taylorjd03@gmail.com

Comment:

To GFP & Commission, I writing this in reference to the NR Archery Tag Allocation proposal and letting you know that I strongly oppose the current proposal and hope that you will modify the current proposal to limit the NR archery hunters in SD.

According to the GFP stats, it shows that NR have harvested a higher number of bucks and does compared to residents. Which is common sense, due to a NR is not going to be as particular on what deer they shoot, because they have a limited amount of time and they want to fill their tag in that little amount of time.

The issue that was brought up to you at a previous commission meetings in Pierre, is the over ran and overcrowded public land in western SD by NR. Which is all because of the unlimited/over the counter NR archery tags. They are able to pick up a tag whenever they want, either on their way to another state to hunt, because they were turned down in another state, turned down for a rifle tag in SD, or just because they want to come to SD for the easy/cheap guaranteed tag. Having an August 1 application deadline is way too late and will still let NR use SD as a last resort after they get turned down in SD or other states. The application deadline for NR needs to be moved back to the same time, when they apply for their firearm tags and get rid of the unlimited NR tags.

If the Commission and the GFP would actually do what they say they do (talk and listen to the public), an overwhelming majority of the sportsmen (except for commercial outfitters and NR) would tell you the same thing, limit the NR archery hunters to an 8% cap, which would help reduce the pressure on the overcrowded public lands. For WR and BH rifle deer seasons there is a cap for NR at 8%, I don't see any reason that NR archery tags aren't also capped at 8%, besides the loss of the NR \$\$\$ that the GFP would lose. It is time for the Commission to start putting their focus towards the average hunter (which is the majority of SD hunters). Also stop catering to the commercial outfitters and NR. Stop pushing through and being a rubber stamp for Secretary Hepler, the top GFP's officials, and Outfitters, whose agendas are not in the interest of the average hunter. For the Whitetail Special buck tag, there was an overwhelming majority of comments (from average sportsmen) that were against it, yet the Commission listen to and voted in the way, that catered to the minority of the comments (NR and Outfitters).

The proposal of 100 NR access permits for 35L is a good idea, but what about all the other large public land areas in SD. All that is going to do is push those NR that don't have one of those access permits to other public lands that are already overcrowded.

I like many other resident sportsmen, have absolutely no problem with NR coming to SD to hunt, but do see the need to limit the number of NR archery tags (8% allocation like rifle) that are available to them and help preserve our overcrowded public lands for the future.

Tom Jensen
Harrisburg SD
tomjensen178@gmail.com

Comment:

Please consider this email my strong opinion that the option of limiting non resident archery tags overall (via a cap or a percentage) is the choice preferred by myself and as many family and friends as I've spoken with on the topic. Please consider the non-resident cap option as the only immediate action to take on preserving our archery opportunity and quality deer we are fortunate to have in South Dakota.

Leonard Spomer

Pierre SD

Ispom@mncomm.com

Comment:

Chairman Jensen, and Ladies and Gentleman of the Commission

I am submitting comments regarding the nonresident archery proposals, and suggestions that I would encourage you to take into consideration.

I am 69 years old and have held a resident hunting license every year since 1962. I have hunted deer with rifle every year except two since 1965, and have hunted archery deer every year since 1982. I served on the RAP for central SD, and the Elk Working Group.

First I will comment on the existing proposals.

No. 1

Delaying nonresident hunters until the first Saturday after Labor Day, or for a 5-12 day window, will have little or now impact on the number of nonresident hunters or their harvest.

I would recommend delaying the start of nonresident archery until October 1st.

No. 2

Establishing a deadline for August 1st for nonresident applications is a start but I would recommend the following.

Nonresident applications should be due no later than June 1st.

Surrounding western states have due dates for nonresidents as early as January 31.

The reason we have had such an influx of nonresident archery hunters in SD is because we currently have no deadline. Nonresidents can apply for all of the other western states, and if they don't get drawn they can always come to SD and get a tag. And even if they do get drawn, and go to one of the western states, they have been able to extend their season by coming to SD and buying another tag across the counter at the last minute. This deadline process needs to be aligned with other western big game states.

Furthermore there should be no difference if the tag is to be used on private property. Their deadline should be the same, no later than June 1st.

No. 3

Limiting access to special units like 35L is a good idea, but should be expanded to include other large blocks of public land like the Ft. Pierre National Grasslands, Buffalo Gap National Grasslands, etc. Otherwise the nonresidents will just move to another public area. And allowing 20% of those access permits to go to nonresidents is too high. I would suggest 8-12% maximum.

Now I would like to submit a new suggestion that aligns with the nonresident issue.

The biggest issue facing the department is funding, and here is a couple of ways to help address that issue.

Many states have an application fee for nonresidents that is usually around \$50. This is a nonrefundable fee that buys you a preference point if not drawn. But, this fee is also in addition to the cost of your tag if you are drawn. In 2018 three of us applied for and were drawn for a Montana elk tag, in a remote unit. The cost of the tag was listed as \$900.00, but in order to hunt you also have to have a nonresident small game license, and an "invasive aquatic species prevention" fee. As I recall our total was \$1009.00 for each of us.

South Dakota is missing the boat. We need to have additional fees for nonresidents. Make them buy a nonresident small game license, or fishing license. Make the taking of predators or varmints a special fee. Or perhaps an invasive species fee, or CWD prevention fee, is in order. And the most important thing is MAKE THEM BUY IT in order to hunt. We could easily be collecting an additional \$30-75 for each nonresident big game tag.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely

Leonard Spomer
20476 Browning Road
Pierre, SD 57501
605-222-1091
lspom@mncomm.com

Robert Barden

Pierre SD

Comment:

I support the three proposals which impact non-resident archery hunters. These are steps in the right direction but more needs to be done to address the problem of extreme overcrowding on lands accessible to the public, which is my experience is mainly caused by non-resident bowhunters. GF&P personnel have expressed their accomplishment for non-residents at the expense of resident bow hunters. The number of permits which non-residents can use on public accessible lands needs to be limited much more than in the current proposal. South Dakota is a mecca for non-resident bowhunters. Some years ago I lost access to the private land where I bowhunted antelope. I have hunted on public accessible land for antelope only once since. Because of the overcrowding it was not enjoyable. I have no plans to go again as long as these conditions exist. On this trip every bowhunter I encountered and every hunting vehicle I saw was non-resident. Thank you very much for your consideration, hard work, and dedication.

Tom Braun

Hot Springs SD

coyowood@hotmail.com

Comment:

Limiting 500 access permits to 400 for residents, and 100 to non-res. should not be allowed! If there are not enough permits or licenses, of ANY type or ANY season, to fill the demand of tax paying SD res., there shouldn't be any for non-res! I've hunted that unit for years---skipped 2018, even though I had a permit, due to increased over crowding. Judging by the license plates in camp areas, along roads, and on CLOSED TRAILS, during the 2017 Dec. season, we thought we were in MN!! SD plates were outnumbered by non-res. plates from several others. Talked to 2 guys claiming to be from S. Falls. Strange to see they had WY plates on each of their vehicles. The number of non res. in the area has been on a steady increase for years. This change IS NOT IN THE BEST INTEREST OF SD HUNTERS! It's in favor of Dept. of Tourism! I realize that in this case, USFS land is involved, which is owned by all citizens of the USA, and access to that land may be argued in favor of non res., but not state hunting rights! I fear once this starts, it will spread to SD owned public areas requiring access permits too! Then, "application fees", then payment for the permit will follow! NO ON THIS ONE!!!!

Gon Sanchez

Fort Pierre SD

passagyrs@hotmail.com

Comment:

Agree on the proposals BUT would like to see the number of access permits for the Custer National Forest in Harding Co limited much further than the proposal of 400/100. The current quota of rifle tags for the same area is only 100/8! I have spent time summer camping in that area every year for the last 30 years and have rarely ever seen another person. I decided to bowhunt there two years ago and was shocked to see a hunter on every cliff top. I couldn't find a campsite in the Cave Hills or Slim Buttes or a hotel room in Buffalo or Bowman, ND because of the massive influx of nonresidents. I was blown away to see this beautiful isolated area inundated with so many people! Needless to say, the chance for a quiet bowhunt in my home state was not possible. I have never run into so many bowhunters in one place in my life. At first I was surprised, but I realized very quickly that it made perfect sense....Unlimited over-the-counter tags and Limited public land....and Muleys!!.....OF COURSE they would all be there.....I sat in the bar that night in shock at all the juvenile forky muleys these guys were bragging about killing....this is a travesty for our state to put this kind of pressure on such a small area.....The commission must limit this impact to maintain the quality and experience that this area offers. I would argue that the access permit quota should be far less than the current proposal...this should be thought of as a trophy limited draw area...JUST LIKE IT IS FOR THE RIFLE HUNT! Please consider drastically limiting the non-resident archery quota to no more than 2-3 times the number of rifle tags.

Gordon Doyle

Madison SD

Comment:

Archery hunting. To also give a limited number archery access permits to sd blk hills.

Ronald Cizek

Wahpeton ND

rcizek46@hotmail.com

Comment:

I marked "other" because although I read the entire report I couldn't find any proposed changes. I am 73 years old and regularly hunt SD & ND archery seasons and Mn for deer rifle. I enjoy my SD hunts immensely and hunt a combination of private, walk-in, BLM and school lands where permission is granted or open to public hunting. From the data I've seen and # of hunters both in state and out of state for archery Pronghorn season along with lower archery success rates and more days in the field versus the # of rifle hunters and their success rate of around 65% and fewer days in the field I would have a hard time understanding any changes for the archery season in the next several years if no severe winter kill is experienced. That, plus I come to SD and spend at least a week scouting, gaining permission, putting up blinds on the private land I hunt etc. which translates to more dollars for SD in terms of both my non-resident license/s and the amount of gas, food and other expenses for my hunt in your state. I enjoy SD immensely and spend up to a month there annually coming out to scout in mid July for a week and then coming to scout EO August early Sept. and then hunt mid to late Sept. Please consider the benefits those of us who may not have a lot of hunting seasons left and what we provide in terms of benefit to the state when making your final decision. If populations are to be managed I for certain would not propose more than one license issued to any individual no matter what the zone. Thank You and most of all I trust you will manage first and foremost in favor of the magnificent Antelope as a resource for both resident & non-resident, Gun & Archery season's in a fair and equitable manner. Kind Regards, Ron Cizek

Jarrett Perry
Rapid City SD

Comment:

I don't oppose anything I just want to let you know that you're still going to be a last resort state, if you make your deadline August 1st. Every state will be done with their draws and every hunter will know if they draw or not. You guys doing this way will just make every other public land out their more crowded.

Delwyn Newman
Lemmon SD
lindelnewman@gmail.com

Comment:

First I want to thank you for realizing the hunting quality of 35L has deteriorated to the point of not being enjoyable because of the numbers of hunters, Res. and NonRes. I do not think it is necessary to delay the start of archery for NonRes. hunters or make Aug. 1st. the dead line on public lands(This makes enforcement more difficult). Also the access permits required for 35L need to be eliminated. The study should be completed as to how many are using 35L(I do not want this to become a fee permit). My suggestion is that the point has been reached where SDGFP will have to institute a draw for archery similar to that used for firearms. If we want to keep our youth in the field we need to remember quality afield is as important as the tag itself. Thank You for letting me have input. Delwyn Newman Lemmon SD.

John Lien
West Fargo ND
john.lien@goldmark.com

Comment:

An application deadline of August 1st in not nearly enough time to make arrangements should you draw a tag. Assuming the drawing will take 1-2 weeks, that only allows 2-3 weeks to make arrangements. Some employers require weeks/months of notice to approve vacation time and paid time off. On top of work issues, there are hotels rooms to book, family matters to secure, etc etc. Why can't the drawing be held immediately after any spring population counts are done. Please move this deadline up as far as possible, ideally in the spring. Having it in August makes no sense and is simply not enough time to make adequate arrangements.

Josh Page
Buffalo SD
jgpage76@yahoo.com

Comment:

I am a big supporter of all the proposed changes, but especially the limited tags within Harding County. As a resident and active hunter within that county it is sad to see the number of mule deer being harvested from September to the end of December. These deer are being hunted hard for four full months. Tags need to be limited per proposal for archery and I believe the muzzleloader tags needs to be limited as well in these units. The quality of deer in the slim buttes especially will be impacted if something isn't done. No, it might not be popular among some hunters but it's common sense and what is best for herd health. I truly hope something is done.

Anthony Bradley
Deadwood SD

Comment:

Deer hunting in this area had become a yearly family hunting trip with brothers, sisters, children and grandchildren. Since limiting the rifle tags as drastically as it has been, the only way to have this family trip is by getting archery licenses and the access permits. By limiting these permits the family hunting trips will cease to happen and no more memories will be made. Please do not limit these permits.

Kurt Kastens
Palmyra NE
hunter24_7@hotmail.com

Comment:

I have been a nonresident archery deer hunter in your state since 2010, I not sure why I would be penalized for not buying my permit before August 1. As a business owner and family man you never know when and if you can hunt, and when and if weather will allow you to travel. I would just like to know what you have to gain by adding these rules to nonresidence

Billy Houston
Louisville KY
Billyhouston162@gmail.com

Comment:

I hunted in the black hills last year. We hunted on sep 1 and stayed a week had a great time but did not get a deer. But I came back the week before gun season and killed a 8 point buck. I like that I can buy a tag over the counter. Me and two of me

Tony Larive
Rapid City SD
trlbhsd@exede.net

Comment:

there needs to be a preference point system also I also believe that the Black Hills needs to to be a separate unit with hunters being able two have two of the three tags East River West River or Black Hills or the one single tag that is good state wide

Zachary Treat
Saint Peters MO
ztreat55@gmail.com

Comment:

As a non-resident, I feel so privileged to hunt in South Dakota. West River has some of the prettiest country I've ever laid eyes on. The Custer National Forest lands in Harding Country are a true treasure to all Americans. We all hold stock in our federal public lands, and it is a real joy to witness the beauty in our land. I loved crawling up on the big plateau bluffs and chasing Mule Deer and Whitetail. I feel a connection with that land and the animals that occupy it. Clean air, open skies and plenty of game. A true hunters paradise. As a resident of the metroplex of St. Louis, I wonder how many of my neighbors understand the value of a place like the Custer National Forest in South Dakota? What about the abundance of BLM lands in West River? I wonder if limiting non-resident opportunity will help hold the value of that land? There are so many chunks of public land landlocked in western South Dakota. How long will your own residents be able to enjoy their rights to that land, as special interests, money, and resource extraction superseded our hunting and outdoor heritage? Your landowners are really receptive to the supplemental income earned by opening their lands to the walk-in program. If you have less hunters, how are you going to pay those landowners? We live in a value-based society, unfortunately. As America becomes more urban and less rural, I wonder who will enjoy spending time in little towns like Buffalo, Camp Crook, Belle Fourche or even Edgemont in southwestern SD? The answer to all these questions is simple: Regulating out non-resident hunters will hurt the value of your public lands, and harm rural economies. It's too easy to go to another state like Colorado and buy a Mule deer tag with better opportunity at virtually the same price. Do not make it harder for non-residents. South Dakota has too much to offer in the way of beauty and opportunity to risk alienating potential allies in the fight to continue our hunting and fishing traditions.

Jesse Kurtenbach
Spearfish SD
jessepkurt@icloud.com

Comment:

I don't think changing the start dates for archery season will do much of anything to mitigate pressure on public land and will only make enforcing more complicated for the C.O.'s

August 1st deadline still leaves SD as a last resort and should be closer to June 1 which will make NR decide as to which state they would like to hunt. I apply to every state west of SD and have to plan whether to buy preference or apply for a tag every year because all of the other deadlines are earlier.

I think putting a cap limit on LAUs should be across the board. Only doing this for 35L will only increase the pressure on other areas such as the Black Hills. We need a quota for these areas based on past harvest statistics and biological carrying capacities like every other state handles their limited draw areas.

Dominic Wolf
Nemo SD
wolfie@775.net

Comment:

If the GFP Commission limits the number of resident access permits for Custer National Forest (Unit 35L), then nonresidents should NOT be allotted any access permits. If nonresidents are granted access to this public land, it would not be fair for those of us that live in South Dakota to be denied access to this same public land.

Dean Bortz

Woodruff WI

dean@outdoornews.com

Comment:

The South Dakota GFP has proposed three changes to the state's archery hunting season framework. I am opposed to two of the three changes: Requiring an Aug. 1 deadline for nonresidents to purchase an archery license, or be restricted to hunting private land if licenses are bought after that date; and delaying the start of the archery season on public lands to the first Saturday after Labor Day. I am not opposed to limiting the number of archery licenses issued for the Custer National Forest. Regarding the proposed Aug. 1 deadline: I have now bowhunted in SD during three seasons and have thoroughly enjoyed the experience. During two of those three years I bought my license after Aug. 1 when I saw that my schedule would allow for me to hunt in SD. That's now I now approach my SD archery hunting. I hope to go every year, but because your state allows me the flexibility to buy the tag at any time, I can work that hunt in and around other fall travels. This is a very important consideration for me and I very much appreciate SD's current season framework. Your state has always made it convenient – when compared to other states – for me and my friends to plan hunting trips. Even down to your web site - it's much easier to use than those of other states. I can't imagine what advantage this archery license deadline would create for the state, other than pulling in more revenue earlier in the year. I wonder if making the move wouldn't cost you revenue. Although I've hunted SD for turkeys and deer since 2000, I could easily shift my bowhunting to ND if that becomes more convenient for me. Please do not set an Aug. 1 deadline for archery license purchases. My No. 2 objection is regarding the delayed opener for nonresidents on public lands. Why? It's PUBLIC LAND. South Dakota residents have no more right to using that land than anyone else in this country. If GFP wished to delay the archery opener on private land, no argument from me. There is no reason to consider that season framework change.

Ross Swedeen

Rapid City SD

reswedeen@yahoo.com

Comment:

I support all three of the current archery deer proposals. However, I believe it is not enough.

Archery hunting in this state is a free for all (both residents and NR). It makes absolutely no sense to me that anyone that wants to hunt a mule deer in the BH with a gun has to wait 10+ years, all the while, ANYONE with a bow is afforded that opportunity. There are many other areas in this state that have similar circumstances. It's ludicrous!

If you're going to limit one group of users, ALL users should be limited. I strongly believe NR should have an opportunity to hunt in SD (including ER rifle deer and BH elk). Why are NR restricted so much when it comes to ER rifle deer and elk? Yet we have zero restrictions when it comes to archery deer. This is a prime example of a governmental bureaucracy's poor decision making capabilities. Common sense seems to get thrown right out the window!

Michael Fuhrmann
Shakopee MN
michael.fuhrmann23@gmail.com

Comment:

I love coming to SD for archery hunting for deer and I spend a lot of money in your state to help out these smaller towns and you are making it harder and harder for people from out of state to get tags. The local guys aren't spending the money for these smaller towns as the non-residents are. These smaller towns rely on the hunters to spend local.

Andy Vandel
Pierre SD
andyvandel@gmail.com

Comment:

I encourage the commission to reconsider the option of setting a non-resident archery tag limit. An 8% limit has been excepted by resident hunters for west river rifle deer. With the recent increase in non-resident licence sales, this is the time to implement the 8% allocation based on resident licence sales. I was on the deer management plan taskforce and this topic was discussed many times and the majority of the group agreed on this method of limited non-resident archery deer licenses. Help keep quality deer hunting for South Dakota tax paying resident hunters.

Leonard Spomer
Pierre SD
lspom@mncomm.com

Comment:

Chairman Jensen, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Commission

Having reviewed the recently released additional information regarding the number of resident and nonresident archery hunters and the harvest statistics for 2018, I find it necessary to present additional comments. I commented first in early May.

Last year nonresidents made up over 14% of the total archery hunters in the State. Furthermore, in some of the limited access units, example 35L, nonresidents harvested 264% more mule deer bucks than residents. Mule deer bucks are the most sought after deer tag for our residents, and this excess harvest by nonresidents is crippling our South Dakota resident's chances at a big mule deer buck not only with a bow but rifle as well.

We cannot sustain that type of rapid growth in nonresident archery hunters, and their targeting of mule deer bucks.

The number of nonresident archery licenses available should be limited to 8% of the previous year's total archery hunters. They need to be limited just like the nonresident rifle tags.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Leonard Spomer
20476 Browning Road
Pierre, SD 57501
605-222-1091

Bighorn Sheep Auction License

Justin Broughton

Sioux Falls SD

justin.broughton@premierbankcard.com

Comment:

I am firmly opposed to stealing money from the sale of the Bighorn auction tag from sheep and giving it to the Governor's pet habitat programs for private landowners. This is an egregious effort by the commission and the Governor's office to capitalize on a resource that is fragile at best when this species has only a limited source of funding. Pheasants and habitat programs can be funded through any of dozens of sources. Bighorn sheep have but a single source. Please do not steal these funds from our ongoing research and conservation of wild sheep in SD to fund programs which can be funded through numerous other channels. Thank you for your consideration.

Sam Stukel

Yanton SD

sstukel@hotmail.com

Comment:

Funds raised by the auction of bighorn sheep tags should be used to benefit wild sheep. This is unique species with very unique needs and the dollar amount raised by the tag can actually make a difference. Conversely, it is a drop in the bucket for "pheasant habitat" and should not be used as such. It would be especially disappointing see it spent on paying for raccoon tails. Please spend wild sheep dollars on wild sheep. Thanks.

Brian Renaud

Attica NY

blurr18us@gmail.com

Comment:

"Commissioners, I strongly oppose the use of ANY funds raised via the sale of an auction tag for bighorn sheep being utilized for ANY program that does not directly benefit wild sheep in South Dakota. The bighorn auction tag was specifically authorized to be utilized by the Midwest Chapter of the Wild Sheep Foundation to raise funds for wild sheep research and conservation in South Dakota. The funds raised by the sale of this tag should be solely dedicated to that purpose. Funds for the second century habitat initiative can be raised through habitat stamp programs, increases in small game hunting licenses for non-residents, and via conservation organizations which are strictly dedicated to that purpose. Thank you for your consideration

Tim Deick
Pierre SD

Comment:

Commissioners, I strongly oppose the use of ANY funds raised via the sale of an auction tag for bighorn sheep being utilized for ANY program that does not directly benefit wild sheep in South Dakota. The bighorn auction tag was specifically authorized to be utilized by the Midwest Chapter of the Wild Sheep Foundation to raise funds for wild sheep research and conservation in South Dakota. The funds raised by the sale of this tag should be solely dedicated to that purpose. Funds for the second century habitat initiative can be raised through habitat stamp programs, increases in small game hunting licenses for non-residents, and via conservation organizations which are strictly dedicated to that purpose. Thank you for your consideration

Nick Daedlow
Independence IA
nick.daedlow@gmail.com

Comment:

Commissioners, I strongly oppose the use of ANY funds raised via the sale of an auction tag for bighorn sheep being utilized for ANY program that does not directly benefit wild sheep in South Dakota. The bighorn auction tag was specifically authorized to be utilized by the Midwest Chapter of the Wild Sheep Foundation to raise funds for wild sheep research and conservation in South Dakota. The funds raised by the sale of this tag should be solely dedicated to that purpose. Funds for the second century habitat initiative can be raised through habitat stamp programs, increases in small game hunting licenses for non-residents, and via conservation organizations which are strictly dedicated to that purpose. Thank you for your consideration.

Christian Harrington
Johnstown CO
charrington@servprofortcollins.com

Comment:

Commissioners, I strongly oppose the use of ANY funds raised via the sale of an auction tag for bighorn sheep being utilized for ANY program that does not directly benefit wild sheep in South Dakota. The bighorn auction tag was specifically authorize

Duane Zuverink
Holland MI
IDHUNT365@GMAIL.COM

Comment:

Commissioners, I strongly oppose the use of ANY funds raised via the sale of an auction tag for bighorn sheep being utilized for ANY program that does not directly benefit wild sheep in South Dakota. The bighorn auction tag was specifically authorize

Joseph Schmaedick
Richland Center WI
jschm581@gmail.com

Comment:

Commissioners, I strongly oppose the use of ANY funds raised via the sale of an auction tag for bighorn sheep being utilized for ANY program that does not directly benefit wild sheep in South Dakota. The bighorn auction tag was specifically authorized to be utilized by the Midwest Chapter of the Wild Sheep Foundation to raise funds for wild sheep research and conservation in South Dakota. The funds raised by the sale of this tag should be solely dedicated to that purpose. Funds for the second century habitat initiative can be raised through habitat stamp programs, increases in small game hunting licenses for non-residents, and via conservation organizations which are strictly dedicated to that purpose. Thank you for your consideration.

Sam Kezar
Lennox SD
sam@aspenarbo.com

Comment:

I am strongly opposed and extremely upset and disappointed that we have gotten to a place where such a delicate, charismatic, native, and important animal with such a fantastic recovery conservation story are now in the eye of greed and potential destruction because it may fetch a high dollar at auction. I will first say that I am in favor of an auction tag where all the funds raised are directly going back to that animals conservation, habitat, and management. However, this proposal to only have sheep get a portion of the funds and the rest be given to pheasant habitat is down right absurd and a disgrace to the state of South Dakota and it history in conservation. Never before was there such interest in the sheep auction funds or otherwise until now where there is the potential for more record book rams. We should be celebrating and bragging about how we have such a fabulous heard and management. In stead we are now going to use all that hard work and dedicated conservation to sell out and USE these animals for something else. And a non-native bird too. Habitat for all animals in not inexpensive. The amount of money that the sheep auction tag would stretch far greater on sheep research, habitat improvements, and conservation versus what it will get to get some grasslands set aside for pheasant habitat. There are real possibilities that with the proper funding, research at our great State Universities, that a solutions could be found to the pneumonia issue in wild sheep herds. But if we sell out on the sheep and use that money for the Second Century Initiative, the chances of that happening just got a whole lot more difficult. I strongly urge the members of the commission to reject this proposal and amend it so that the one auction tag funds be given directly back to sheep. The same process should be true for elk, deer, pheasants, or any other animal that people wish to pursue and pay money for. No where else in North America are highly prized and sought after charismatic wildlife auctioned off to gain money for other causes. Please don't let South Dakota change that. There are other ways to raise funds for pheasant conservation, but using sheep or other animals as a prize pig to get a little extra cash out of it is not the way it should be done.

Jacob Grimsrud

Elkton SD

jakegrimsrud34@yahoo.com

Comment:

Commissioners, I strongly oppose the use of ANY funds raised via the sale of an auction tag for bighorn sheep being utilized for ANY program that does not directly benefit wild sheep in South Dakota. The bighorn auction tag was specifically authorized to be utilized by the Midwest Chapter of the Wild Sheep Foundation to raise funds for wild sheep research and conservation in South Dakota. The funds raised by the sale of this tag should be solely dedicated to that purpose. Funds for the second century habitat initiative can be raised through habitat stamp programs, increases in small game hunting licenses for non-residents, and via conservation organizations which are strictly dedicated to that purpose. Thank you for your consideration.

Paul Roghair

Kadoka SD

tallpaulr@hotmail.com

Comment:

I strongly oppose opening up the auction tag to the Badlands unit. If one is to look, how many years did the units in the Black Hills receive of resident only hunting? Why does this new unit only get now 2 at most before it turns into a rich mans game? I have heard stories about these wealthy groups or individuals that " might just buy the tag and not use it" if that was the case they can buy the one that is open now and pay ten times the amount it is going for, there is not a rule that says they can't. In addition, with the limited area in which to hunt the possible doubling (almost guaranteed with records on the line) of hunters in a small area do you not think that it will detract from the hunting experience and turn it into a competition hunt between a wealthy hunter and his group of guides and an average hunter from our state being bullied and harassed? I also have issue with the money being sucked off to improve pheasants east of the river or in paid hunting areas. Lastly I ask that you stop and think about what message you are sending to our states sportsmen and women when you say "oh we can get a record animal here, lets sell it to the ones with money because we can get it and the heck with the average guy getting it." That message comes through clear that South Dakota is all about making money on our hunting and not about managing animals for our resident hunters. In closing, I am sure you will ignore the pleas of our hunters and chase the money, when you do so give the resident a chance to say that when hunting the Badlands unit the auction tag cannot be used until after the resident hunter has harvested their sheep, thus showing that we do still value our resident hunters more than dollars. Thank you

Tavis Rogers

Oak Creek CO

tavisrogers@msn.com

Comment:

The allocation of proceeds from the auction of the South Dakota Bighorn Sheep Auction Tag should remain 100% dedicated to the restoration of wild sheep in South Dakota.

These funds should NOT be reallocated to non-native pheasant habitat improvements, particularly on private lands and commercial pheasant facilities.

Jeremy Welch

Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

I believe the money raised by the bighorn sheep tag being auctioned, should stay with improving bighorn sheep count in the state. It should not be used for anything else including pheasant numbers!

Jeremy Welch

Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

Commissioners, I strongly oppose the use of ANY funds raised via the sale of an auction tag for bighorn sheep being utilized for ANY program that does not directly benefit wild sheep in South Dakota. The bighorn auction tag was specifically authorized to be utilized by the Midwest Chapter of the Wild Sheep Foundation to raise funds for wild sheep research and conservation in South Dakota. The funds raised by the sale of this tag should be solely dedicated to that purpose. Funds for the second century habitat initiative can be raised through habitat stamp programs, increases in small game hunting licenses for non-residents, and via conservation organizations which are strictly dedicated to that purpose. Thank you for your consideration.

Crystal Kezar

Lennox SD

ckezar@gmail.com

Comment:

Do not exploit bighorn sheep to raise funds for pheasant habitat. This is wrong! Any funds raised from a Bighorn sheep auction tag should go directly to supporting sheep habitat ONLY! A more effective approach to raise funds for pheasant habitat would be a \$5 pheasant stamp purchase requirement for small game hunters.

Gerald Shaw

Rapid City SD

photolab.gsp@gmail.com

Comment:

I feel as though the Sheep Tag money should stay with the sheep. I do understand that without pheasants we likely wouldnt have sheep or goats in our state. However, there needs to be more transparency on the amount the sheep get or dont get moreover, and a legitimate reason to allow the funds to go elsewhere. To give an average of what the sheep have typically got seems to be a pretty poor number in light of what it has potential to bring. More discussion needs to be had before this gets approved. And the amount of money the tag will bring will far benefit the sheep more than the pheasants. The amount of money that will be needed to bring SD back to the pheasant capitol of the world far exceeds the money the BHS Auction Tag will bring in. I personally feel the money should stay with the sheep. Raise all licenses by \$5 and procure the funds that way.

Katie Wiederrich

Sioux Falls SD

Katie.wiederrich@gmail.com

Comment:

If South Dakota wants to continue to have an auction tag for big horn sheep, all of the funds need to go back to the sheep, sheep research, and sheep conservation.

Nathan Bachman

Sioux Falls SD

Nathan.bachman@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Justin Whitehead

Mitchell SD

jstnwhitehead@yahoo.com

Comment:

I support the Bighorn tag raffle IF the funds go to Big Horn sheep and habitat conservation. I do not support sheep tags for funding pheasants.

Wyatt Skelton

Bryant SD

wyattskelton@hotmail.com

Comment:

I oppose funds from the auction of the bighorn sheep tag being diverted from its intended sole purpose which it was originally started for on managing the bighorn sheep. Bighorn only. Also oppose opening badlands unit to being included in the auction areas.

Jeremy Timmermans

Chancellor SD

Timmyjat@yahoo.com

Comment:

It's as simple as any Sunday in church. They tell you before the collection plate gets passed exactly where your contribution is going. It allows people to give their hard earned money to where they believe it will do the most good. If the people of SD want to donate to the SCH Initiative, then have a fundraiser and ask.

Laura Dressing
Sioux Falls SD
Lkhurley@live.com

Comment:

oppose

Greg Van Den Berg
Sioux Falls SD
gmknvdb@gmail.com

Comment:

I support of the proposed changes as it appears the biological data supports these changes. However, I very much oppose the use of the auction revenue for the Second Century Initiative. I am very saddened that the use of auction funds has seemingly been decided without input from all stakeholders. I can't help but feel like the State is trying to exploit a resource only because they can make a buck and spend it elsewhere. The idea of Tag Auctions seems to make many people uneasy as on the surface it seems to monetize our wildlife. History has shown our country has learned some hard lessons when it comes to monetizing wildlife. The only thing that makes an auction more palatable is that the species "pays its' own way" by removing an individual to help support a population. To take any money away and use it elsewhere tiptoes into the water of monetizing an animal and going against the Conservation model that has corrected many mistakes from our history.

Joel Wagner
Brookings SD
wagnerjw27@hotmail.com

Comment:

"Commissioners, I strongly oppose the use of ANY funds raised via the sale of an auction tag for bighorn sheep being utilized for ANY program that does not directly benefit wild sheep in South Dakota. The bighorn auction tag was specifically authorized to be utilized by the Midwest Chapter of the Wild Sheep Foundation to raise funds for wild sheep research and conservation in South Dakota. The funds raised by the sale of this tag should be solely dedicated to that purpose. Funds for the second century habitat initiative can be raised through habitat stamp programs, increases in small game hunting licenses for non-residents, and via conservation organizations which are strictly dedicated to that purpose. Thank you for your consideration."

Jared Pearson
Summerset SD
docjpearson@gmail.com

Comment:

Bighorn sheep funds should be used solely for the use of bighorn sheep conservation.

Justin Inhofer

Sturgis SD

Justin.

**Inhofer@animalhealthinternational.
com**

Comment:

The profits from this tag need to spend on sheep, research, and the conversation of sheep. Which it was intended for not pheasants or pheasant habitat. This is the only reason I voted for the Auction tag

Derek Howard

Stickney SD

Comment:

Why do we keep trying to fix something that's isn't broke. Leave the stuff the way it is. Money is not everything and the future for our children to be able to enjoy hunting is dwindling away as this is becoming a full out money game. The money brought in from a auction needs to stay only for the bighorn sheep. Dont take money from one fund to pay for another.

Amy Miller

Canton SD

Amemiller11@gmail.com

Comment:

I strongly oppose the big horn sheep auction tag money to be going anywhere but to the SD big horn sheep heard.

I would also like to see SD lottery tag winners get the opportunity to harvest their sheep before the auction tag winner as well.

100% of money goes to sheep conservation in SD.

-Amy

Sean Fulton
Rapid City SD

Comment:

I am In full support of auctioning off a South Dakota bighorn sheep tag to create funds for more opportunities for hunting bighorn sheep, But if any of these funds are allocated for anything other than bighorn sheep research or placement I am strongly opposed to that and the game and fish will not get any of my support in that matter. There are dozens of organizations in support of pheasants and other types of game in South Dakota. They don't need to be stealing funds from the big horn sheep which has very limited opportunity for anyone that is a resident. The odds of drawing a tag are so slim as it is why take that away from us as residence or take possible funding to create more opportunity for other people to have a chance to hunt big horn sheep in South Dakota.

My opinion is that the governor and other entities want hook up their friends and family who probably charge for pheasant hunting but cannot dedicate some of their properties to habitat without government funds as aid. If they want to charge people to hunt pheasants on their property then they can create and leave habitats for pheasants instead of plowing and cutting everything including the ditches.

The game and fish is already on a lot of people's radar and the general public is not really happy with some of the decisions being made. I myself believe most decisions are for the better but if this money is used for something other than bighorn research then you will be hurting the gfp and lose the little respect that most people have left. I don't know one person who feels this money should be used anyway other that put back into the bighorn sheep population.

Commissioners,

Thanks for your time and please be cautious of your decisions on the use of monies acquired. I repeat I am strongly opposed to use of bighorn sheep funds generated being used for anything other than bighorn sheep research and replacement.

Sean Fulton RC

Brendan Farrell
Tea SD
ashdan817@yahoo.com

Comment:

I support it only if all the funds go to research of rams and continue growth of ram population

Justin Allen
Pierre SD

Comment:

I don't support the current Big Horn Sheep Auction unless all proceed are used 100% for bighorn sheep management. The auctioned license was agreement between the sportsman and the sheep foundation several years ago only because the funds would used to manage sheep in SD. The funds should not used for other pet projects.

Jesse Kurtenbach

Spearfish SD

jessepkurt@hotmail.com

Comment:

Dear SDGFP Commission,

For historical reference I reached out to the former president of the Midwest WSF prior to the auction tag being initiated back in 2012. I have also reached out to several on the board of the current Midwest WSF but have not received a response, which seems rather odd to me.

The following is an email chain involving former Secretary Vonk and the working group whom spent so much time getting this auction tag implemented to help bighorn sheep in South Dakota. Feel free to read the whole email chain but I have copied the paragraph that talks specifics as to how the money will be handled. Of particular note is when former Secretary Vonk said the money would be given to the SDGFP and put into a separate account for the bighorn sheep and only spent on bighorn sheep projects.

Directly from 2012 Email that I sent a copy of to the full commission.---

4) Discuss the logistics of a potential Bighorn Sheep account:

It was discussed that Midwest is a federally non-profit 501 (c) 3 group. Also when an auction tag is purchased through Midwest, the check is written to Midwest. Curt said 100% of the sale price of the auction tag would be returned to help fund the South Dakota bighorn sheep. Midwest does charge a 5% convenience fee to the winning bidder, which they retain to fund bighorn sheep projects. Rip asked Sec. Vonk how he would like this money to be handled. Sec. Vonk said the auction tag money would be given to the SD GF&P and put into a separate account for the bighorn sheep and only spent on bighorn sheep projects. Rip asked if this money could ever be taken internally or any other way and Sec. Vonk said no. Curt (Midwest) and Tom Krafka (SCI Greater Dacotah Chapter) said they would retain their money until invoices came in from a project and then they would write a check for the invoice. Sec. Vonk asked how does everybody agree on what projects to fund. Rip said in talking to other states with auction tags, they have working groups setup that agree on what projects should be pursued. Everybody liked the working group idea. Tony Leif said that regardless if an auction tag happens or not, a working will be formed for the bighorn sheep.

Accepting a personal letter of guarantee from the current Secretary Hepler like he stated at the last meeting holds about as much weight as this email. At some point in the future the position of Secretary will be held by a different individual and the letter will become invalid, apparently just like the agreement former Secretary Vonk made in this email. The SDGFP does a lot of work with private citizens and I would be willing to bet a legal contract is signed before any of that work is done. A landowner wouldn't be able to write a personal letter of guarantee that they will allow public hunting or depredation in return for SDGFP help.

A specific dollar amount should be included in the current bighorn sheep auction tag proposal. I have heard the 5 yr rolling average thrown around as a number that both parties are willing to accept, I think that is fair.

I would like this to be included in Public comment and will be adding this myself via the website to ensure it makes it to the public record.

Thank you for taking the time to read this historical data

Respectfully Submitted,

Jesse Kurtenbach
Spearfish SD
605-380-5972

Eddie Childers

Interior SD

eddie_childers@nps.gov

Comment:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposal to include the Bighorn Sheep Auction tag in the hunting area known as the Badlands Unit for the 2020 hunting season. This area encompasses both private and federally owned US Forest Service National Grasslands north and south of Badlands NP.

We commend your staff for being such a great partner in the restoration of Rocky Mountain Bighorn sheep to the Badlands of South Dakota. Without your help and support Rocky Mountain Bighorn sheep would not exist today as a thriving population throughout the Badlands/Conata Ecosystem.

As a valuable partner, we would like to suggest the following recommendations concerning the hunting of Rocky Mountain Bighorn sheep in this unit.

1. A Buffer zone of "no hunting" of at least 100 meters adjacent to the Park Boundary. This would provide a safety zone for anyone photographing wildlife within or near the Park.
2. Changing the name of the unit from the "Badlands Unit" to the "Grasslands Unit." Last year we received many phone calls from a confused public wondering why we were allowing hunting in our north unit when it is clearly forbidden by our enabling legislation.
3. If the proposal is approved to be available for the Auction Tag, there is the potential that 2 large rams could be harvested from the population. Our data indicate that at least 59 rams exit the park between November and December each year during the rut and 8-10 of these animals are in the $\frac{3}{4}$ curl or better age class. Sustained hunting of rams over several years could reduce the older age of rams substantially. Consequently, we recommend careful consideration as to how many mature rams may be taken each year. Our staff would like to be involved in this decision and will gladly share any data we may have to make an informed decision on harvest.

One last thought. We realize that harvesting 1-2 rams each year will not be detrimental to the population. In fact our data suggest the population could reach over 450 animals by 2024 barring any unforeseen disease outbreak. However we also recognize the high value of wildlife viewing opportunity of large Rocky Mountain Bighorn sheep in a wild setting such as the Badlands. We average more than 1 million visitors per year along the 240 Loop road. Consequently, we believe that this value should also be considered when considering opening up this unit for an additional hunting tag and would also request that the NPS be invited to participate in discussions before a final decision is made.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Ross English

Spearfish SD

rossenglishod@gmail.com

Comment:

I wanted to make a brief comment on the commission proposal for administrative action for the bighorn sheep hunting season. Let me begin by saying I fully support allowing the auction license to be valid in both units. The auction winner will have spent a great deal of money for their license in support of South Dakota bighorn sheep. They should be offered the opportunity to hunt both units. With the recent record book ram taken in the Badlands unit, I believe this change also gives the state an opportunity to raise even more money than it has in recent years. My opposition revolves around the language "...to also raise funds to supplement the Second Century habitat initiative...". This is a vague statement that to my understanding doesn't even specify how much of the sheep auction license money will be used for the Second Century Initiative. In my opinion, any money not spent directly on sheep conservation and research is simply not fair. I would guess the auction winner would feel the same too. I believe the Second Century Initiative was a poorly thought out plan that lacks the science needed for sound wildlife management. Regardless of my opinion on the Second Century Initiative, I think we can all agree that money should not be stolen from an auctioned sheep license to help fund it (no matter how effective or popular the program is).

From the way I understand it, the current language allows the auctioned funds to be used for any big game although, I believe, the vast majority has been spent on sheep or goat conservation. When the auctioned license was first proposed, GF&P had a lot of residents that were opposed to it, and understandably so. It would be a slap in the face to them if the state now reneged on their selling point and started allowing these funds to support the Second Century Initiative (primarily small game). I understand that the Second Century Initiative is Governor Noem's pet project. I also understand that GF&P commissioners are appointed by the governor. This obviously puts the entire commission in a tight spot. As a concerned South Dakota citizen and lifelong South Dakota hunter, I am asking you to carefully consider this administrative action. Adding the Badlands unit provides a great fundraising opportunity for South Dakota sheep. Attempting to allocate some of those funds for small game is simply not fair to the license bidders, South Dakota big game hunters, and most importantly South Dakota Bighorn Sheep.

Matt Kane

Huron SD

Mattkane40@hotmail.com

Comment:

The use funds of the auction of bighorn sheep tag should in no way be used for other purposes. Keep the wild sheep funds for wild sheep.

Ethan Zakrzewski

Brandon SD

Comment:

We need to support keeping wildlife on the mountains especially bighorn sheep. The future of hunting and enjoying the outdoors depends on the animals and their accesible habitat.

Mathew Fetherhuff

Aberdeen SD

mathewfetherhuff@gmail.com

Comment:

I firmly believe that the funds generated from the sale of a bighorn sheep tag should go back into the bighorn sheep. It makes absolutely no sense to pull money from a sheep tag to this fund. If anything, there should be a different fund set aside directly for bighorn sheep and the betterment of the habitat and all money generated from sale of tag should go to that. You can not deny the fact that pheasants, which the habitat initiative seems to be really geared towards, are a invasive species. They did not naturally occur here, bighorn sheep did. Pheasants may thrive here now, but they are still not a native species. They contribute a huge amount to the economy but taking funds from this auction tag to help boost the pheasant population, which would then in return create more money for the state, is a line that should not be crossed. If you want to raise money for that initiative, impose a 5\$ pheasant stamp or similar license required to hunt pheasants. 5 dollars won't stop someone from hunting, even if it did, it would be an extremely small percentage of people. If you can't afford 5\$ for conservation towards pheasant habitat when you are the one who is pursuing them then you probably should be at work, not hunting.

Sean Newberg

Canton SD

newbergsean92@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Seth Mulvehill

Piedmont SD

Comment:

Using any money that is based around the bighorn sheep of SD for any other game/habitat that isn't a bighorn sheep is distasteful and politically aimed. KISS - Keep It Simple Stupid.

Sam Huewe

Brandon SD

Samhuewe@gmail.com

Comment:

All the money being raised for sheep, I hope is staying for the sheep. I hope someday to peruse one but with the shortage and the costs not sure of it will happen. Please help grow the sheep herd and lower the number of cats

Thad Nafziger

Pierre SD

Thadnafziger@yahoo.com

Comment:

Once again I find myself (a lifelong resident & license holder) on this page for comment. Frustrating that I disagree with direction/action/proposals & protocol of the Dept of gfp so frequently anymore. This particular branch/or department of govt. has become nothing short of an embarrassment,& is completely misguided & out of touch with its constituency. I really don't know if comment on this positions form is nothing but a waste of my time,as I suspect that comments made here to the Dept are merely shuffled on to?..who knows..possibly a seasonal summer helper, or (not to demean anyone's title) but possibly to a person in a strictly clerical role? This way the Dept can always say that comment was received and read.Surely feels as any comment made here is not being viewed or given any consideration by any Dept member in any position to address rational thoughts/ suggestions/ protests, or in general dishes of their constituents. That being said I will yet again comment on another issue brought forth by the Dept. I as a resident will on all likelihood never draw a sheep tag in the hills (yet will continue to try) & I was never in favor of auctioning off a sheep tag..giving one of the very precious few opportunities to the highest bidder vs. the everyday sportsman/woman to partake in what really must be considered a hunt of s lifetime. This being said, I realize this tag auction generates dollars..problem is these dollars need to stay in 100% support of the resource that has generated them. All funds received through sheep tag auction need to stay with all things sheep related. Be it research, equipment-radio collars-man hours spent on anything related to the species. This in a nutshell folks is one of bureaucracy's biggest problems..ribbing Peter to pay Paul mentality. In the end that does not work..as we are becoming so painfully aware of (ie social security going broke, etc.)...don't want to turn this into a rant on govt. inadequacies and shortcomings, but the money raised by selling that tag to the highest bidder needs to support its benefactor and only them. Please do not rob the coffers for a different program that obviously cannot support itself.

Joshua Hagemann

Mission Hill SD

Comment:

I think the current proposal could greatly benefit the state.

Jeff Grosdidier

Ethan SD

j_grosdidier@hotmail.com

Comment:

I oppose the transfer of funds because the bighorn sheep have not reached the levels promised when this sale was approved. Until the sheep reach the promised levels then the money should stay with the sheep

Andrew Schmidt

Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

Please keep all monies affilliated with sheep auction allocated for sheep consevation.

Patrick O'Connell

Brandon SD

patrickoconnell428@gmail.com

Comment:

I think the money from the auctioned off bighorn tag should go to bighorn conservation within the state. Not for any secondary programs.

Joel Kanable

Harrisburg SD

Joel.kanable@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please keep the funds to protect the sheep, not used for anything else.

Brent Kastner

Rapid City SD

brentkphoto@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose the use of big horn sheep revenue to be used for anything else but the preservation and support of big horn sheep habitat. I think it is a disservice to take funds from a relatively small funding area and pushing it to a different area.

Keith Pullins

Rapid City SD

Keith_pullins@yahoo.com

Comment:

I oppose allocation of the lottery funds for anything other than improving big horn sheep

Virgil Pfennig

Brookings SD

Virgilpfennig@gmail.com

Comment:

I support the use of the SD sheep hunting tag proceeds to be used for the preservation of sheep habitat only

Kris Weinberger
Piedmont SD

Comment:

The pheasants in eastern South Dakota have nothing to do with the big horn sheep in western South Dakota
Leave the

Connor Miles
Hartford SD

Comment:

Keep big horn sheep dollars for big horn sheep only..

Jason Wolbrink
Stickney SD
wolbrinke@gmail.com

Comment:

Money raised from the sale of that tag needs to stay within the big Horn sheep. No reason should it go anywhere else, just because it is possibly going to be a large amount of money doesn't need it needs to be moved to a different account. Look how well the state is doing on getting these animals established. Let's keep it going!!!

Riley Niewewhuis
Corsica SD

Comment:

Wild sheep are hard to keep healthy and growing well , if the financial support is not there to help stay on top of the Big horn sheep in SD , they may be threatened.

Denny Tesch
Rapid City SD
Dwtesch71@gmail.com

Comment:

The money raised for sheep is raised For SHEEP!!

Chuck Point

Sioux Falls SD

cjpoint@sio.midco.net

Comment:

I hope that you will do all you can to repeal what the Governor has started and stop anything more. Predators are a necessary part of our Eco System. The Governor's Program is not supported by any serious science. Thanks.

Cade Berry

Sioux Falls SD

Cadecberry@yahoo.com

Comment:

I oppose the current proposal, and the only way it will gain my support is that it be guaranteed that all of the funds from the governors auction tag go directly back into the bighorn sheep program.

Marlin Dart

Brookings SD

Mdart90@yahoo.com

Comment:

Using bighorn funds for second century initiative

Steven Morgan Jr

Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

oppose

Samuel Jacobson

Castlewood SD

sam.jacobson@gmail.com

Comment:

The diversion of funds for other wildlife goals is a government over reach for the intended protection of the limited resource of big horn sheep. Please consider the potential cost of protection of this unique resource in South Dakota.

Jason Barbee
Hartford SD
Race8dad@yahoo.com

Comment:

It is ridiculous for this to even be on the table. These funds should be goin towards the better of sheep herds here in SD. I do understand that ringnecks bring in alot of money and revenue but at the same time does nothin for habitat for our public grounds. Pheasant hunting has gotten so out of hand that I havnt hunted them in a number of years, as for my son. My daughter has never hunted pheasants. I hate to put her thru the frustration of landowners and pay hunters being total jerks to us while road hunting or simply driving by on the way to walk right of ways or other public ground.....ok back on topic. These "guides" have plenty of money and habitat for "their" birds. Let's keep this money raised by big horn sheep for big horn sheep. Thank you for your time.

Trevor Reil
Sioux Falls SD
Trevor.m.reil@gmail.com

Comment:

The money raised by the wild sheep should be used to help conserve the wild sheep.

Ivan Visser
Brandon SD

Comment:

oppose

Michael Norton
Rapid City SD
nortonmichael1922@yahoo.com

Comment:

Landowners already get bull elk tags yearly, don't hunt there own land. When it's elk deprevation tag- which should mean cow elk tags - which they deserve for destroying fence and eating crops- I know several that lie about elk on their land-

No big horn sheep- now way- this money needs to stay to maintaining the herds and not touch private land owners- money needs to preserve the public lands and help food plots and shelter belts west river for once-

Deerfield Boating Restrictions

Lamoyne Darnall

Rapid City SD

lamoynedarnall@yahoo.com

Comment:

With the drastic increase in the number of boats it only seems like common sense to open another lake for recreational boating and allow a boat to move from the south boat ramp to the inlet in a decent amount of time. Please approve this change .

Todd Mcrae

Rochford, SD

todd.mcrae@imacorp.com

Comment:

Removing the 5 mph restriction on Deerfield would greatly impact this lake in a negative way and would forever change the solitude that is now found on this lake. There are many fisherman, paddle boarders and kayakers that would no longer find this lake usable because of the number of boats that would be added to the lake, including all the water skiers. The people that want to drive their boat at those speeds can go to Pactola or Sheridan. The lake is too narrow to have boats speeding by and not cause a disruption to the fisherman, paddle boarders and kayakers.

Paul Nelson

Lead SD

pgnelson@vastbb.net

Comment:

Deerfield lake has had a no wake restriction for as long as I can remember and for me it is nice to go on with a canoe or kayak with out having to worry about some boat going way to fast close to me and pushing me around. I know it is only 25 mph but if this passes then they will ask for a faster speed until there is no wake zones! Just one point!!

Meldawn Nelson

Lead SD

Meldawn66@yahoo.com

Comment:

A beautiful lake will be destroyed if wake limit is raised.

Jason Schuldt
Spearfish SD
jasknx@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield has always been a very quiet, peaceful place. The camping is wonderful, as is the fishing, but to me, the best part of going there is the peace and quiet. There are lots of other places where people can go with big boats and jet skis, but it seems like Deerfield should be left to the trolling motors and kayaks. Thanks.

Michael Lees
Rapid City SD
mike@wescomm.com

Comment:

Deerfield is the only quiet safe lake in the Black Hills. Please don't disrupt the tranquil charm of this lake by increasing the boating speed limit.

Gene Wilts
Toronto SD
gwilts@itctel.com

Comment:

Leave it the way it is. This is a great lake for peace and quiet and fishing. The lake is too small to increase the speed limit without affecting the quality of fishing.

Martin Hunt
Hill City SD
hunt4martin@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield has always been a fishing lake. Changing to a 25mph limit will encourage tubing, wakeboarding, wake-surfing etc. All of which are done at under 25mph. The added disturbance will make Deerfield less of a peaceful fishing lake and increase shore damage from waves. With the increased popularity of Kayak fishing; Deerfield, as a No Wake Lake, is excellent for Kayaks, Kayak fishing and not dealing with large wakes. The purposed change to make Deerfield Lake a 25mph limit seems unnecessary with Pactola and Sheridan just down the road for people wanting a lake to go above wake speed and water sports. My vote would be No on changing Deerfield Lake from a "No Wake Lake" to a 25mph limit. Thank You

Dave Halverson

Sturgis SD

halversondave00@gmail.com

Comment:

This lake has fragile banks that will be eroded with a senseless 25 mph speed limit. This lake's elevation is 5900 feet and it is currently a peaceful fishing and camping venue. No need to ruin this 435 acre jewel with wave runners that belong at Pactola, Orman or Angustora!

Harold Fenhaus

Rapid City SD

hjfenhaus@icloud.com

Comment:

Please consider the user who enjoys the peace and quiet.

Jarred Burluson

Lead SD

Jburluson13@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield is a good place for fishermen and kayaking. It's a good lake to go relax and get away from the high speed lakes. Increasing the speed limit on this lake will only ruin a good lake.

Jeff Blankenfeld

Aurora SD

blankenj3@hotmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield is a quiet retreat from a hectic life style most of us live in. Keep it simple, and quiet. No wake on the lake is working fine. Thank you

Tracy Cook

Summerset SD

trcook19@gmail.com

Comment:

One of the things that sets Deerfield Lake apart from so many of the other bodies of water in the Black Hills is the ambience. When you go there, you know that it will be quiet and peaceful. To lift the no-wake zone restriction would destroy that ambience. The idyllic atmosphere is the exact reason that so many of us want to go up to Deerfield Lake to begin with. Please, please do not ruin what makes that lake so special.

Rick Bradford
Rapid City SD
Rcb411@yahoo.com

Comment:

Deerfield is the only nice lake to boat fish without having to deal with wake and jet ski headaches. This lake also has a wide variety of wildlife like Osprey and Bald Eagles that surround the area and use the lake as a source of food. They are at this lake mostly because of the quiet natural habitat that surrounds this area. You let boats and jetski's on this lake most of the wildlife will not be around. Leave one lake to the people that don't like being bothered by the speed boats and skiers there are 3 lakes that are large that they can do their thing! Thank you

Jennifer Keller-Bradford
Rapid City SD
Jen.keller29@hotmail.com

Comment:

There are plenty of lakes that allow a wake, this lake is a nice area to escape the chaos. Based on its size, allowing a wake increases danger, reduces trolling abilities and will prevent a lot of the world life from remaining in the area.

Marge Duprel
Sturgis SD
margedranchs@outlook.com

Comment:

As our family frequently camp and Deerfield, boat, canoe on the lake. It is a quiet lake for young people to canoe without the wake of boat roaring next to you. As we are elderly we enjoy the calmness of the lake. There are plenty of other lakes they can speed and water ski on. Please leave as a no wake lake.

Robert Koski
Spearfish SD
jstbkoz@spe.midco.net

Comment:

I have lived in Lawrence county for 63 years. (Lifetime) I have had numerous boats with bigger motors. When I fish Deerfield I use my float tubes and kayaks. I would hate to not be able to take my grandkids out fishing and touring in kayaks on Deerfield because of motorboats buzzing around. It would ruin the Deerfield experience! Leave speed on the bigger lakes only please! Bob Koski

Luke Rouns
Rapid City SD
hootowldesign@gmail.com

Comment:

Leaving one of the larger lakes at a no wake Lake is a good idea. If it were to change to a no wake this would attract the jet skis and people going much faster than 25 and not realizing it. It will also cause the lake to be much more rough because of the wakes and increased boat traffic. Sheridan and Pactola are very close and provide a larger body of water that is safer for water craft traveling at higher speeds. Deerfield is not ready for this, please reconsider changing the speed limit. Thank you.

Larry Smith
Rapid City SD
gofishy_mn@yahoo.com

Comment:

support

Mike Loeffen
Sturgis SD
mjloeffen@q.com

Comment:

oppose

Joseph Vandenberg
Spearfish SD
jwvdbjv@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield lake is one of the few peaceful places left in the Black Hills. This change would absolutely destroy that peacefulness. There are many places to enjoy watersports in the area and this does not need to be added to that list. In addition to the loss of tranquility, this will also damage the natural state in which the lake has remained, including the fishing and overall ecology. I am highly opposed and think changing the ordinance is highly unnecessary and irresponsible.

Bhumi Baumberger
Lead SD
bhum7@hotmail.com

Comment:

This is the only lake of any size in the area that is still a serene environment for locals and tourists alike that want to be away from the chaos of the other larger lakes. Please consider this when making your decision.

Jeff Yennie
Summerset SD
jeff.yennie@gmail.com

Comment:

We don't need another Pactola or Sheridan. Deerfield is a quiet lake that is a great place for anglers, kayaks, and people that want to get away from the crowds of Pactola and Sheridan Lake in the summertime. Not to mention that this would likely have an impact on reproduction rates and success of the fishery. Shut this proposal down.

Bryce Borr
Rapid City SD

Comment:

oppose

Mark Geffre
Lead SD
mjgeffre@hughes.net

Comment:

deerfield lake is the only quiet lake left in the black hills and should be left the way it is now.

Greg Delzer
Rapid City, Formerly Lead. SD

Comment:

This is the last remaining lake in the Hills where you can go to relax and feel as though you are on a pristine mountain lake. The lake is small, and speed is not necessary. Erosion will occur. If you want to go fast, pick a different lake and leave this one alone!

Doug Geary
Lead SD
douggeary@allstate.com

Comment:

Deerfield should continue to be a no wake lake as the size of the lake cannot support ski boats in my opinion. Deerfield is one of few Black Hills lakes that are quiet and peaceful do to the no wake rule. Thank You.

Geri Hill

Deadwood SD

ger10456@hotmail.com

Comment:

I have lived in the Black hills all my life and seen many changes not always for the best. I have been going to Deerfield for 60 years and one of the treasures of it is the peacefulness. There are many other places for the speedboats to go in the Hills... Please do not add this peaceful lake to that list. Thank you. Geri Hill

Judy Geffre

Lead SD

mjgeffre@hughes.net

Comment:

Deerfield lake should be left the way it is now .we dont need fast moving boats out there . even if they going 25 mph.

Blaine Burleson

Deadwood SD

Comment:

Iv been going to Deerfield lake my entire life, as well as my parents and grandparents. The reason we love this lake is due to the no wake and being able to enjoy piece and quiet, turning it into a wake lake would not only completely ruin that enjoyment I get to spend with my family but for many others also.

David Hanna

Rapid City SD

davidhanna85@gmail.com

Comment:

Please do NOT change the No Wake Zone rule for Deerfield Reservoir. That reservoir is a peaceful GEM deep in the Black Hills. The no wake zone mandate, makes this an exceptional place for kayakers, canoes, row boats, and small watercraft, and allows bank fishers to not fight boat wakes with their bobbers. And, allowing wakes would only erode shoreline, increase sediment deposits and provide ZERO enhancement to the recreating use of the lake. Last, this is a headwater reservoir for City of Rapid City drinking water - keeping it clean is important! Leave it as is, please!

Steve Schacht
Rapid City SD
steves@ktllp.com

Comment:

There are already many lakes that power boat users can access in the black hills. I guarantee that next if this is allowed you will have pressure to allow boating at any speed. Deerfield Lake serves a great purpose in having a lake that can be enjoyed in peace and to be able to canoe and kayak safely and a place where fisherman do not need to deal with constant wakes and activity from people towing tubers and other power boat activities. I am really skeptical as to what purpose increasing the limit serves. please be sensible and leave Deerfield alone.

Dori Mcrae
Rochford SD
Dbellmcræ@msn.com

Comment:

This small lake is enjoyed by fishermen, kayaks and paddle boards. Lifting this no wake zone and allowing a 25mph will change this drastically. This lake is not big enough to increase this speed and will be dangerous for those that enjoy it as it is.

Chuck Klafka
Hill City SD
Klafka.chuck@gmail.com

Comment:

As an avid angler and user of Deerfield lake I think that lifting the no wake on Deerfield would increase the amount of users and degrade the overall ambiance of this lake. Please don't lift the no wake restrictions
Thanks Chuck Klafka.

Samantha Burleson
Lead SD
Samanthadburleson05@gmail.com

Comment:

We enjoy Pactola and Orman for our fast pace water sports. Deer field is a great lake to slow down and relax! There are alot of people who enjoy the lake for canoeing! We also need to take a look at the pollution that will hit Deer Field if the speed changes

Pat Urbaniak

Sturgis SD

urbaniakp2000@yahoo.com

Comment:

I have heard that there is a proposal to change the no wake rule on Deerfield to a 25 mph speed limit? If so, this would make this secluded lake less appealing and make it more like Pactola! I hope this is a rumor and will go away. I love hunting and fishing in the Black hills and this is where I live. Please don't ruin it!

Roger Hudson

Lead SD

rogerroanne@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield is one of the most peaceful areas in the Black Hills, also one of the prime breeding areas for bald eagles. Please do not change the speed limit on this lake.
Thank You

Anne Apodaca

Custer SD

annie.apodaca@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is the lake that kayaks and canoes, as well as float tubes go to to get away from the boat traffic on Pactola, Angostura, and Sheridan Lakes among others. Wakes from fast moving motor boats make it miserable to be on a small kayak due to the waves it causes sometimes big enough to capsize smaller craft. Please leave Deerfield as a no wake lake. It provides a different type of recreation opportunity for this type of boating which is not available elsewhere in the area except on little ponds.

Cody Warren

Rapid City SD

Clwarren94@yahoo.com

Comment:

support

Jenn Johnson

Rapid City SD

jennwhitney12@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is one of the last remaining lakes in the black hills that is truly safe to kayak. Being a no wake zone along with a lower speed limit makes Deerfield a destination for young families. Making the lake another recreational boating lake would be very unfortunate.

Kalen Dringman
Rapid City SD
Kalterdring@yahoo.com

Comment:

I'm strongly opposed to lifting the no wake zone on Deerfield reservoir. Deerfield is one of the few lakes I can use my canoe for fishing and not have to be concerned with jet skiers or fast moving water craft. Keep Deerfield calm and peaceful; Sheridan and Pactola no longer are. Thank you

Rod Colvin
Mitchell SD
karlac48@gmail.com

Comment:

I canoe and fish on Deerfield Lake. Please do not increase the boat speed limit. The lake is too small to support high speeds for boats.

Jessica Eggers
Rapid City SD
benchbud@hotmail.com

Comment:

I oppose raising the speed limit from 5mph to 25mph. Deerfield lake is the only large lake that is not overcrowded with speed boats and pwc's. It is quiet and great for fishing, canoeing, kayaking, and paddle boarding. Raising the speed limit will cause the lake to become overcrowded like Angustora, Pactola, and Sheridan Lakes.

Roanne Hudson
Lead SD
roannehudson@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield is a Lake that people can enjoy without loud boat motors fish without waves and kayak and just enjoy the peace and quite and wildlife

Lora Burleson
Rochford SD
LORA.BURLESON61@GMAIL.COM

Comment:

I am strongly against removing the no wake rule on deerfield. This lake is the perfect place to kayak, canoe, swim and just relax. I feel it would be dangerous to the people enjoying these activities if the speed limit was increased

Kevin Ryan
Rapid City SD
Wowphoto57703@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please leave Deerfield as a fishing lake only. Leave no wake in force. No need for water skiers here or speed boats. Maybe a 10 mph limit or something. Leave it alone.

Jeff Hohle
Rochford SD
jhohle@earthlink.net

Comment:

I just heard about this proposal - obviously being pushed by speed boaters who are determined to spoil the last safe haven for fishermen and kayakers.

Brian Peacock
Rapid City SD
bjp04b@acu.edu

Comment:

I think the wake restrictions on Deerfield Reservoir should remain in place.

Don Cavanaugh
Rapid City SD
ds_cavanaugh@yahoo.com

Comment:

Why ruin a very peaceful lake with speedboats and wild boating? Your 25mph will not be obeyed, and no one around to enforce it until after the fact. Boaters have Pactola & Sheridan to speed on, why add another lake that needs a Sheriff's presence to be somewhat safe on. PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE leave Deerfield alone. Thank You

Tom Carr
Lead SD
kcarr1@spe.midco.net

Comment:

Use lake for fishing & kayaking

Charles Loftis
Rapid City SD
chuckloftis@gmail.com

Comment:

At a mere 414 surface acres, and with the significant number of non-motorized users (wading anglers, canoes, kayakers, personal pontoons, and float tubers), SDGF&P will be facilitating hazardous conditions.

At 25 mph. for motorized craft, the reaction time to stop will increase so greatly. The risk of harm to users of non-motorized craft is too great, in my opinion.

Much larger reservoirs of Pactola, Sheridan, Angostura, and Orman are already availed to those who "feel the need for speed."

And let's be frank: the size of those impoundments facilitate it.

Small reservoirs do not.

Ross Sailor
Rapid City SD
rossdsailor@gmail.com

Comment:

Please do not raise the no wake ruling on Deerfield lake. This is my family's favorite lake to canoe and fish on. A 25 mph rule will not be followed/enforced and it will completely ruin the experience of our favorite lake in the hills. It is the only good sized lake to enjoy peacefully.

Angela Thomas
Hill City SD
ATHOMAS57745@GMAIL.COM

Comment:

Deerfield Reservoir is one of the last remaining lakes in the Black Hills where a person can fish in peace. Because of the 5 mph speed limit, you can still hear the birds and experience peace and quiet when you are out enjoying Deerfield. Keeping Deerfield primitive by restricting wakes, keeping the gravel roads and having limited infrastructure is the best way to keep usage down and limit the number of speedboats and jetskis. There are already lakes that are designed for high use such as Pactola and Sheridan, and they have the infrastructure in place to deal with the thousands of people that flock there every summer. Can't we keep one large lake for nature and for people to experience the water and the woods in peace? The petitioner states that the Deerfield Reservoir is underutilized. How long will it take for it to be overutilized? Who will monitor utilization and carrying capacity? The argument about speed of vehicles during winter use is not valid. User groups during the winter and summer are completely different. The Deerfield trail is not open to motorcycles or ATVs because there are plenty of other trails for that. The same applies for the lake. Keep the 5 mph speed limit. If a fisherman can't stand the 20 minute boat ride to get across to a fishing hole, then he should go to a different lake.

Brian Jenner
Summerset SD
bubbamame@yahoo.com

Comment:

I think it should stay a no wake body of water. Much nicer for kayaks and shore fishing.

Samantha Weaver
Hot Springs SD
Weaver4@gwtc.net

Comment:

One of the big enjoyments of Deerfield Lake is the peacefulness it has. You can't hear motors of boats, no cell service, and it feels like a place where you can thoroughly relax and enjoy the outdoors. I don't understand the idea of a 25mph zone when there are other lakes in the area that boaters can go to. Keep this lake the way it is so we can continue to fish in peace and quiet. Thanks!

Shannon Horst
Black Hawk SD
jeepcj776@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake will be overrun with jet skis and boats. Deerfield is a great lake for fishing and a canoe as it is. Dont change this lake into what Sheridan has become. Overrun with people tubing and racing around the lake.

Patrick Wellner
Pierre SD
Pat.wellner@gmail.com

Comment:

It is my opinion that the GFP commission should not lift the ban on wake on Deerfield lake. The status quo provides a safe spot where paddlers do not have to deal with inconsiderate motorized boaters.

Martina Hartwell
Belle Fourche SD
martinaruz@yahoo.com

Comment:

There are few lakes in the BH that allow for a peaceful paddle where you don't have to be concerned about being run over by power boats or jet skis...it would be nice to keep Deerfield that way!

Justin Wills
Rapid City SD
Emisdad88@gmail.com

Comment:

Why change a great spot to get away and enjoy nature by making it a a motorized boating lake? Too many canoes and kayaks it would not only take a way from the beauty, but also be extremely unsafe conditions.

Eric Kloehn
Rapid City SD
kloehn88@hotmail.com

Comment:

Removing the no wake zone on Deerfield Lake has gotta be one of the dumbest things I've ever heard of. There are dozens of other lakes to take your boats on and cruise up and down on. I love Deerfield for the peace and quiet there. Please don't ruin that

Jon Holmgren
Rapid City SD
jholmgren@midco.net

Comment:

As an avid canoeist, I strongly oppose this change. Deerfield Lake is the only major body of water in the Black Hills I do not have worry about being swamped by the wake of motor boats, jet skis or worse yet, get hit by by a irresponsible boat operator.

In addition, Deerfield Lake provides a unique (and the only..) tranquil and peaceful outdoor lake experience for those who seek solitude in the hills. The increased speed limit will eliminate that. For those who seek to go faster than the wake restriction in their boats , they have already Pactola, Sheridan Lake, and Stockade to do so.

Martha Bohls
Rapid City SD
martie.bohls@gmail.com

Comment:

Keep it peaceful and quiet for stand up paddle, kayak, wading, campers and hikers. Leave no wake

Russell Denke
Rapid City SD
russsden@yahoo.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Lyle Casteel
Keystone SD
Sdjeepeguy@hotmail.com

Comment:

NO!!!!

Daniel Warnke
Rapid City SD
Danwarnke@gmail.com

Comment:

I am in strong opposition of the proposal to lift the current no wake restriction on Deerfield Reservoir to a 25 mph restriction.

Carey Robley
Dakota Dunes SD
Rcbolindsey@aol.com

Comment:

I oppose lifting the No Wake rule. Our family has vacationed at Deerfield Lake —it is so peaceful as it is and is a lovely relaxing location. It is nice to have a quiet place to visit and kayak. It would be a shame to change it. It is my son's favorite vacation spot in the Black Hills. There is no other Lake like it. The other no-wake lakes are more like large ponds.

Evan Walterman
Rapid City SD
bhonthefly@gmail.com

Comment:

I strongly oppose lifting the no wake zone in Deerfield Reservoir. That is what sets the Reservoir apart from many others in the Black Hills. There are plenty of other boating opportunities in the area and the thought that the no wake zone is "outdated" or "no longer practical" as described by Ken Edel in his request is simply not true. Please do NOT lift the no wake zone regulation. Thank you

Richard Burton
Rapid City SD

Comment:

Currently Deerfield lake is the only place fishermen can go over holiday weekends without being harassed by jetskis, water skiers, etc. There is no need for another place participate in these activities as all other lakes in the hills are open to them.

Selena Spring

Custer SD

selenann@hotmail.com

Comment:

This is one of the few lakes in the BH that still has the low speed. It's perfect for families to kayak and paddle board on without having to worry about boats waking them. The 25 mph limit will be abused so unless you are going to have someone out there enforcing it 24-7 please leave it as is. Thank you!

Peggy Humbracht

Camp Crook SD

lena.loulou@hotmail.com

Comment:

Don't we have enough dams and lakes to use the larger and high speed boats on? I enjoy visiting Deerfield for it is quiet and secluded without the added noise from larger boats? Please reconsider your decision to remove the "no-wake" zone, and leave well enough alone.(not all changes are for the better)

Cory Winklepleck

Sioux Falls SD

corywinklepleck@gmail.com

Comment:

Me and my family are avid kayakers and we stay every year at least two weeks out of the year at whitetail loop campsite on Deerfield reservoir. the primary reasons we choose to stay here is the beautiful scenery and the fact that we can kayak without having to worry about motorized boats driving unsafely and posing a threat to us in our kayak unfortunately most motorized boaters are not on the lookout for low-lying craft and pose a severe threat to kayakers on both large and small bodies of water for example I can barely use lake Vermillion in the eastern part of the state due to recreational boaters who treat the main channel as there personal speed lane. Were as if I use lake Alvin that is also a no wake lake I can boat without worry of not being seen until it is to late. Please keep this bodies wake restrictions in place to allow everyone in all forms of water craft to be able to utilize these waters safely

Justin Beyer

Driscoll ND

justin.hockey@hotmail.com

Comment:

I oppose the limit of archery access permits for the Custer National Forest (Unit 35L). I understand the need to reduce the pressure on the deer in the CNF, especially concerning the Mule deer. However, I have been Whitetail hunting for years in the CNF hills, mostly in the later part of the season. In all the years that I have been there, I could count on one hand the number of other archery hunters that were pursuing whitetails. It pains me to think that we may lose out on the opportunity to hunt whitetails there knowing that the majority of hunting pressure comes from just mule deer hunters.

Sincerely,
Justin Beyer
701-201-0153

Presston Gabel

Hot Springs SD

presstongabel@yahoo.com

Comment:

Leave Deerfield alone; Sheridan and Pactola in the area already allow for bigger motors and boats. Leave Deefield as a fishing lake.

Derek Ryan

Rapid City SD

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Kelsey Terpening

Sturgis SD

otter_2001@hotmail.com

Comment:

It's nice to have a large lake to kayak on without having to worry about boats making wakes.

Summer Humbracht
Hot Springs SD

Comment:

Would love to see Deerfield remain a No Wake Lake.

Tiffany Trask
Rapid City SD

Comment:

There are many alternative lakes in the Black Hills for boat recreation, please leave the ban. Deerfield is the only decent-sized lake that boasts tranquility and clean water for kayakers, SUP, fishers, elderly folks who want a peaceful float on their boat, family canoeing, etc. Many people who camp there go for the peacefulness that can't be offered anywhere else in the Black Hills. Lifting the ban will have a direct effect on the number of staff needed in that area full-time to address the partying, danger to the land, overrun boat ramps, road damage, parking, etc.

Please keep the ban. Offer the unique experience of the no wake Lake in the Black Hills- it truly is an experience sought after by both locals and tourists!

Dwight Patterson
Rapid Acity SD
Dwight@spire4.com

Comment:

Deerfield is an excellent fishery that gives people the opportunity to fish and rec without having to deal with skiers, surfers and loud music. Don't destroy this valuably peaceful resource.

Dave Uehling
Hot Springs SD
mowerdave1@yahoo.com

Comment:

Deerfield is one of the few places where you can kayak and enjoy the reservoir without wakes left by speeding boats

Cindi Kruse
Hill City SD
Cindiakruse@gmail.com

Comment:

Please, no. Who does this benefit? This will push out canoers, kayakers, wind surfers, paddle boards, swimmers, campers, etc. who use Deerfield because of it's no wake regulation. Not to mention it is clean and peaceful, unlike nearby Pactola, Sheridan and Angostura.

Jamie Romero
Rapid City SD
jrrmakin@gmail.com

Comment:

We own a boat and still don't want the wake restriction to be elevated. It's the one larger lake that is still peaceful and hopefully it remains that way. Thank you!

Karen Street
Hill City SD
Streettradersrep@gmail.com

Comment:

We kayak at Deerfield lake and appreciate that there are not speed boats in the lake. It is a peaceful place, please keep it that way.

Kortney Hall
Hot City SD
Kortnapier@gmail.com

Comment:

No wake at Deerfield is important because it provides families with children a lake that is safe for children to kayak and swim without fear of motorized vessels. We drive 2 hours just to camp and enjoy Deerfield because of the no wake zone! A lot of our neighbors friends enjoy camping and kayaking at Deerfield.

James Chastain
Rapid City SD
chastainjim@yahoo.com

Comment:

The peace and solitude in Deerfield Lake is priceless. It's a large lake that allows canoes, kayaks and other smaller and slower boats to spread out and enjoy its beauty. The Black Hills doesn't need another noisy high speed lake like Pactola, Sheridan and Angestora. These three are unsafe for kayakers and canoes to cross or try to enjoy open water. PLEASE leave Deerfield as a no wake lake.

Cory Lewis
Rapid City SD

Comment:

Please do not make it 25mph, this is the only big lake we can kayak on without fear of being ran over!!!!

Larry Mills
Hermosa SD
Lvmills2@gmail.com

Comment:

Please do not raise the boat speed limit on Deerfield. I have been fishing Deerfield for 50 years and is still my favorite. It is a gem and the last of the quiet family friendly lakes in the hills. A raised speed limit will bring big boats, loud stereos, and the boozers to a naturally beautiful place. Please no.

Ben Lewis
Rapid City SD

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Thomas Tolman
Rapid City SD
thomas.e.tolman@gmail.com

Comment:

Having been a former employee at the Outdoor Campus West I taught kids and members of the community about conservation. I always explained conservation was the wise use of natural resources.

Deerfield is praised as being one of the few lakes in the hills you can get away from everyone. You don't have to deal with wakeboarders blaring terrible music at Pactola and Sheridan. You don't have to fight through the crowds like at Custer State Park. It's just a good lake to enjoy nature.

This talk of lifting the wake zone, coupled with Noem's trapping program, is a pretty disheartening. We're suppose to be the stewards of the land. Instead it seems like we're actively mismanaging our resources.

It'd be a bummer if folks like me stopped fishing and hunting in protest, taking away money from the state, as well as small businesses that depend on the industry.

Roger Foote

Watertown SD

rfoote069@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield reservoir is a premiere destination due in part to its current restrictions on wake. As an avid paddler, I can attest that this reservoir is a paddling experience without equal. The safety component itself is great enough that paddlers seek out this place to enjoy the beauty and peacefulness without the fear of being overrun or harrassed by jet skis and impaired boaters. As a fisherman I would like to remind you of the world class fly fishing opportunities here along with the long sought after lake trout. There is no need to change current practices, you would only be changing one set of users for another.

As a Lake shore professional, the damage in the riparian zone caused by excess wake will have an expensive and detrimental effect on areas near landings and picnic areas. Unfortunately recreational users will not disperse throughout the system but concentrate near the facilities, causing additional damage. And of course there will be a few adventurous PWC users that will attempt to pilot their watercraft up the creek that feeds the lake, potentially damaging delicate trout habitat.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment, I will continue to bring my family and friends here to enjoy what Deerfield has to offer.

Arianne Mehlhaff

Rapid City SD

Pepperburton@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield is one of the few lakes in the hills that we can enjoy without the noise pollution from watercraft.

Kathleen Brown

Kadoka SD

kathy.brown@goldenwest.net

Comment:

This really comes down to a matter of public safety. Deerfield Lake is simply not big enough to warrant raising the speed limit above five miles per hour. Just look at Sheridan Lake in a sunny Sunday afternoon. It is chaos! Not only would raising the speed limit be dangerous to the paddlers, swimmers, and leisurely boaters, but with higher speeds comes erosion to the shoreline. Deerfield Lake simply cannot handle the pressure of more speed on its pristine shores. I strongly oppose raising the speed limit in Deerfield Lake. Thank you for your consideration.

Kimberly Pehrson

Rapid City SD

Kimberlyspehrson@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose lifting the no-wake rule on Deerfield Lake. It should remain a peaceful lake where people can recreate without fear of being run over by a boat or a boat ruining their fishing and the serenity of the lake.

Jesse Mayer
Rapid City SD

Comment:

Can't wait for it to pass.

Becky Drury
Rapid City SD
Beckydrury@gmail.com

Comment:

Keep Deerfield as a no wake lake. Seriously, it is about the only place one can kayak without being hit by a speeding boat.

Susan Campo
Rapid City SD
susanlucillecampo@yahoo.com

Comment:

I need a place to boat where it not a speed race. I like peace and some level of quiet on at least some lakes nearby. Do NOT end the trolling speed limit of 5 mph.

Ryan Anderson
Sioux Falls SD
Randerson8@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Kim Olsen
Rapid City SD
Kmolsen80@yahoo.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Shelli Brandli
Rapid City SD

Comment:

Please leave this peaceful lake as it is. There aren't many places to go to get away from speed boats, etc.
Thank you

Kellie Stover
Hot Springs SD
Kstover@planetmail.com

Comment:

Please dont ruin this lake. Stockade is ruined by motor boats³ and we dont need to make every lake like that.

Kailey Lindstrom
Milaca MN
Kaileyindstrom@gmail.com

Comment:

It is so peaceful with no wakes. Please do not allow it!

Misty Bruce
Rapid City SD
mbruce1995@gmail.com

Comment:

It's about the only small peaceful lake you can go to without the boats going as fast as they can. Please don't change the rule at Deerfield.

Vicki Hasart
Saint Lawrence SD
vichofer@yahoo.com

Comment:

Our family camps at Deerfield lake multiple times through the summer. We have done this for many years. We select this area for the peacefulness and a safe place to take out kayaks without worrying about being ran over. We are going to select another location if the no-wake zone is lifted. Most likely we will have to select a different state all together. There are limited lakes with trail system also in the area.

Arland Bruce
Rapid City SD
arlandbrucr95@gmail.com

Comment:

It's about the only small peaceful lake you can go to without the boats going as fast as they can. Please don't change the wake rule at Deerfield.

Kristy Gonyer
Hot Springs SD
gonyerk@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose the proposal to removing the wake zone on Deerfield Lake. I think that it is important, especially in an area that has relatively few lakes, to protect some of the lakes for those who prefer to recreate without disruption of noise and/or concern for their safety while on the water. Angostura, Sheridan and Pactola already provide locations for those who wish to recreate at a faster pace. The atmosphere at these lakes is completely different than the other quieter lakes, and not something that want to see expanded further. Please don't take away our peaceful lake!

Geriann Headrick
Pierre SD
glh1966@hotmail.com

Comment:

Having young children it is nice to have a safe place to reach them water sports and recreation without the worry of boats and jet-skis.

Scott Christiansen
Nahant SD
Scott2Ray@sbcglobal.net

Comment:

No fast boats on Deerfield lake.

Don Martin
Rochford SD
Donmartinent@gmail.com

Comment:

Keep the No Wake rule!!

Kim Curtis
Rapid City SD

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Susan Beeman
Spearfish SD
Blkhills72@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Carrie Wellee
Marion SD
Carrieweller1@gmail.com

Comment:

This will ruin that peaceful area of the hills! I kayaked on Sheridan and I was scared to death. We have a cabin near Deerfield and I pay dearly in property taxes. . We have a canoe And kayaks. No way would I ever let my teen sons kayak on there if it is motorized! Leave well enough alone ! Please! That lake is for peace, not to make a buck on speed recreation. Leave it to those who want to quietly and slowly enjoy it.

My late uncle, once saw a whole herd of elk swim the Deerfield reservoir. What a blessed thing to be fortunate enough to see! Do you think that would happen on a motorized lake? You would also be disturbing the elk herds patterns.

Marlene Einrem
Rapid Cith SD
marleneeinrem@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please leave a no wake on Deer Field Lake. Removing it will just make it another Angastora which it nothing more than a bunch of drunken boaters flying across the lake. Keep that garbage out of Deer Field Lake!!

Teri Malam
Minneapolis MN
terimalam@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Julie Bybee
Rapid City SD

Comment:

Please leave the no wake policy in effect at Deerfield Lake as it ensures a more peaceful experience and is safer for paddle boarding and kayaking.

Heidi Long-Lind
Hill City SD
heidi_lind@yahoo.com

Comment:

This is one of the last peaceful lakes left in the Hills. There are plenty of other lakes that noisy speeding boats can use. This is one of our favorite lakes because of its no wake rule. PLEASE keep it that way!

John Long
Hill City SD
john.long@kw.com

Comment:

Please do not lift the no wake rule at Deerfield there are plenty of other lakes that the noisy speed boats can tear around. Deerfield is nice because it is peaceful and quiet and you can paddle and swim without dying.

Kevin Dorsman
Rapid City SD
Kevin.dorsman@k12.sd.us

Comment:

Deerfield lake should remain peaceful and free from loud, noisy boat enthusiasts. Preserving a serene lake is a necessity and makes little sense when there are plenty of other lakes all within 30 minutes or so. Keep it as is for future generations and their ability to relax and enjoy the lake.

Elliott Warshaw
Rapid City SD
ewarshaw@gmail.com

Comment:

Please do not abandon one of the last peaceful lakes in the area. It will ruin the atmosphere for fishing and peaceful gatherings.

Jeremy Garoutte

Sundance WY

Jrock750r@yahoo.com

Comment:

I strongly oppose this it is such a nice peaceful lake why ruin it

Teanna Aduddell

Rapid City SD

Comment:

Please leave the no wake rule. It's really nice to have a SAFE place to take Kayaks/paddleboards and not have to worry about being run over by a boater who isn't paying attention or be tipped over

Amy Garoutte

Sundance WY

beautifysundance@yahoo.com

Comment:

As someone who's camped at Deerfield lake, I think the quiet calm atmosphere IS the draw.

Ty Brown

Rapid City SD

tabrown2013@yahoo.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Neddie Hayes

Box Elder SD

Neddiehayes@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please do not remove the no wake lake. It's so nice to be able to go somewhere that's not a party on the water like Angostura. This nice, quiet, peaceful lake is my favorite in the area!

Debbie Muller
Rapid City SD

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Chris Moser
Rapid City SD
Moser_c1@hotmail.com

Comment:

I'd like to see this lake kept quiet and peaceful. Leave it alone. It is nice to go there and not have speedboats, jet skis and such cruising all over. There are other lakes that they can already do that at.

Jacob Krueger
Spearfish SD

Comment:

Deer Lake needs to remain no wake, to be one of the only peaceful lakes in the hills.

Hillary Lutter
Piedmont SD

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Janet Lindsey
Black Hawk SD
sdski4fun@aol.com

Comment:

PLEASE NO!! This is the only decent size lake to be able to paddle and not worry about getting swamped or run down by motor boats. Who's going to be out there every day to check speeds?????

Kathy Scott
Rapid City SD
chattykathywithak@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Augusta Mcmillin
Kadoka SD

Comment:

I support the standing of the no-wake rule.

Barbara Iwan
Rapid City SD
Biwan@outlook.com

Comment:

Do not ruin Deerfield. Keep the NO WAKE

Trenton Ellis
Spearfish SD
trenton.ellis1@gmail.com

Comment:

It's completely reasonable to leave this alone. If people wish to boat in this manner, then they have options in the Hills - e.g. Angostura, Pactola. This is one of the last larger lakes that has retained it's peace. We don't need Whitesnake blaring jet boats at Deerfield. Please. If it ain't broke...

Lisa Hanson
Brookings SD
lisamhanson14@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose lifting the Deerfield no wake zone.

Jill Lindstrom
Milaca MN
younglivingjill@gmail.com

Comment:

Taking away the no wake zone would devastate this lake. We spend the summer at deer field.

James Harens
Rapid City SD

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Maggie Melanson
Rapid City SD
maggiemelanson@msn.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Brad Jones
Newcastle WY
Bradjones888@rtconnect.net

Comment:

I absolutely oppose removing the no wake law at Deerfield! There are gods plenty (read: almost all of them) lakes for the fast boats. Please keep Deerfield as it is for those of us who enjoy a calm, quiet experience.

Judie Stratman
Rapid City SD

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Amber Lenz
Moose Lake MN
Amber.lenz@hotmail.com

Comment:

It is a peaceful, beautiful area that I love to spend time at. Lifting then No-wake is just going to wreck the peacefulness of the lake by bringing big boats in going way to fast!

Robert Rowles
Rapid City SD
bobr549@yahoo.com

Comment:

I wholeheartedly oppose the removal of the no wake restriction on Deerfield. This lake is the only large lake in the hills that is quiet and peaceful enough to enjoy a day of fishing or kayaking on without being buzzed by bigger boats. There is no reason at all to allow 25 mph speeds on this lake.

Wade Wierenga
Hermosa SD
Wadewierenga@hotmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jaycee May
Eagle Butte SD
Jaycee.may.2012@gmail.com

Comment:

Please do not switch this lake

Alexander Levy
Summerset SD
levyalex8500@gmail.com

Comment:

Please keep Deerfield Lake a no wake lake.

Mark Friedel
Spearfish SD

Comment:

Please leave it is.

Kari Marlow
Watertown SD
Pckari2@yahoo.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Devin Dennis
Piedmont SD

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Dusty Swanson
Rapid City SD
motorman2010@gmail.com

Comment:

Please do not remove the no-wake from Deerfield Lake

Rex Caldwell
Rapid City SD
Rex@midco.net

Comment:

Deerfield lake has been a no wake to preserve the pristine environment and help with erosion of the banks. I have fished Deerfield for 44 years and was just there May 12, 2019. It's the nicest lake in the Black Hills just like it is. Please don't change anything about it.

Mickayla Willison

Rapid City SD

Mickayla.willison@gmail.com

Comment:

Keep this lake a peaceful lake. We need a place that is big enough to not be done kayaking or canoeing within an hour because it's too small. Deerfield is that lake and speed boats and large waves would make it difficult to enjoy a full day out.

Justin Herreman

Rapid City SD

Llamakeeper@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield Reservoir is a gem of a lake and a very special and unique location. Changing the rules will damage the aesthetic and value of this lake in an irreparable manner. There are many large lakes in The Black Hills where motors and wakes are allowed and this is the only large lake where no wake rules apply and motor noise is not prevalent during the summer. Please do not change this rule.

Andra Swanson

Hill City SD

Andraswanson@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Nicole Skouge

Vale SD

Nskouge@gmail.com

Comment:

Please do not lift the no wake restriction on Deerfield lake. It is one of the last lakes in this region where we can actually get a little bit of peace and quiet and enjoy kayaking or canoeing without the danger of speed boats and skiers racing around causing trouble. We all know that that creates a dangerous situation as we have seen by all of the injuries that have happened on lakes like Pactola and Angostura. The speed motors and skiers have plenty of other opportunities to enjoy what they like to do so please allow us to enjoy what we like to do

Kim Goldsberry

Hill City SD

kimbogoldsberry@gmail.com

Comment:

Are you crazy....be still..... lake....

Alex Ingalls
Rapid City SD
Alexingalls09@icloud.com

Comment:

We need to stop giving all our lakes away to the boaters. It's already difficult finding good fishing spots and places to just relax with boats on the other lakes. Keep the wake zone in place

Brandi Ferguson
Rapid City SD
Brandi-renae7787@yahoo.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Mary Fletcher
Rapid City SD
Mfletcher.srf@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jennifer Neubert
Hill City SD
Jennneubert@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Melanie Bond
Lead SD
bond9031@hotmail.com

Comment:

This is the last good-size lake in the Black Hills that I can kayak on and not have to worry about getting hit by big wake. They have Pactola, Sheridan, Orman and Angostura to go fast on.

Nicole Young

Pierre SD

Nicole.f.young15@gmail.com

Comment:

This is the peaceful family getaway in the state because it is a no wake lake. Please preserve this treasure!!!! There are plenty of other lakes to go fast on. Don't change it for the sake of those wanting quiet family getaways and great mountain fishing

Alexa Voorhees

Hill City SD

arvoorhees@live.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is one of the only lakes in this area with no wake. It is surrounded by forest service and cow permits, and this change would bring in an increased amount of traffic that this area cannot support.

Nicole Knuppe

Rapid City SD

Nicoleknuppe@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Priscilla Engen

Custer SD

pengen@ goldenwest.net

Comment:

Please leave Deerfield Lake a No Wake Lake. I enjoy canoeing and fishing there because it's so peaceful there, there are eagles there that come back every Fall, there are also mink there and wading birds. It's an ecosystem that should not be disturbed.

Sean Larson

Rapid City SD

sean.larson@mines.sdsmt.edu

Comment:

Dont remove the no wake rules on Deerfield Lake, plenty of other lakes for people to go speed around on

Rena Schaeffer
Belle Fourche SD
rsschaef@q.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Lily Zahor
Spearfish SD
zahorlil@gmail.com

Comment:

A no-wake rule provides a safe environment for paddle boarding , canoeing, kayaking, etc. There are plenty of other places to go if you want high speed with your motor boats.

David Randolph
Rapid City SD
dv.rando@gmail.com

Comment:

Plenty other lakes for that .

Nick Ferguson
Rapid City SD
Nfergusonick@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Deb Kavanaugh
Rapid City SD
dannak2@yahoo.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jordan Skiles

Hill City SD

jordan.skiles1993@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Brad Baker

Hermosa SD

Brdbkr79@gmail.com

Comment:

Removing the no wake restrictions will allow wakeboard/wake surf boats to ruin fishing on yet another lake. They are a danger to small fishing boats, kayaks and paddle boarders. Deerfield is the last safe place we have to enjoy fishing and other recreational activities without fear of being run over by a huge wake.

David Swank

Rapid City SD

David.t.swank@gmail.com

Comment:

There are relatively few bodies of water in South Dakota that provide the serenity that Deerfield Lake provides. Several other large bodies of water - Angostura, Pactola, and Sheridan, just to name a few - already exist for the enjoyment of motorized boaters. Leave Deerfield as the lone haven from the incessant buzz of motorized watercraft.

Taylor Angel

Rapid City SD

T.nielsen0115@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Erica Van Pelt

Piedmont SD

Ericadvp@yahoo.com

Comment:

PLEASE keep Deer Field a NO WAKE lake.

Wayne Booze
Hartford SD
wbooze@gmail.com

Comment:

I've been going to Deerfield Reservoir since I was a kid. It's an amazingly peaceful place where I now can take my children to truly enjoy the wonders of our great Black Hills.

It's a place where I can rejuvenate and get away from the world.

Removing the no-wake restriction means it will be one more place for people to bring personal watercraft, glitter rockets, and other unsavory activity.

The Black Hills has Sheridan and Pactola where people can play.

Deerfield is for fishing. It's for peace and quiet. For primitive campsites, not racing motors.

Don't ruin Deerfield.

Michelle Hobart
Hill City SD
Michellesabino66@gmail.com

Comment:

Keep it peaceful, it's one of the last places that is!!

George Rehberg
Rapid City SD
grehberg5@rap.midco.net

Comment:

Please keep no wake rule - it is one of few lakes to enjoy, without competition from high traffic and motors. Stocking walleye in Deerfield and or Pactola would be something I would support.

Taylor Reber
Rapid City SD

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jessica Hessler
Rapid City SD
Myfriendinsd@gmail.com

Comment:

Keep this beautiful gem serene! Deerfield is one of the few lakes where you can still see wildlife around the lake trail. Fishing is great. Kayaking is perfect. Let the motorized boats zip around Pactola, Angostura and Sheridan

Stacy Smith
Rapid City SD
ssycats@hotmail.com

Comment:

Please leave Deerfield as a no-wake lake.
As a kayaker, it is nice to be able to go to one lake in the hills and not get run over by speeding boats and jet skis.
Also love seeing the nesting eagles there and enjoy the peace and quite the lake had to offer.

Candy Allen
Hill City SD
candyclaire1960@hotmail.com

Comment:

Please keep Deerfield Lake a no wake lake. People with boats who want to ski and pull a tube have other lakes in the area to do that on. I appreciate the fact that Deerfield is a no wake lake. It is very peaceful to kayak or canoe on, and my friends and I don't have to worry about being swamped because of a boat. If I wanted to worry about being swamped, I'd kayak on Sheridan or Pactola lakes. Deerfield is also a beautiful lake to sit and watch the eagles fish. Please keep it a no wake lake.

Chris Matusiak
Blackhawk SD
Chrismpp@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Anna Quinn
Rapid City SD
Anna.e.quinn@hotmail.com

Comment:

There are so few places left in the hills that aren't ruined by drinking, noise, speed and rudeness. There is nothing wrong with allowing the hills to be the serene and peaceful place it was meant to be. Please do not allow wake at Deerfield. Give the hills back it's peace. Please.

Kristin Stephenson
Rapid City SD

Comment:

I oppose lifting the no wake law from Deerfield Lake. This is the only peaceful lake in the hills that is safe for canoeing and kayaking. Also it will disturb the great fishing.

Karl Stephenson
Rapid City SD
Karlstephenson@gmail.com

Comment:

Please don't remove the wake limits on Deerfield. It nice having a peaceful lake that you can fish from a small water craft and not have to worry about larger boats making large wake. Ive always enjoyed fishing and camping at this lake because it's so peaceful without bigger boats making tons of noise.

Tracy Anderson
Hill City SD
tracyleeanderson@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose removing the No-Wake restriction. I believe the 5 MPH speed limit should remain in place. Damage to shorelines can occur with higher speed limits.

Thayer Ronfeldt
Rapid City SD

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Thea Mccracken
Rapid City SD
Theadavis4@aol.com

Comment:

I believe that it would be cruel to the locals to remove the no wake rule. I have spent many hours on the lake in my kayak, and would be completely terrified if this rule were removed.

Patrick Brown
Kadoka SD
Patrickjamesbrown123@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jessica Oliveto
Rapid City SD
Advo.jess49@gmail.com

Comment:

Keep no wake at Deerfield in place

Richard Teeslink
Rapid City SD
dteeslink@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield is a favorite for so many people that want to enjoy peace and quiet. I won't even go to Pactola or Sheridan due to the stupid and noisy.

Joel Shoop
Rapid City SD

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jordan Hannon
Rapid City SD
jayhawkducks@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please do not lift the no wake rule! This is my favorite lake to fish because of the peace that comes with it and the eagles that fish along side you!

Cory Neubert
Hill City SD
Epiphine100.cn@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Cassidy Downen
Rapid City SD
ctrupe08@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jason Wright
Rapid City SD
jaydub076@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Phil Ueket
Hill City SD
Theueckers@gmail.com

Comment:

I agree with the position of the Black Hills Paddlers stayed here:

Dear Game Fish and Parks Commission:

We the 600+ members of the Black Hills Paddlers are writing this letter in opposition of the plan to remove the no wake restriction on Deerfield Reservoir. We are a regional organization of paddlesports enthusiasts in the Black Hills Region. We are composed of members who enjoy canoeing, kayaking, stand-up paddle boarding and other human powered water sports. Many of our members enjoy fishing from our paddlecraft.

Deerfield Reservoir is the largest lake in the Black Hills where people can enjoy recreational opportunities without fear of boat wakes and without the noise of loud boat motors. There are plenty of other lakes in the region (Pactola Reservoir, Sheridan Lake, Angostura Reservoir, Stockade Lake) that are large and where motor sports enthusiasts can enjoy their recreational opportunities.

We the majority members of The Black Hills Paddlers feel it would be a disservice to the Black Hills outdoor recreation community and the tourism industry to change the atmosphere of this gem of a lake. We have assisted in Triathlons at this lake in the past and this venue was chosen because of the lack of motorized boat wakes.

We respect the rights of motorized boats and many of us are owners of motorized watercraft. Deerfield reservoir is also a haven for wildlife including nesting eagles and we believe this change will negatively impact this wildlife in multiple ways. We respectfully request this change not be made and the solitude and uniqueness of Deerfield Reservoir be preserved for the enjoyment of all South Dakotans.

Regards,

Justin Herreman - Vice President
Stacy Smith - Secretary & Treasurer
600+ additional members

Kiley Thorpe
Lincoln NE
Kileyann704@hotmail.com

Comment:

This is a beautiful and peaceful lake we visit when we travel!!

Bradley Allen
Black Hawk SD
brushfirebrad@gmail.com

Comment:

The lifting of the no wake zone at Deerfield will have a negative impact for recreation in the Black Hills. Paddlers, non motorized boaters, and other outdoor enthusiasts will lose one of the last remaining lakes in the Black Hills to enjoy a peaceful lake. There are several other larger lakes which already allow wakes and motorized boats that are much more conducive to the activity.

Chad Ronish
Hill City SD
Cronish88@gmail.com

Comment:

The lake is too small for high speed water craft. There will be a safety issue with high speed water craft in with all of th traditional low speed craft and activities.

Sheri Henry
Keystone SD
HalleysHouse@aol.com

Comment:

I oppose changing Deerfield Lake from a no wake lake.

Melissa Leuning
Stewartville MN
Msleuning@yahoo.com

Comment:

We own a cabin in the Black Hills and enjoy the peaceful attributes of spending time out there. There are plenty of option for folks who want to use their boats. It sounds like Deerfield is the last option for people who don't want to be around jet skis etc. Let's keep that one option for families who want to stay away from that activity.

Vicki Alexander
Rockerville SD
Ruvicki2003@gmail.com

Comment:

Please keep this lake a no wake rule. Its one of the last peaceful lakes around. Plenty wildlife, a wonderful place for peace n quiet!

Randy Hartley
Rapid City SD
randy.hartley@state.sd.us

Comment:

As an avid kayaker Deerfield Lake is one of the few lakes, and the only large lake, in the Black Hills where you can kayak, fish, and enjoy being on the water without a constant stream of boats churning up the water. Fairness applies to all and not at the expense of the few. There is no reason to change the no wake rule. There are more than enough lakes for boating and providing them another one because they've over crowded or abused the existing boating lakes comes solely at the expense of others. It's fine the way it is.

Stephanie Lindsleh

Rapid City SD

Stephanie.lindsley@hotmail.com

Comment:

Allowing motorzed boats to have a wake on Deerfield lake will completely change the function of the lake. It is not necessary, as there are many other options for motorized boats at higher speeds in the area. Please leave Deerfield Lake as it is and a safe/peaceful option for the people who use it for the many non motorized summer activities.

Roy Hollon

Hill City SD

Comment:

oppose

Janice Helgeson

Rapid City SD

gerberdaisy202@gmail.com

Comment:

Keep Deerfield Lake a no wake!

Robert C Carr

Lead SD

leadh2o@hotmail.com

Comment:

This lake in the high mountains of the northern black hills is a place to camp and have perfect peace and quiet. There is no logical reason to change the classification. It would damage the shorelines and destroy the peace we all seek in this life. Dearfield is listed as a Pristine Kayaking lake in the South Dakota magazine, and is becoming more popular all the time for kayaking and paddle boards with the no wake classification.

Sharlene Chastain

Rapid City SD

Sharlene.chastain@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please keep Deerfield a no wake area. Thank you.

Matea Hunsaker

Rapid City SD

matealexander@hotmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield lake is not just a place where the GFP collects money. It's a place where humans and animals still have a peaceful environment. Removing the no wake status would not only hurt the atmosphere for humans but also for the cows that drink from that lake. The Canadian geese that come there and swim on the lake. The elk, deer and other sacred wild life depend on that lake. The country in Deerfield has already been taken over by atvs, please don't let it be taken over by fast boats. There is ample opportunity in the hills to go drive your boat with a wake including Pactola, Sheridan and Angastora. Please do not take away the peacefulness and sustainability of Deerfield lake. For not only the humans that enjoy that kind of atmosphere but also for the animals and ranchers that depend on it.

Colton Medler

Rapid City SD

colton.medler@mines.sdsmt.edu

Comment:

Deerfield Reservoir should remain a no wake zone lake. Several other lakes in the Black Hills area have wake zones and they are unsafe for swimmers, kayakers, canoers, and people trying to stay away from boats.

James C Sorensen

Sioux Falls SD

Jcsorensen1937@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield is one lake we fish on. I want the shoreline to remain peaceful.

Ashley Luten

Hill City SD

aamcvey1374@gmail.com

Comment:

I grew up just miles from Deerfield lake and now live only about 8 miles from there now. By changing the lake from a no-wake to a wake allowed lake will greatly impact Deerfield Lake and the people that enjoy this lake. This lake is one of very few lake in the black hills that can be enjoyed because of it's peaceful nature. Paddle boarding, kayaking and just trolling around fishing would be greatly impacted by this proposed change. I am greatly against this proposal and hope to see this stopped.

Corinne Johnson
Kingston WA
CorinneJ33@live.com

Comment:

Deerfield is the only lake in the Hills that fishermen can go and not get run off the water by speed boats and jet skis. Please keep it that way. I realize I'm not a resident of SD, but I spend a large portion of summer there, and fishing at Deerfield is what I like to do.

Alex Cameron
Rapid City SD
a_cameron@outlook.com

Comment:

I strongly oppose the lifting of the no wake restriction on Deerfield Reservoir. This lake is a safe haven for small boats, fisherman, kayaks, and more. It is a go to destination to escape the summertime traffic of recreational boaters. A 25MPH speed limit would allow tubing, Skiing, Wakeboarding, pontoons, and the worst of them all wakesurfing. At a blazing 10MPH wakesurfers create 5 foot tall artificial waves in which they can actually surf with no tow rope. These wave destroy shorelines and everything that lives below them.

Take a look at these average speed for popular watersports:

Activity Boat Speed
Combo Skiing 25 mph
Slalom Skiing 19-36 mph
Shaped Skiing 20-30 mph
Wakeboarding 16-19 mph
Kneeboarding 16-19 mph
Barefooting 30-45 mph
Jump Skiing 24-35 mph
Ski Racing 60-130 mph
Trick Skiing 11-21 mph
Tubing 8-25 mph

There are more lakes in our area that offer boaters opportunities for watersports and recreational boating than there are for small boats, kayaks, fisherman. Please keep Deerfield a safehaven for natural habitat for the sake of preservation and conservation.

Joshua Sheets
Rapid City SD

Comment:

Please do not remove the no wake zone rules for Deerfield lake.

David Booze

Black Hawk SD

Boozedmaverick6@aol.com

Comment:

Removing the "No Wake Restriction from Deerfield Lake" will adversely affect the peaceful serenity and safe watercraft operating environment that hundreds travel to Deerfield to enjoy. Allowing boaters and other watercraft to generate wakes will affect those fishing from kayaks, and other small vessels, plus boats trolling at slow speeds. The lake is insufficient in size to allow wake creating vessels to maneuver freely around the numerous people fishing and others enjoying the pleasure of just floating or kayaking around the lake. Additionally, the creation of wakes has an adverse on the shorelines creating erosion of soil and plants from the edges that will drift into the lake and settle to the bottom changing the nature of the lake. From a safety concern, although perhaps unintentional, skiers, speed boats, and jet ski and related vessels consistently underestimate the safe operating distance from slower moving vessels. In addition, the wake continues to travel well beyond the safety zone required for safe maneuvering by wake generating vessels around non-wake generating vessels.

Ken Fish

Custer SD

kenfish69@live.com

Comment:

oppose

Howard Schrier

Hill City SD

Schrierh@hotmail.com

Comment:

10 mph would be a sufficient change. Assistant Chief Hill City Fire Department. Have a nice day and good luck trying to satisfy everyone!??

Berniece Duprel

Sturgis SD

beany_d@hotmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Stephanie Burleson

Hill City SD

stephburleson605@gmail.com

Comment:

This is one of the last big lakes around that is not over ran by speed boats and making it dangerous to those trying to relax and fish. Please don't take the no wake from Deerfield lake.

Kari Kelting

Hill City SD

Kkelting63@gmail.com

Comment:

We've enjoyed the lake for over 20 years as a no-wake lake, please don't change it! It is so special....peaceful and quiet. We have a very small pontoon with a small electric motor and we bird watch and enjoy the beauty that is Deerfield.

Kaitlinn Verchio

Hill City SD

kaitlinn.verchio@hotmail.com

Comment:

Removing this rule would turn the peaceful lake into another Angostura. There's plenty of other lakes to rod boats up and down.

Gary Larson

Deadwood SD

glarson@sanfordlab.org

Comment:

This should stay as a fishing lake, as recreational boating would totally take over the lake if the No Wake Zone proposal passed. For Campers and fishermen that use the lake now, would be pretty much be ran off!

Jared Price

Rapid City SD

Manforhire12@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is a place of Peace, a place where my friend passed away and I can go there to reminisce and be with him. Having people tearing it up with jet skis and speed boats would be a tragedy in of itself.

Joe Leedom

Spearfish SD

jmleedom@sio.midco.net

Comment:

There needs to be a resource for those people that want canoe or kayak without fear of speedboats and jet ski.

Taryn Alexander

Hill City SD

Taryn.719@gmail.com

Comment:

I would like to keep Deerfield lake a no wake lake

Tiffany Carlson

Princeton SD

Comment:

Keep it the way it is!! So peaceful and relaxing

Karen Workman

Rapid City SD

Bhhiker68@gmail.com

Comment:

Oppose any change

Larry Cole

Newcastle WY

larryco@vcn.com

Comment:

Please keep Deerfield Lake just as it is.

Gary Dahlin

Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

DC Trolling motors & small craft only should be allowed

Stephanie Weisenberger

Rapid City SD

stephanie.j.weisenberger@gmail.com

Comment:

Please keep the no wake rule on Deerfield! It is very nice to have a quiet, peaceful place for those of us who enjoy paddling, fishing, etc.. All of the other lakes in the Black Hills allow wakes, so please let us keep one that doesn't and that can remain peaceful. I also worry about the eagles that like to nest there. If suddenly there's a lot of noise they may not want to return in the future. I know a lot of us love seeing them out there. Again, please keep the no wake rule.

Allen Gross

Rapid City SD

allengrosz@gmail.com

Comment:

This change would devastate what we love and have grown to cherish about Deerfield. I fly fish and kayak and would no longer be able to spend a whole day of my sport because of disruption caused by wake boats (10 mph) and jet skis who in the past at Pactola have run over my fly line.
Thank You

Sarah Hyde

Box Elder SD

Sarah01@hotmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield lake should stay wake free

Natasha Welch-Gerbracht

Hill City SD

Comment:

oppose

Mike Sunich

Lead SD

MSunich@sanfordlab.org

Comment:

I can't believe you would even consider a speed increase for Deerfield. It is the only body of water left in the Black Hills with a no wake restriction. Deerfield is also a prime nesting area for the bald eagle as we all know. The introduction of the Lake Trout has improved the quality of fishing at Deerfield significantly. Do the right thing and keep the no wake restriction in place. It is the right thing to do for our beautiful Black Hills.

Lisa Hoffer
Chamberlain SD
sweetlisah@yahoo.com

Comment:

I believe we need to let some things remain natural, peaceful, enjoyed as they were meant to be, wild!!!

Stephen Beals
Rapid City SD
sdsbeals@gmail.com

Comment:

Let's have one larger reservoir that has slow traffic on it to enjoy fishing and kayaking.Keep it no wake.

Shirley Cole
Newcastle WY
larryco@vcn.com

Comment:

Deerfield is a relaxing, quiet place to fish from shore or from non motorized watercraft and also for canoes, kayaks, paddle boards. Any of these without noise or wake from motor boats and jet skis. Please leave it as is.

Cheryl Pruett
Platte SD

Comment:

Please, please leave one lake in the Black Hills untouched by noisy motors and gas fumes.

This lake is the most pristine, peaceful lake where a person can truly enjoy nature. Whether sitting on the shore, fishing, kayaking, bird and animal watching, canoeing, camping or hiking, it's one of the few places left to enjoy nature without being disturbed by motors and wakes.(Not to mention the increase in garbage this will bring to the area.)

I enjoyed observing a mink "fishing" along the shore the last time I was there. I sat quietly in my kayak for a long time with no fear of a boat coming along to disturb us with noise or a wake.

The peaceful feeling of solitude you get while at Deerfield Lake is one of the most healing experiences you can find in the Black Hills.

There are many places for larger motorized boats, and so few for those who enjoy a quieter, slower pace. Please do not change it.

Thank you.

Thomas Cameron
White River SD
tcambosox@gmail .com

Comment:

Please do not increase the speed limit on Deerfield Lake. There are plenty of other lakes for higher speed recreation. If the speed limit is increased it will create serious safety issues.

Andrew Hentz
Spearfish SD
ahentz63@gmail.com

Comment:

Do not allow motorized boats on ANY lakes or other bodies of water in the Black Hills. Let them go to Keyhole Lake or Orman. We don't need the noise, stink and oil and gas in the Rivers, Creeks and Lakes from which I catch and eat fish. AT ALL. If you need some extra cash in your pockets don't be taking it from the powerboat market....get a job mowing lawns or something honest. Legal minds are watching folks.

George Eccarius
Rapid City SD
georgeeccarius@aol.com

Comment:

I am a 21 year old college student who grew up in the Black Hills, and I strongly oppose removing the "No Wake" regulation on Deerfield. Since I was little, Deerfield has been a special place for me and my dad. In fact, I caught my very first trout there. We always enjoyed it because of the peace & quiet, remoteness, and quality fishing. I am worried about losing that if speedboats and wakeboarders take over the lake. Throughout high school, I saved up money to buy a small fishing boat with a low HP motor--perfect for Deerfield. I also enjoy fishing Pactola and Angostura, but I am not able to fish these lakes Memorial Day-Labor Day because they turn into "party lakes", and the wake created by the bigger boats makes it hard to use my small boat and enjoy the fishing. That is fine, but Deerfield is the biggest lake in the hills with a no wake regulation. I understand there are plenty of lakes in the Hills where these larger boats don't go, but they don't have Lake Trout (my favorite species!). Deerfield is known as a remote, peaceful environment perfect for owners of small boats, shore fisherman, people camping, hikers, kayakers, etc. Please keep the lake how it is and thank you for all the GFP does.

Nancy Halbur
Custer SD

Comment:

People who kayak or canoe need to have some lakes of some size they can go to and not have to worry about the big boats and their waves.

David Krantz
Rapid City SD
db1551@rushmore.com

Comment:

Please leave it as it is. No need to increase speed limit. We have enough lakes to water ski & use for that kind of recreation. Thank You

Scott Eccarius
Rapid City SD
sgeccarius@gmail.com

Comment:

Probably the only major Black Hills lake with no wake, no cell service, no jet skis, no speed boats, etc.. PLEASE do NOT remove the 'No Wake" regulation; it's one of the things that makes Deerfield special. Thank you for your consideration.
Scott Eccarius

Jill Murphy
Spearfish SD
sjaemurphy@hotmail.com

Comment:

There are few places left in the Hills that are not commercialized. Deerfield lake is magical. Please leave it alone!

Vicki Koebernick
Rapid City SD
Drvickik@hotmail.com

Comment:

Keep Deerfield a no wake lake! There are plenty of more suitable lakes for high speed boating. Deerfield is one of the few lakes that you can kayak in peace without fear of being run over!

Valerie Gross
Rapid City SD
vsgross@midco.net

Comment:

I love to take my grandchildren fishing in our kayaks on Deerfield Lake and this would be lost with a change of the no wake currently in place. If you do not turn the kayak into the wake created by a wake boat it will flip your boat and this would not be a pleasant experience. Please help me continue to provide my family with a positive and an out door enjoyment that they would long for throughout their life.

Mare Davis
Rapid City SD

Comment:

You dont need motors on deerfield lake..leave it alone

Lisa Christensen
Rapid City SD
lisachristensen11@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please keep Deerfield Lake as a no wake lake. Allowing motor boats, speed boats and jetskis will disturb the most pristine fishing in our state. You will not find any fresher water in the state. Motorized boats will cause more pollution to this area. It is a special place to see bald eagles as you peacefully paddle the shores of Deerfield Lake.

Albert Dominguez
Rapid City SD
Alberto.dgz@hotmail.com

Comment:

support

Christy Dunn
Black Hawk SD
Cdunn0921@yahoo.com

Comment:

oppose

Roy Kugler
Broomfield CO
r_n_kugler@comcast.net

Comment:

Allowing speeds of up to 25 mph will ruin the tranquility of this lake.

Marian Alderman

Spearfish SD

Walderman@rushmore.com

Comment:

Leave the no wake regulation enforce at Deerfield lake.

Mike Smith

Rapid City SD

Mjconan@q.com

Comment:

If you have been in a kayak when a wake boat goes by, speed is not the issue. Its wake is huge, and not a good place to be for a beginner kayaker. There are plenty of other lakes for that, leave one for the rest of us.

Sarah Lemon

Rapid City SD

Skryslpac@gmail.com

Comment:

I am writing to oppose lifting the "No Wake" restriction at Deerfield lake for the following reasons:
1) it offers a home to paddle sport enthusiasts as a place away from the turbulence created by motor boats.
2) changing the lake attendance, noise, and traffic would alter the ecosystem of Deerfield Lake.
3) this lake is a sanctuary to recreationalists seeking a quieter lake experience. Not everyone enjoys the colorful, energetic noise of a motor boat turbulent lake. This place is a refuge to many and changing the speed of lake life here may be a turn off to a number of people; myself included.

I petition for you to keep Deerfield quiet. Thank you.

Chris Quail

Rapid City SD

Clquail1880@hotmail.com

Comment:

This lake is used by many kayakers, SUP'er, swimmers, and fishermen who appreciate the no wake rule. Hikers, birders, and enthusiasts enjoy the nature and true "quiet" of Deerfield without the noise and commotion. There are plenty lakes in the hills that allow wake. Please do not pass this.

Monte Rohrbach
Rapid City SD
obimonte@yahoo.com

Comment:

The Black Hills used to have so many beautiful, peaceful places to go. It is already overrun with noisy boats and UTV's. And not just engine noise. These people have their stereos cranked constantly with no regard to anyone else. Just trying to have a quiet paddle on Deerfield is already tough due to UTV's revving their engines for extended periods at the campground . These people have more than enough places to go already. Please preserve what is left. I do not support removing the no wake restriction on Deerfield.

Cyndie Hamilton
Rapid City SD
RCHAMFAM@AOL.COM

Comment:

Please do not make changes in the laws regarding motorized boats on Deerfield. I love this lake, as a kayaker, because of its beauty and size, serenity and peace. It's great to be able to go to a larger lake in the Hills and not have to be concerned about speed boats, and whether or not they see me. Thank you.

Paulette Kirby
Rapid City SD

Comment:

oppose

Dan Bjerke
Rapid City SD
dlbjerke@midco.net

Comment:

Please keep the existing no wake speed of 5mph

Amanda Wilson
Summerset SD
amanda_f_wilson@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please do not remove the no wake rule from Deerfield Lake

Timothy Glidden

Rapid City SD

gliddentimothyw@yahoo.com

Comment:

This is a wonderful lake to kayak and camp and relax. We DO NOT need boats cruising around making wakes and a ton of noise. Even with the 25mph limit the atmosphere and tranquility will be ruined. Boats have plenty of other lakes they can enjoy. LEAVE DEERFIELD THE WAY IT IS!!!

Rebecca Glidden

Rapid City SD

Comment:

oppose

Alice Allen

Custer SD

allens@gwtc.net

Comment:

I enjoy kayaking on Deerfield Lake. It is peaceful and a great opportunity to view wildlife or fish. I feel safe on the lake because Motorboats are limited to 5 mph. At 420 acres, this lake is not a large lake. Mr. Edel claims the lake is underutilized by boaters...that's OK because the folks who like to canoe, kayak, paddleboard, or floattube fish can safely use the lake at the same time as folks fishing from motorboats at trolling speed. The current management accommodates everyone very nicely. Keep it the same.....no one fishes at 25 mph! Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Samuel Greear

Whitewood SD

sjg@blackhillstrails.org

Comment:

Recreation is an important staple for us in the Black Hills, and the opportunities provided at Deerfield are unlike any other lake in the region due to the no wake zone enforced on the lake. Lifting this restriction would be a mistake as it would lessen the diversity of options available to area residents and visitors. Non motorized outdoor experiences are a growing segment of the recreation economy. Unfortunately, GFP has failed to survey these uses in the past, and major economic impact reports from GFP have failed to include such users as those that utilize major facilities like the Mickelson trail and Deerfield Lake. All other lakes in the area support wake-producing uses, let's maintain the status quo at Deerfield and support this growing segment of our recreation economy.

Emily Nelson
Rapid City SD

Comment:

This is my favorite lake to fish at. Its so peaceful to fish at because there aren't huge wakes hitting the shoreline. Please keep Deerfield as a no wake lake!

Desmond Keller
Rapid City SD
Desikeller@hotmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield is really the last gem of lakes in the northern Black Hills an opportunity to go somewhere and not have to be ousted by loudspeakers engines etc. is the lure of the lake like Deerfield. To be able to go canoeing fish and enjoy the perfect beauty and serenity of the lake is far too scarce anymore. Please don't fix what's not broken.

Beth Rovere
Rapid City SD
roveres13@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Corey Lewis
Custer SD
coreylew303@yahoo.com

Comment:

The lake should remane no wake. Eagles and other wildlife would be impacted negatively.

Jacob Jackson
Spearfish SD
Jhjackson@vastbb.net

Comment:

Vehemently opposed. Please preserve some solitude and a decent place to kayak

Shirlene Haas
Rapid City SD
SHIRLENE.HAAS@GMAIL.COM

Comment:

Deerfield Lake provides unique recreation opportunities for those seeking a slower, quieter experience. Pactola and Sheridan Lakes are crowded, noisy places during the summer when both lakes are filled with boaters. In addition, there is an occupied bald eagle nest at Deerfield Lake. Loud boat engines would undoubtable disturb the nesting eagles. I STRONGLY oppose this petition!!

Jesse Lewton
Lead SD

Comment:

oppose

Michael Swenson
Storden MN

Comment:

Lifting the wake zone would create erosion on the lake shore. It's certain to lead to more emergency calls due to high speed accidents involving human powered vessels and drunk motor boaters.

Jeremiah Thomas
Hill City SD
Jthomas57745@gmail.com

Comment:

Many individuals recreate at Deerfield because of no wake. I have lived 5 miles from the lake for 18 years and over the recent years more and more fisherman, kayakers and paddle boarders are using the lake because it's safe. I spend plenty of time on Pactola have observed many unsafe senarios. Also doubtful people would obey 25mph, plus the extra forces needed to enforce the speed limit. Please keep Deerfield quiet and safe.

Jon Fleming
Rapid City SD
Jon.g.fleming@gmail.com

Comment:

This is of the last truly peaceful settings in the hills and would be over run with fishing and sport boats if this is lifted.

Kayla Herbener
Rapid City SD

Comment:

Deerfield should NOT become a wake lake. This is our favorite spot to go as a family to kayak and fish because we feel safe, and we love the peace and quiet.

Crystal Kryza
Spearfish SD
Ckkryza@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please consider leaving Deerfeild lake as it is.
Part of the beauty, charm and use of this outstanding resource is that it is a no wake lake.
Please do not change a blessing like Deerfeild. It would not make it a better place nor would it be a healthy choice for this wonderful lake.
Thank you for considering my opposition and for taking the time to read my view on the idea.
Sincerely and hoping you choose the health of the lake,
Crystal Kryza

Donna Savage
Rapid City SD
Donna. Dakotayogi@gmail.com

Comment:

Please keep Deerfield peaceful and safe for non-motorized watercraft and the non-wake fishing community.

Gage Skillingstad
Hill City SD

Comment:

oppose

Shana Merchant

Rapid City SD

shanamerchant78@gmail.com

Comment:

I adamantly and profusely object to changing Deerfield Lake from a no wake lake. There are plenty of other lakes in the hills that already allow this for those that choose to terrorize with their speedboats, skis and loud music. This is one of the few places that people can fly fish, kayak, paddle board, and float tube without the constant threat of some drunk running them over. We have used this lake exclusively for the last 20 years for these reasons and more. There should be some refuge from all of the obnoxious people for those that truly enjoy nature and all it has to offer. If you change the speed limit to increase to more than 5 miles an hour I will make it my life's mission to reverse it. There is no reason those folks can't go to one of the many other lakes that accommodate this. Why ruin one of the last best places in the hills?? A TERRIBLE IDEA!!!!

Max Merchant

Rapid City SD

thetroutdoctor@gmail.com

Comment:

This is the worst idea I have ever heard. There are plenty of other places people can go if they want to speed around the lake and terrorize everyone and everything. This is a nice quiet fishing lake where you are actually safe to float tube and kayak without worrying about idiots running you over. It is a remote quiet location that will most definitely be ruined if this change is made? All it will do is attract more people than the area can handle and ruin it for everyone. Who is going to police the area and enforce all the regulations that should accompany such a change? Are you going to personally kayak with my children to guarantee their safety? As someone who uses this lake for more than 6 months out of the year I implore to not make these changes!!!

Jordan Purdy

Rapid City SD

Jpurdy1@yahoo.com

Comment:

What an amazing and peaceful lake. It would be ruined if it was no longer be a no wake lake. There aren't many places left for kayakers where it is calm and also safe. Boats often go far too fast and too close to kayakers and other lake goers

Alexander Dickman

Deadwood SD

Stihl605@gmail.com

Comment:

With lakes like Pactola overrun with water sport boaters there is not many quiet places to fish, canoe, kayak etc left. Let's keep this special place the sanctuary it is for these activities. The UTV's have taken over the trail system, don't give out last quiet lake away too!

Monte Martell
Rapid City SD
bhjeep@gmail.com

Comment:

Do not remove the no-wake.

Josh Whitford
Sturgis SD

Comment:

support

Milishs Stevens
Rapid City SD
Milishas@gmail.com

Comment:

There are very few lakes in our area that are no wake for those of us that fish or leisure kayak it's s great place. Please don't change the current 5mph max

Scott Swenson
Rapid City SD
jangoscott@gmail.com

Comment:

Please do not do this. It's a horrible idea. Deerfield is the one Black Hills jem that is far enough away from the city and provides a pristine experience without the sounds of jet skis and wake boarding motors, not to mention their loud stereos blasting tunes for the skiers, wake boarders, and the rest of the world to hear. Sound will travel across the lake and disrupt the peace that currently exists there. This will disrupt the tranquility that we experience when we go there to get away from modern annoyances. Wakes slamming against the shorelines is not welcomed there. Canoes, paddle boards, shore fishing, and swimming is all that belongs there. Don't turn this lake into another Pactola, Sheridan, Angostora, or Orman. Winter travel on the lake should be plenty enough to satisfy the folks in need of motorized lake travel (status quo). Don't destroy this beautiful landscape for a few dollars in state pockets. This day and age of unnecessary motorized expansion needs to stop. This is ridiculous.

Mary Jewett
Hill City SD
MaryOrumJewett@aol.com

Comment:

oppose

Brian Stambaugh

Newell SD

brian@nrmrpetrophysics.com

Comment:

Keep it as it is, 5 mph max, thank you

Ashley Holtquist

Spearfish SD

ash.holtquist@gmail.com

Comment:

Lifting the no wake restriction is an unnecessary action that would drastically alter the peace the lake offers. It is a calm and secluded lake that people use to get away from the activity of most recreational lakes. There are several lakes within the Black Hills that currently accommodate water sports so to preserve the diversity of the area I oppose this action.

Vernon Ross

Sturgis SD

vsross@vastbb.net

Comment:

Deerfield is the only lake in the Hills that a fisherman can go and not get run off the water by jet skis and speed boats. Please leave the no wake limit in place.

Steve Johnson

Kingston WA

steveandcori@comcast.net

Comment:

Please leave the limit in place, this is the only place in the Hills to fish without getting blown off the water by speed boats and jet skis. I spend my summers fishing at Deerfield even though I am from out of state.

Roxanne Evans

Rapid City SD

Roxanneevans69@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Jim Smoragiewicz
Rapid City SD

Comment:

We have plenty of other lakes in the Black Hills without this rule for people looking to go fast. Please keep the Deerfield Lake speed limit as is. We need a lake for people looking for recreation away from waves and noise. Thanks.

Mark Farrand
Rapid City SD
markfarrand@hotmail.com

Comment:

I am against any change of the no wake zone currently in effect. Deefield is the only large tranquil body of water remaining in the Black Hills. In our society that is constantly barraged by noise and social media, I believe it would be a travesty to lose that place of aolittide. Thank you.

Nance Teal
Rapid City SD

Comment:

Keep speed limit on Deerfield Lake as is

Ryan Baskerville
Box Elder SD
rb5501@aol.com

Comment:

Would like to see the rules remain the same with a no wake speed. As a kayak owner, it is nice to have a lake where my wife and I do not have to worry about boats speeding by or worse being hit by someone not paying attention. With the amount of activity that goes on in the Black Hills during the summer, it is nice to have a place that is free of motorized sounds so you can enjoy nature.

Mary Floto
Raoid City SD

Comment:

oppose

Jennifer Wildeman

Rapid City SD

wildemanjenn@yahoo.com

Comment:

I have been fishing at Deerfield lake since I was a little girl. My grandparents would take us camping up there with all the cousins. We would enjoy fishing off the shoreline of Lake Deerfield. And into my 20s I would go fishing there all by myself, just bobber fishing off the shore. This was the only lake, other than Bismarck Lake, that I wasn't harassed by boaters as I fished from the shore. As a single young girl safety was important to me. Lakes like Pactola and Sheridan, if I went fishing there I would be harassed by older man in boats, who would constantly parked their boats by my bobber to try to get my attention. Deerfield lake was a safe haven to go and just fish. Now that I am married and have a family I feel that Deerfield is the same quiet lake it was when I was single. I now take my three children there enjoy our time fishing off the shores of Deerfield. Boaters do take from the peace and quietness of shore fishing. Please, please, do not change the no wake laws. I would like to enjoy the no wake Deerfield Lake with my grand children, as I did with my grandparents! I will respect your decision but I had to say something since I have spent decades fishing off the shore of Deerfield.

Colette Swan

Rapid City SD

Collieswan@yahoo.com

Comment:

There are plenty other lakes for the boats to go to
Deerfield is a nice peaceful place and great for kayaking and bank fishing. Please leave it alone and keep it peaceful.

Terrill Hovet

Rockerville SD

terrill.hovet@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please do not lift the no wake restriction on Deerfield Lake. My family and I camp and fish Deerfield many times throughout the summer. The main reason is for the peace and quiet.

Lonny Kracht

Sturgis SD

lonzo@rushmore.com

Comment:

I am a life long (60 yrs) resident of the Black Hills. I grew up fishing this lake year round. I haven't fished Deerfield much in the last 30 years but last year in June I did take my two grand kids there to fish. We shore fished and during the day we saw only two boats go by and this was on a Saturday. I couldn't believe that on a Saturday we saw only two boats using this lake! I agree with the comments that this fishery is much under utilized. I think there is a much better change that could be made that would make Deerfield Lake more appealing to anglers and that is to stock a few walleyes in this lake instead of just trout. The reason my family and several of my friends stopped fishing this lake years ago is we like to fish for Walleyes and Trout rather than just Trout. In my opinion the best change that could be made to improve this fishery for everyone is to leave the "no-wake" regulation in place and to stock a few walleyes to appeal to more anglers. Deerfield is loaded with tiny rock bass, perch, and crowdads and I can't see how a healthy population of walleyes and trout couldn't co-exist like they do in Canada. I would love to return to fishing no-wake Deerfield if I knew there was the possibility of catching a walleye or two.

Thank-you

Ryan Scarborough

Rapid City SD

Comment:

Please leave Deefield lake as a no wake lake. Plenty of other option exist for people to use high(er) speed boats in the black hills.

Barbara And Willie Hasart

St.Lawrence SD

bhasart@hur.midco.net

Comment:

We would like to keep the No Wake Zone as is-we enjoy the peace and quiet of the canoes Etc.

Herb Teal

Rapid City SD

Comment:

I would request that the no wake restriction on Deerfield Lake stay as is. Keep it peaceful and quiet.

Brett Forman
Rapid City SD

Comment:

I own both a Kayak and inboard boat. The hills need a larger lake that allows Kayaks and Canoes to be used without fear of collisions or Powerboats creating large wakes close by. There are enough lakes that allow wakes, Deerfield should not be one of them.

Maryanne Rohrer
Rapid City SD
m71746@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please keep the boating speed at Deerfield Lake to the current 5 mph limit. Deerfield Lake is one of the few - or maybe only- good sized lakes in western South Dakota where kayaking, canoeing, and other activities can be enjoyed without the worry and noise of faster traveling boats. Sadly, boaters who travel at higher rates of speed often have disregard for those who enjoy water recreation without motors and come too close to the non-motorized traffic thus threatening their safety. Deerfield Lake is one lake where South Dakota citizens can experience quiet and serenity without the fear of speeding boats upsetting their craft. I am not knowledgeable about motorized personal watercraft machines but fear that this would become a problem at Deerfield. It's location may make enforcement difficult. Please keep Deerfield as is. Thank you.

Brian Mettler
Spearfish SD
bsmettler@hotmail.com

Comment:

please, please, do not remove the no wake zone from deerfield lake, i am 51 years old and started camping at deerfield (specifically ditch creek) when i was only 6 months old and have been up there every summer since camping/fishing and canoeing

this is the one lake that we can take our canoe and actually enjoy ourselves without the fear of being swamped by all the boats flying around

is it really that much of a difference when someone is up there in a boat enjoying the day fishing and they can make it from one end of the lake in 5 minutes instead of 20 i really don't see that as any kind of legitimate reason to ruin the lake with all the increased noise and wake, there needs to still be some places in this world a person can go and the sound of nature is what you hear

i beg you, please don't remove the no wake zone

thank you
brian mettler
spearfish

Jamie Mutter
Piedmont SD
jmutter78@gmail.com

Comment:

Keep Deerfeild Lake as a No Wake Zone.

Brett Sutton
Rapid City SD
Ustawasser@aol.com

Comment:

I agree "some of us want a place without mechanismization! This is a quiet, peaceful place of slow pace and relaxation. If it takes time to "motor", row or paddle across so be it. Enjoy it, and let me enjoy it! Can there not be some place for us technotards.....

Bill Lewis
Rapid City SD
Blew777@msn.com

Comment:

Keep the no wake lake or it will become another Sheridan or angostura party lake and drive all fishermen out of the hills

Sandra Burns
Rapid City SD
sandy@projectsolutionsinc.com

Comment:

As a kayaker, Deerfield is the only larger lake that we can be on past 11am without the noise, smell and noise from motorboats. The beauty and solitude is the best part of the lake. Please keep it quiet and calm for kayakers and hikers.

John Rozell
Hill City SD
jrozell@tsf.com

Comment:

Raising the speed to 25mph from 5mph will turn Deerfield Lake into a recreational lake. It is certainly possible to water ski at 25 mph or under. The 25 mph limit will attract bigger boats and jet skis. It would be a shame to allow this. john rozell

John Mitchell

Rapid SD

JSKMITCH@RAP.MIDCO.NET

Comment:

I spend a lot of time on Sheridan Lake and Pactola. Both of these lakes get so busy with Jet personal watercraft and speed boats pulling tubes that the lakes become busy to the point of danger. There is little point in trying to take a fishing boat onto Sheridan or Pactola from July 1 to mid August. Deerfield should keep the no wake limit to allow for fishing without the risk of getting run over or swamped by the high speed boats.

Kim Weyer

Rapid City SD

kim_weyer@yahoo.com

Comment:

The Black Hills have recently been inundated by 4 wheelers other utvs. There is not a space that I hike or ski where I don't hear the whine of motors and the earthly damage done by wheels. Please let Deerfield be a place where we can still go play and not deal with motors and chaos. Please.

Scott Gamo

Cheyenne WY

gamowolk@yahoo.com

Comment:

Deerfield's current and longstanding no-wake restriction provides a different fishing atmosphere than other regional lakes. Having fished there for over 50 years I support maintaining the no-wake restriction. If it can be demonstrated that a higher speed limit such as 10mph also minimizes any wake then perhaps it could be raised to a bit higher than 5mph for a compromise.

Olen Chambers

Rapid City SD

ocnk@vastbb.net

Comment:

I have been a resident in in the Deerfield area since 1987 and love to fish this beautiful lake. I do not want to see no wake go away.

Gary Johnson

Rapid City SD

garyj@enetis.net

Comment:

Please, please do not remove the no-wake rule on Deerfield Lake. This is a beautiful and serene place in the Hills and should be kept that way.

Ryan Jennings
Spearfish SD
ryanjjennings@gmail.com

Comment:

I have spent time canoeing on Deerfield and enjoy the peace on the lake with the current 5mph limit.

Todd Pechota
Custer SD
Shelly.1219@icloud.com

Comment:

I am opposed to the proposal to remove the no wake zone. Enforcing a speed limit has increased costs that are not discussed. The lake is one place that tranquility still exists for paddlers and float tubers

Larry Chilstrom
Rapid City SD
bhillselk@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose any change in the proposed speed limit for boats on Deerfield Lake.

Laurice Johnson
Rapid City SD
lalejo22@hotmail.com

Comment:

I totally oppose the new proposal to raise the boat speed from the current 5 mph to 25 mph on Deerfield Lake this action will destroy the beauty and tranquility of the lake and will ruin it for all the kayakers and canoers and shore fishermen young and old alike ,I think they can go to Sheridan Lake and Pactola and rip around if they want instead of ruining the one beautiful lake that is left, I would bet that if its changed the trout fishing would be gone in 2 years and the lake full of Pike!! Please leave this the way it is and always has been a Very Beautiful Lake !!

Marla Sebade
Rapid City SD
mksebade@vastbb.net

Comment:

Please DO NOT change the wake restriction on Deerfield Lake. We enjoy kayaking there!

Doug Dobesh

Spearfish SD

caldo5691@hotmail.com

Comment:

I certainly hope that common sense is the determining factor that is used to decide this issue. We have plenty of other opportunities in the Black Hills to have our senses assaulted by the noise and chaos that permeate our daily lives. I am convinced that there are people who aren't happy unless they are making noise. Is it so offensive to have one oasis of peace and solitude for people to enjoy. No one has their right to access this lake infringed upon by having a no wake zone, but plenty of people would have their right to peace and quiet infringed upon if the No Wake Zone restriction is removed. Please do the right thing and LEAVE DEERFIELD THE WAY IT IS.

Thank you,
Doug Dobesh

Kari Marx

Hill City SD

Kmmarx27@gmail.com

Comment:

I support Deerfield being a no wake lake. Much more peaceful and so many people kayak and canoe. It should be no wake as it has always been.

Allen Heakin

Rapid City SD

Waterbuff1@rap.midco.net

Comment:

I have been an avid sportsman and outdoors person since moving to Rapid City in 1992 when I transferred to the U.S. Geological Survey's Water Resources office. I am increasingly concerned about changes in land-use for recreational vehicles and now I feel compelled to write you about the potential for changing the speed limit on Deerfield Lake. There are only a handful of lakes in western South Dakota where people can still enjoy our beautiful natural surroundings in peace and solitude. There are plenty of lakes where people can enjoy going fast on the water. Let's retain a few lakes for the people who enjoy the tranquility that Deerfield provides for residents and visitors alike.

Craig Oyler

Rapid City SD

Oyleroutdoors@hotmail.com

Comment:

The Black Hills offer a variety of opportunities for all of our outdoorsmen, and one of the opportunities is going to a quiet peaceful lake and not having to listen and deal with jet skis, surf boats, and the loud music. We only have one such opportunity for that, and it's Deerfield lake. It would be a shame to take away the very reason why so many people go to Deerfield. There are plenty of lakes for the recreational boaters to go to, let us outdoorsmen keep just one for us to go to and fish in peace and quiet.

Gregory Johnson

Lead SD

wefish50@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please see that Deer Field lake remains a no wake zone. I am a long time fisherman and love to fish the lake just because of the peace and quiet. There are are lakes already available for the speedsters.

Mark Ruddeforth

Rapid City SD

mark@sheridanlakemarina.com

Comment:

I strongly oppose increasing the speed limit on Deerfield Lake from the current 5mph to the proposed 25mph. We should preserve one of the few remaining slow speed and/or non-motorized water recreation areas that remain in the state. There are more than enough lakes that allow unrestricted speeds and we should preserve Deerfield as a paddle sports destination lake.

Arlie Nelson

Newcastle WY

Comment:

We are frequent visitors at Deerfield and oppose raising the boat speed limit of 5 MPH. It is a beautiful lake as is and that would definitely change with the increase in boat speed. Please keep the serene, peaceful quiet of the lake!

Joel Petersen

Rapid City SD

joelpetersen61@gmail.com

Comment:

My family and I often enjoy the peace and calm of Deerfield Lake. We canoe/kayak, camp, hike, fish and birdwatch. I'm concerned that raising the speed limit would negatively impact all the activities we have enjoyed over the years.

When guest from out of state visit we take them to Deerfield they usually comment about how peaceful and relaxing the lake is.

Deerfield Lake is perfect as is, please don't raise the speed limit.

Robbi Buller

Parker SD

rbuller@iw.net

Comment:

There's plenty of recreational opportunities in the Hills . Deerfield is a quiet precious resource . There needs to be a place protected from noise and speed . Deerfield is a sanctuary for those seeking quiet and solitude . Please keep it that way !

Raymond Gellerman

Cust SD

jannrayg@gwtc.net

Comment:

PLEASE LEAVE Deerfield Lake as a no-wake lake. We do not need the noise nor speed of motorboats ruining the peacefulness of this beautiful lake. My wife and I appreciate being able to kayak here without having to deal with the wakes from motor boats.

Bruce Evans

Rapid City SD

bse36@hotmail.com

Comment:

I've lived in the Hills area for 36 years and Deerfield is where I go to hike, fish and boat when I want peace and quiet. Ken Edel should not be allowed to influence a rule change simply because he wants to fly around the lake using electronics to locate fish. He needs to slow down and have some respect for those of us who appreciate the lack of wakes and motor noise unique to Deerfield. Finally, I own a boat and it does not take "25 minutes" to get anywhere on Deerfield, that is a gross exaggeration in my opinion.

Michael Stoner

Rapid City SD

Comment:

I strongly oppose changing Deerfield's no wake rule. We go to Deerfield often because it is a no wake lake and is a safe, peaceful area to fish and canoe.

Eric Reisenweber

Sioux Falls SD

Ereiser13@hotmail.com

Comment:

As an avid outdoorsman, I relish the peace and quiet while enjoying both hunting and fishing. Deerfield is an awesome example of a great lake that one can enjoy a day of relaxation on the water. I ask that you strongly consider leaving the 5mph speed limit on the lake.

Kelli Shaw
Rapid City SD

Comment:

Most lakes are already fine for boaters, Deerfield will become a party spot due to its remote location. We have a large community of people who value the few quiet lakes we still have.

James Theis
Rapid City SD
wjtjm@centurylink.net

Comment:

This is a ridiculous proposal for a beautiful, serene lake that EVERYONE I know personally wants to stay as such. If anyone can't travel fast enough on Deerfield, they can boat elsewhere!

Craig Mickelson
Spearfish SD

Comment:

I strongly Oppose the proposal to eliminate the no wake rules at Deerfield. I am a 66 yr. old fisherman and appreciate having a calm fishable lake with no waves destroying shoreline and creating unneeded noise. I would love to leave it as is.

Bruce Gefvert
Spearfish SD
mileamminute@live.com

Comment:

A goal of our state parks should be to address the wide range of most common interests held by our state's residents. Adequate provisions are already in place for recreational boating. Appropriating an elite lake for no wake traffic is imperative. Recreational motor boating infringes on wildlife and those who prefer a more natural environment. Please leave Deerfield a no wake lake. As a user of the BWCA, I know this is not an easy call, but its a call we need to make. Thank you

Craig Mickelson
Spearfish SD

Comment:

I am not sure if I have the correct agency to comment to but I strongly oppose a proposal to lift the no wake zone at Orman Dam. We are already seeing shoreline deteriorating and it is not funj to sit in a violently rocking fishing boat or kayak and try to fish.

Scott Olson
Rapid City SD
dr.auger81@hotmail.com

Comment:

The lake is meant to be a peaceful retreat from fast moving boats, jet skis, and other fast watercraft. It's the only lake I can be on most weekends with my inflatable pontoon and not get pushed around by recreational boaters. The solitude and peacefulness is a big reason I go there and others would agree that it needs to stay that way. There are plenty of other large lakes that recreational boat users can go to. Let's continue to keep Deerfield as a no-wake lake.

Jason Himrich
Rapid City SD
jmhimrich@gmail.com

Comment:

Us kayak fishermen would hate to lose the opportunity to easily traverse the lake without fear of colliding with a boat. Also, the Black Hills is growing daily. To lose a peaceful lake would be a blow to everyone who lives here.

John Schmeltzer
Whitewood SD
schmeltz@rushmore.com

Comment:

Please leave the no-wake restriction in place

Kathryn Johnson
Hill City SD
kj24054@gmail.com

Comment:

Currently Deerfield Lake is the only lake of substantial size that with no-wake restriction. All other no-wake lakes in the Black Hills are tiny by comparison. The non-motorized boaters in the area need a lake of some size such as Deerfield to enjoy quiet calm recreation. Motor boats have Sheridan and Pactola.

David Whitney

Rapid City SD

whitneys@rushmore.com

Comment:

I'm writing in support of maintaining the no-wake restriction at Deerfield Lake. It is my contention that there is no compelling reason to disturb the peace and quiet of the lake and surrounding area (which I also enjoy) when other more accessible bodies of water are open to motorboats, jet skis and the like. Besides the noise, the waves created by powered watercraft would make the lake more difficult for those canoeing, kayaking, and paddle boarding - all of which are becoming more popular due to the relatively low cost and ease to get on the water. The proposed 25 mph speed limit would in all likelihood be widely ignored (jet skiers are not typically known for their love of quietly and slowly pattering around large bodies of water) and difficult to enforce in any meaningful sense. We are rapidly losing the peaceful quality of life (don't get me started on the near constant drone of ATVs/UTVs on trails and roadways all spring, summer and fall) that drew many of us to the Black Hills in the first place. Leave Deerfield Lake as it is, an oasis of tranquility in a forest that grows ever noisier year after year. Please and thank you.

Joseph Hall

Rapid City SD

josephehallnemo@gmail.com

Comment:

Fishing by boat is not prohibited presently only the speed of movement about the lake. This seems a prudent way of compromise for the diverse pleasures of the lakes users and provides a semi tranquil venue for all since there are multiple lakes that provide for greater water craft speeds.

Sandra Allen

Rapid City SD

sallen@rushmore.com

Comment:

If Deerfield Lake is change from no wake I think Center Lake in Custer State Park should also be changed!

Randy Allen

Rapid City SD

2020hsrda@gmail.com

Comment:

Leave it alone

Dusty Kiner
Rapid City SD
Dusty_kiner@yahoo.com

Comment:

Strongly opposed to this. That lake is the gem of the Black Hills. It is quiet and peaceful. Lifting the no wake zone rule would ruin the lake for so many outdoor enthusiasts that enjoy it's solitude.

Evening Howey
Hill City, Sd SD
Howevening101@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Dennis Olson
Rapid City SD
apex5363@centurylink.net

Comment:

Lived in SD for my 66 years. We need to keep some of the natural beauty and quietness. Every where you go is boats, jet skis racing around the lakes. Keep Deerfield Lake a pristine body of water with the no wake restrictions. Thank You

Janet Rose-Perrenoud
Rapid City SD
jrosep.jrp@gmail.com

Comment:

We are avid Kayakers and Deerfield Lake is our favorite place to Kayak because of the no-wake restriction. It is large enough to spend several hours paddling around the lake. We enjoy the quiet, solitude, and natural beauty of the lake. There are ample places that are either too small for kayaking or too busy for an enjoyable paddle that are available to fisherman. So it will take the fisherman a few extra minutes to get to there desired fishing spot on Deerfield Lake because of the no-wake restriction. Is that really a big deal! We all need a place to slow down, relax and enjoy our beautiful Black Hills. Please do not replace the no-wake restriction on Deer field Lake and take away our favorite place to enjoy a truly South Dakota gem. Thank you

Bruce Venner
Rapid City SD
b-lvenner@midco.net

Comment:

Please keep the 5 mph speed limit at Deerfield Lake. That's what makes it unique and special. There are plenty of other lakes for high speed boating.

Kayte Halstead

Hermosa SD

Kayte@acupuncture4health.com

Comment:

Please leave Deerfield no wake for kayakers and fishermen

Michael Trier

Custer SD

mgtrier@yahoo.com

Comment:

There are plenty of lakes where motorboats can go fast. Please preserve Deerfield's status as one of the few, if not the only, lake of significant size that is "no wake" and quiet.

Jim Thomson

Rapid City SD

jimtpias@aol.com

Comment:

This is a small quiet lake. Fishing is a leisure sport. Boats don't have to scream to a favorite spot as if they're in a tournament. 25MPH is way to fast. I can pull a tube, kneeboard, wakeboard and even water ski at speeds far less than that. I don't use Deerfield but a quiet peaceful experience at least one place in the Hills should be available.

Dale Stoner

Rapid City SD

daledonna8000@rap.midco.net

Comment:

I have been fishing at Deerfield for over 50 years and have greatly appreciated the peaceful and quiet it is without boats speeding around. Lets keep Deerfield this way

Scott Wright

Hermosa SD

outbackgunsmith@gmail.com

Comment:

I have been going to Deerfield reservoir off and on for 25 years. And the draw for me is that there is a 5mph speed limit. It means I can kayak, use my 12' aluminum boat and not have to worry about wakes swamping me. It makes the lake way more enjoyable with the 5mph speed limit. If people want to go fast let them go to a larger reservoir like Pactola. I take my motor home and boat to Deerfield because it is calm, quiet and beautiful place to go. If you allow wakes you will get the partyers and people who don't appreciate such a beautiful place. Not to mention law enforcement costs will go up and the possibility of accidents will go up also. I think your proposal is a bad idea!! It is sad that people whom are in a hurry would ruin the experience for others whom enjoy the quiet, calm of Deerfield Lake!

Andrew Harvey

Rapid City SD

Comment:

This lake is a perfect spot to get away from the noise and recreation boaters. Please please please don't ruin his for our local citizens!!!

James Ronfeldt

Rapid City SD

jr32281@gmail.com

Comment:

I am in total opposition to removing the no wake designation on Deerfield Lake! This is one lake where we can go and actually enjoy a day of fishing without getting blown off the water by idiots! Anglers should have rights too!

Kammi Doud

Rapid City SD

Kammi_doud@yahoo.com

Comment:

The proposed mph is still fast enough to allow recreational towing of tubers and kneeboarders along with some skiers. Wording needs to be considered if you are restricting these activities while increasing the speed of travel. May get more support with a 15 mph limit.

Steve Rozmiarek
Chadron NE
Stever.roz@gmail.com

Comment:

I am an out of state fisherman who travels to Deerfield specifically because it is a no wake lake. There are always kyyaks and canoes enjoying the lake there to, and wakes destroy that. I avoid several other lake options on the way to Deerfield specifically because they allow wakes. Stockade could be a great lake, but wakes destroy the peace and quiet there, my family has been harrassed by a group of kids water-skiing specifically because I asked them to please go somewhere else so we could continue to shore fish where we were. Deerfield doesn't need this. I pay far more money for my family to enjoy fishing in South Dakota than any jetski does. Let us keep the perfection that is Deerfield as is please. There is no no benefit to changing it.

Dwight Griffiee
Sturgis SD
kdgriffiee@vastbb.net

Comment:

lets keep it a no wake zone, its the only bigger lake left to enjoy shore fishing, canoeing, and kayaking.

Thomas Kellar
Rapid City SD
tdkellar@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is unique in the Black Hills as a no wake lake. Just as there are places in the Black Hills where hikers and bicyclists can enjoy nature with no motorized traffic, there should be a lake free of the noise and air pollution that would come with boats creating a wake. Other area lakes like Pactola, Sheridan and Angostora offer ample opportunity for those wanting motorized transport . Additonally, enforcing a 25 mile per hour speed limit, as proposed, would complicate policing Deerfield.

John Melvin
Rapid City SD
johnm@rushmore.com

Comment:

I like to shore fish were it is quite. The first time I saw a boat going slow on Deerfield, it didn't make sense to me but it only took a minute to realize what a great idea it was. Please leave it the way it is with NO-wake.

Thank you
John Melvin

Glen Anderson
Hot Springs SD
geshaccc@yahoo.com

Comment:

Angostura becomes unusable on weekends for fishing due to numerous boats. I go to Deerfield for trout as it is peaceful. Pactola and Sheridan should be enough for water sports.

Donna Smeins
Hill City SD
Lwalteraz@gmail.com

Comment:

Too much traffic on Deerfield Road already. This is a quiet fishing lake & kayaking area.

Clarence Bowman
Fairburn SD

Comment:

Why do we need another small hills lake used for high speed. We already have to many. It would be nice if you could manage what you have instead of messing more stuff up. So sad

Christopher Lupo
Rapid City SD
christopher.lupo1@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is the most unique lake in the Black Hills, and it would be unwise to remove the no-wake restriction. The logic behind proposed change is garbage - to save people 15 min when trying to get to a fishing spot - and would effectively turn Deerfield (a peaceful, tranquil, and true gem) into another Pactola/Sheridan.

Myself, and many like me, prefer to fish/kayak/canoe at Deerfield because we don't have to worry about boats flying by us. There are many other lakes that have no-wake/non-motorized regulations, but none rival the size of Deerfield and the solace it provides.

Lynn Jackson
Custer SD
jacksons@paulbunyan.net

Comment:

oppose

Ryan Hudson

Lead SD

hudson900@hotmail.com

Comment:

I strongly oppose the idea of allowing Deerfield to become a wake lake. I think the lake is perfect the way it is, and is a very popular spot for kayakers and float tube fisherman.

William Anderson

Rapid City SD

wacopter@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield does not need a higher speed limit. More wakes would just irritate the people on the water and increase erosion concerns.

Fred Whiting

Keystone SD

Legrserch@hotmail.com

Comment:

Please do not eliminate Deerfield as a major lake that can safely be enjoyed by fishermen and other users of canoes, kayaks, belly boats, paddle boards and other non-motorized watercraft.

Kate Scott

Elgin AZ

madreanwildlife@gmail.com

Comment:

To Commission of South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks;

There are no words to convey my feelings of the misguided path you have set in motion with horrendous, abominable, disgraceful attack on wildlife. Where is your compassion for the egregious assault you are waging on these sentient beings? Collecting tails? Have your minds reverted back to the darkest of times in humanity, before the world had fire? No words can express my utter disdain for your despicable actions.

So yes, I urge the commission not to extend the use of traps on public lands. I for one will tell everyone in my state to never visit your state, if this program isn't completely eliminated. Maintaining the current May 1 deadline is absolutely necessary.

Kate Scott
Director
Madrean Archipelago Wildlife Center

William Griffin

Custer SD

griffinw2351@gmail.com

Comment:

I regularly kayak on Deerfield Lake, and find it one of the only large lakes in the Black Hills that capture the peace and quiet so essential to relax. To risk losing that to enable motor boaters to get across the lake a few minutes faster is a very bad idea. Take your time, enjoy yourself; you're fishing!

Evan Thomas

Rapid City SD

evanbthomas@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose the change: preserve the no-wake zone in Deerfield Lake.

Tim Johnson

Rapid City SD

timcjhn@gmail.com

Comment:

Please keep Deerfield lake as is. As a business owner of a hotel in hill city, I know travelers come in and stay because of Deerfield. Each lake is unique and this is something unique about Deerfield. It's also so small that it would be a safety concern I believe and too costly to enforce and maintain all that would come with.

Cody Bauernfeind

Lead SD

Comment:

I use the lake slot for fishing and camping and really appreciate the slow boat traffic

Jeff Townsend

Lytton IA

jnvtownsend@windstream.net

Comment:

Leave the speed on Deerfield Lake alone as it one of the few area lakes that is not boat crazy. We enjoy the peacefulness.

Katrina Starr
Rapid City SD
Katie.starr@state.sd.us

Comment:

Please don't take away the no wake zone. This area is the best for paddle boarding without fear of people waking by you.

Kelly Brennan
Rapid City SD
kellysue96@hotmail.com

Comment:

Please leave it as is.

Susan Stimson
Custer SD
sue_stimson@hotmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is one of the few places a person can walk, hike or ride a horse, or boat, or just be near hearing the sounds of nature without the interference or noise of motors.

Brandy Hof
Box Elder SD

Comment:

We have plenty of other areas on the Black Hills that are available for this sort of activity. Please keep the serenity of Deerfield in tact. I love the fact that I can safely float around the lake fishing without boats flying around

Mark Perrenoud
Rapid City SD
drmarkp@rushmore.com

Comment:

- * One individual should not be able to create such a consideration by the GF&P Commission.
- * I kayak regularly and Deerfield is wonderful for this because of the no wake zone. Any increase in the boat speeds takes this away and makes kayaking, etc. more dangerous because of the risk of capsizing.
- * A healthy outdoors should offer areas that are quite, still and the pace of life is slower. Deerfield Lake is beautiful because it provides that. GF&P did the right thing when they originally put this restriction in place.

Thank you for your consideration of this opposition.

Jodie Kauer Mader
Rapid City/Hill City SD
Jodkrmdr@gmail.com

Comment:

We don't need this lake that is rather small in reality to have boats on it going too fast. Please leave it the way that it is.

Kara Pfannenstein
Rapid City SD
Ke Barnett78@hotmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Brian Pfannenstein
Rapid City SD
Bpfannen@hotmail.com

Comment:

oppose

John Kelley
Rapid City SD
ctybear@hotmail.com

Comment:

I would like to ask the commission to keep Deerfield Lake a No Wake. There are plenty of lakes in the hills area for people to ski or jet ski on.

Jennifer Stewart
Lead SD
Jennystew@hotmail.com

Comment:

Do not remove the 5mph wake zone at Deerfield lake. The serenity of the lake is a huge draw and it gives people the opportunity to use the lake without having to worry about boats and water machines racing around.

Jason Bryce
Rapid City SD
the66lemon@gmail.com

Comment:

Oppose removing slow no wake at Deerfield Lake

Steven Schelske
Rapid City SD
Stevendschelske@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose the replacement of Deerfield Lake's no-wake restriction with a 25 mph restriction. Leave it the way it is.

Jc Joyce
Black Hawk SD
Jeepfrog@yahoo.com

Comment:

Wakesurfers could certainly use deerfield for surfing with a 25mph limit. I'm in favor of removing the 5mph limit.

Jeremy Rear
West Fargo ND
Jrear78@gmail.com

Comment:

I grew up in Lead and spent alot of my youth fishing at Deerfield. And one of the biggest attractions to the lake is the peace and quiet without boats and jet skis screaming all over. Please leave it as it is!!

Karli Green
Rapid City SD
Karlinona@gmail.com

Comment:

I think we need to keep at least one of our lakes quiet for those who just want somewhere peaceful to go. I remember taking my uncle up there the summer before he passed away from his brain cancer. If there were boats jetting across the water, that day with him wouldn't have been as calm and peaceful. I enjoyed spending time with him up there, watching the eagle's nest and just the simplicity of nature up there. I'm sorry one guy feels like it needs to change because it takes him 25 minutes to get to his fishing spot, he could leave earlier to get there. Also, how long does it take him to catch a fish size worthy of keeping? That could take 25 minutes too. It's part of the hobby. Keep the speed limit at trolling speed.

Karli Green
Rapid City SD
Karlinona@gmail.com

Comment:

I think we need to keep at least one of our lakes quiet for those who just want somewhere peaceful to go. I remember taking my uncle up there the summer before he passed away from his brain cancer. If there were boats jetting across the water, that day with him wouldn't have been as calm and peaceful. I enjoyed spending time with him up there, watching the eagle's nest and just the simplicity of nature up there. I'm sorry one guy feels like it needs to change because it takes him 25 minutes to get to his fishing spot, he could leave earlier to get there. Also, how long does it take him to catch a fish size worthy of keeping? That could take 25 minutes too. It's part of the hobby. Keep the speed limit at trolling speed.

Morghan Wainwright
New Underwood SD
nonemorghana@aol.com

Comment:

Please leave deer field lake a no wake zone.

Ray Winsel
Rapid City SD
raywinsel@yahoo.com

Comment:

I as an avid fisherman think that Deerfield should remain as is. Canoes, Kayaks, and fly fisherman enjoy the lake with no wake.

I own a pontoon and am off Pactola or Sheridan by noon because of the craziness.

Mr Edel is not a true fisherman if he needs to race across Deerfield to fish.

A true fisherman has patience and enjoys the peace of fishing in quite

Mr Edel, they will welcome you at Pactola or Sheridan Lakes

Rebecca Olson
Lead SD
olesgrl@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please leave lakes for only kayaking, SUP, calm water fishing, distance swimming and meditative recreation. It is hard to find a place where calm outdoor lake time exists. Speed boats create a party boat atmosphere and disrupt the wildlife. I don't have to worry when we are on a no wake lake that my family will collide with a speedboat as we are kayaking and SUP or deal with the dangerous turbulent wake. The speed boats have MANY lakes to choose from. Deerfield Lake and few other lakes are sanctuaries for us. Please leave restrictions on no wake lakes.

Susan Oneill
Whitewood SD

Comment:

Leave it alone!! One guy crying that he can't get across the lake fast enough to fish should not be a reason to change the restriction! People choose Deerfield for the sole reason there are not motorized boats on it! There are limited waterholes th

Lauren Pyle
Sioux Falls SD
larain@gmail.com

Comment:

Please maintain the no-wake zone at Deerfield lake. Many paddlers love its tranquility, and it's the only lake of its size in the area where I feel safe taking my child out on the water with me. Those wanting to make waves have plenty of opportunities at Sheridan and Pactola. Build another marina at Pactola!

Laurie Sliper
Rapid City SD

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Keith Myers
Hill City SD
kam-890@live.com

Comment:

Keep no wake

Brian Hayen
Rapid City SD

Comment:

please keep no wake rule

Tim Ferrell
Sturgis SD
timferrell@hotmail.com

Comment:

I am opposed to upping the speed limit on Deerfield lake to 25mph. It is one of the few places I can take my family to kayak and paddle board peacefully. We do a lot of fishing from the kayaks and the waves produced for faster moving watercraft make it more difficult to fish like on other lakes such as Pactola and Orman dam.

Larissa Oyen
Sturgis SD
Larissa_S@hotmail.com

Comment:

My family loves going to Deerfield Lake to kayak and paddle board because we know we are safe and do not have to worry about boats hitting me or my young children. My camp at Deerfield 6-8 weekends throughout the summer for this reason.

Laural Bidwell
Rapid City SD
labidwell@aol.com

Comment:

Hi - Deerfield Lake is a peaceful and quiet beautiful spot in the Black Hills. I read in the paper that someone has proposed and gfp is considering eliminating the no wake rules at Deerfield. The request also was to increase the speed allowed on the lake to 25mph. This is a small lake and a nice spot for quiet kayaking and canoeing. I think we should save some special places for those who are tired of the noisy onslaught of motorized vehicles. Please keep the no wake rule in place and for that matter it wouldn't hurt to eliminate the allowance of motors all together. It wouldn't hurt.

Mark Jones
Edgemont SD
dakota8678@yahoo.com

Comment:

Deerfield has always been a wonderful lake for canoe and kayak recreation. There has been a huge increase popularity in both of these. Please don't let jet skis on Deerfield

Charles Hart
Rapid City SD
hart@rap.midco.net

Comment:

Please do not remove the no wake restrictions on Deerfield Lake. It is one of the few lakes of any size in this area in which canoes, kayaks, trolling can occur without the frequent disruptions caused by speed boats and jet skis. ATVs continue to do significant damage to the northern hills and adding additional motorized boats would continue to deteriorate and ruin this very unique environment. Thank you. C Hart

Talese Aucoin
Redfield SD
taucoin85@gmail.com

Comment:

I often vacation in the Black Hills. Deerfield being no-wake is a rare gem. In this area you see no lakes without loud boats and jet skis chopping up the waters. It's nice to be able to find a lake that isn't being utilized for loud recreational activities. There's plenty of other lakes for that.

James Bingham
Rapid City SD
jlb501@outlook.com

Comment:

Please do not increase allowable speed of watercraft on Deerfield Lake to 25 mph. Deerfield Lake is a quiet treasure and should be maintained as such. While the increase may help a few fisherman reach their spot a bit faster, the increase will ruin the enjoyment of the lake for many.

Audra Casteel
Keystone SD
Audra.casteel@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose Removing Deerfield's no wake restriction

Kathi Schneider
Sturgis SD
sniideprime@hotmail.com

Comment:

Leave Deerfield as it is, a peaceful lake without speedboats!

Jeremy Olson

Lead SD

frozenland@hotmail.com

Comment:

Please keep the wake restrictions enforced. There is so few lakes of any substantial size that I can safely canoe, kayak and paddle board in anymore. With all the wake boarding and faster boats on the larger lakes, it is unsafe to use the smaller crafts and truly enjoy the serenity of nature.

Scott Oyen

Sturgis SD

S_oyen@hotmail.com

Comment:

The law needs to stay the way it is.

Lani Olson

Rapid City SD

lmolson90@msn.com

Comment:

We have lakes that allow higher boat speeds. Deerfield Lake has a lot of people who love it BECAUSE of the tranquility, free of the noise and boats zipping everywhere. Please keep it as it is.

Richard Woodworth

Rapid Citt SD

Woodworthr44@hotmail.com

Comment:

Please leave Deerfird as a no wake lake, it is now for fishermen and peace and quiet. There are enough places for the boats to go and race around.

Rob Ristesund

Hill City SD

robritesund@gmail.com

Comment:

Please retain the current no-wake law on Deerfield Lake.

Connie Allen

Hill City SD

callen0605@hotmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield lake area is known for being a backwoods area. Allowing faster speeds on the lake will not be of a benefit to the area. Deerfield lake is a very cold mountain lake, therefore it is not a lake for water sports. Fishing, paddle boarding, kayaking, peaceful & serene are what this lake is best known for. Please keep it that way.

Milo Winter

Rapid City SD

rmwinter@rushmore.com

Comment:

I have boat-fished Deerfield for years-it takes a very little time to find any fishing spot with no-wake speed. The serenity is great. The proposal to allow faster boating is unnecessary and inappropriate in my opinion. Keep it as is!

Mary Johnson

Frederick SD

mary_cat_mayer1971@yahoo.com

Comment:

I may not live in Rapid City anymore, but I remember many times going to Deerfield Lake to camp and shore fish. Changing the wake speed on this lake would be the worst thing!! People go to this lake because it's quiet and you don't have to deal with the jet skiers, water skiers, and tubers. You can just enjoy the beauty and tranquility of the area. Please don't change the speed limit on this lake. There aren't many lakes left where you can go to have peace and quiet and enjoy the hills.

Steve Sylliaasen

Rapid City SD

Armyvet1970d@gmail.com

Comment:

Under no circumstances should Deerfield lake be invade by high powered boats and especially jet skies. The peace and quite and tranquil atmosphere must be maintained to insure those who wish for this peaceful atmosphere can go and relax and enjoy the outdoors in the environment Deerfield lake now offers.

Lesley Warren
Rapid City SD
lesleywarren@juno.com

Comment:

I am opposed to motorized watercraft on Deerfield Lake. Please, please retain the "no wake" environment of this lake. It's one of the very few lakes for truly non motorized use and as far as I know, the only one of it's size in the Black Hills.
Thank you,
Lesley Warren

Bret Aman
Nemo SD
baman@q.com

Comment:

leave the lake as is a no wake speed limit there is no reason to change, the lake is not that big. only place left where you are not getting washed a shore by speed boats and jet skis. DO NOT CHANGE TO 25 MPH.

Nicholas Goldsberry
Rapid City SD
goldsberrynicholas97@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield is a special lake due to the peace and quiet. There are many other lakes you can high speed boat on. Including Angostora Reservoir, Orman Dam, Pactola Reservoir and Sheridan Lake. Deerfield is highly used by kayakers and those who enjoy canoes. Many anglers with smaller watercraft come up here to get away from the speed boats and jet skiers. Deerfield should be left as is

Emily Trappe
Hermosa SD
y_lime_18@hotmail.com

Comment:

Opening Deerfield lake to larger motors by lifting the no wake zone will keep me out of more SD waters. Please oppose this suggestion.

On a side note, enforcing the no wake in Jenny Gulch on Pactola would be great too.

Jared Carstens
Rapid City SD
jpcars10s@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Melody Tromburg

Custer SD

Princes@getc.net

Comment:

No to wake

Kerry Greear

Whitewood SD

kerryannieo@hotmail.com

Comment:

This lake is an area of solitude and peace. Our family loves it just the way it is. We kayak and hike at the lake

Colleen Langley

Nemo SD

woodtick1@hughes.net

Comment:

Please do not sacrifice the tranquility of Deerfield Lake by allowing speeding water craft. There are plenty of other sites available for that.

Pam Ludwig

Sioux Falls SD

Pamluds@hotmail.com

Comment:

We lived in Custer for 15 years and Deerfield was one of our favorite lakes to take our kids. The current wake regulation is perfect and should NOT be changed. The lake is peaceful without speeding jet skis or boat engines revving and speeding across the lake...there are plenty of other lakes people can go if they feel the need to go faster

Josh Miller

Spearfish SD

jmiller@spearfish.k12.sd.us

Comment:

When you look at the list of big lakes in the Black Hills that have No Wake, the list is short. Kayakers, small boats, and anglers deserve a peaceful location to go that gives them relief of the big motors. Many people like camping at Deerfield because of the quiet and peace it offers. There are plenty of lakes for the big boats to zoom around on. Let Deerfield remain what it is - one of the geatesr Black Hills lakes

Medea Posser
Sturgis SD
ladyambir@yahoo.com

Comment:

Deerfield should remain no-wake

Mark Vedder
Rapid City SD
sdvedder@vastbb.net

Comment:

To Whom It May Concern:

I am opposed to removing or modifying the current no-wake regulation for Deerfield Lake. This lake's motorized restriction offers a place of serenity and calm in the otherwise very busy Black Hills recreational water areas. Families can experience scenic beauty, shore-fishing, canoeing, kayaking, float tubes, and yes boating less than 5 mph, a series of values unsurpassed and unprovided anywhere else in the Black Hills.

There are two other reasons to NOT reduce or amend the current restrictions: 1) there is a bald eagle nest on the north side of Deerfield Lake which requires noise and disturbance restrictions to permit successful nesting each year; and 2) the Bureau of Reclamation manages the lake for sustained, regulated flows for downstream uses - and wake damage to the shoreline will reduce the quality and quantity of the lake's water. Erosion of the shore's edge to wave action from boating will degrade Deerfield Lake by releasing additional sediments into a narrow body of water.

I understand Mr. Edel's request, but believe changing the Deerfield Lake's restriction regarding no-wake would be a detriment to the values presently in place for more recreational users and water quality and quantity. Mr. Edel can visit Pactola and Sheridan or other lakes within the Black Hills area if he desires faster fishing access and use.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide public comment on this proposal.

Sincerely,
Mark Vedder

Kimberly Guy
Rapid City SD
Kguy74_@hotmail.com

Comment:

Should remain wake free

Lee Guy
Rapid City SD
Lguy66@hotmail.com

Comment:

Should remain wake free

Doug Miller
Nemo SD
ordwayantiques@msn.com

Comment:

For individuals who want to "speed around" Deerfield Lake, I say there are other lakes in the Black Hills they can use. I, for one, enjoy the serenity / low stress of being able to canoe / paddle boat on such a beautiful lake as Deerfield, without the noise / distractions of fast moving boats. Please do not remove this "no wake" restriction!

Ronald Mcarthur
Spearfish SD
dak3mac@rushmore.com

Comment:

I would like to see the 5 mph limit maintained on Deerfield Lake. Wouldn't raising the speed limit require more personnel to enforce the limit and ultimately require more money be used for the purpose. Keep it as it is please.

Kristi Bowie
Rapid City SD
bowiekbs@yahoo.com

Comment:

Deerfield is one of the only places to go without boats zooming around everywhere. It's really peaceful and it would be a shame to lose it the way it is.

Vince Vidal
Rapid City SD
vidal@midco.net

Comment:

We have enough boating area in Western South Dakota without spoiling this treasured spot enjoyed by me, my family, my visitors and friends as great place for shore-fishing, canoeing, kayaking and other serene activities away from the noise and choppy water generated by speed boats and jet skis. Please do not change No-Wake. My name is Vince Vidal, 223 Alta Vista Dr., Rapid City, SD 57701

David Schneider
Sturgis SD
curbguy@vastbb.net

Comment:

Deerfield is the only no wake lake of any real size in the Black Hills for us that enjoy the peace and quiet of of it's no wake status. I have fished it many times from my boat and have no problem with the 5 mph speed limit. There are other lakes in the Hills for those who what to go fast,let them go there. Leave Deerfield as is !

Dennis Mallow
Black Hawk SD
fireman@rushmore.com

Comment:

Please leave the lake as is. As a retiree he has know place to be and all day to get there.

Bryan Peters
Rapid City SD
bryanp1972@gmail.com

Comment:

Please DO NOT CHANGE the no-wake regulation for Deerfield Lake. Deerfield is the only sizable reservoir in the Black Hills where shore anglers, canoers, kayakers, float tubers and boaters can peacefully and respectfully coexist in much the same space. Deerfield should remain as quiet and serene a place as possible. Deerfield should remain a cold-water specie lake managed primarily for trout species and perch. Largemouth bass, rock bass and other warm water species should be eliminated from the lake. Walleye and/or northern pike should never be introduced. It is the closest thing we have to a true mountain reservoir--please keep it the same and let Pactola and Sheridan take the brunt of the recreational watercraft traffic.

Jeffrey Vetter
Belle Fourche SD
team95monte@yahoo.com

Comment:

oppose

Linda Harris
Rapid City SD

Comment:

As a kayaker, I'm in favor of keeping the no wake zone (5 mph) classification for Deerfield to maintain the peaceful recreational enjoyment of this water body.

Blake Lohman
Denver CO
blohman85@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Lesa Mcdermott
Custer SD
Lesamcdermott@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake should stay a no wake area

Mike Bulich
Rapid City SD
Mbulichrealtor@gmail.cim

Comment:

Leave Deerfield lake the way it is.

Jim Stewart
Black Hawk SD
jim@blackhills.name

Comment:

I support the 5 mph speed limit on Deerfield Lake. Power boaters have many places to run fast, let's keep Deerfield Lake quiet.

Thank you!

Doris Mertz
Custer SD
dmertz35@msn.com

Comment:

Please leave Deerfield Lake as it is. Pactola and Sheridan Lake are nearby and offer options for faster boating.

Linda M. Hasselstrom

Hermosa SD

lindamichele777@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is too small for motorized vehicles; the racket would disturb people and wildlife for miles around. And it's one of the few lakes left where the elderly or children can fish quietly without some moron with a motorboat ruining the day. Let them go to Angostura.

Mark Warren

Rapid City SD

2nv502@gmail.com

Comment:

Please keep Deerfield Lake the way it is. Speed boats will ruin it. Thanks!

Sue Schwaneke

Rochford SD

schwaneke@aol.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is a jewel in the middle of the Black Hills where the solitude is wonderful. People can bird watch, kayak, and fish without the artificial noise from motors. Most of the other lakes in the Hills do not have a no-wake restriction. Keep Deerfield Lake peaceful.

Melanie Tollefson

Lead SD

melanietollefson@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

**Sd Canoe & Kayak Assoc. Sd
Canoe & Kayak Assoc.**

Sioux Falls SD

sdcka@midco.net

Comment:

Dear Game Fish and Parks Commission:

The South Dakota Canoe and Kayak Association is writing this letter in opposition of the petition to remove the no- wake restriction on Deerfield Reservoir. We are a statewide organization of paddle sports supporters who utilize water resources throughout South Dakota. We are composed of over 1,800 members and enthusiasts who enjoy canoeing, kayaking, stand-up paddle boarding and other human powered water sports. Deerfield Reservoir is the largest lake in the Black Hills where people can enjoy recreational opportunities without fear of boat wakes. However large, it is still approximately 2 miles long and measures approximately 1,500 feet at its widest. An increase in wake producing water craft in its narrow confines will increase unwanted interaction between motorized and non-motorized craft. The issue of waves caused by wakeboarding boats and by jet skis is a great safety concern to the paddling community. Wakeboarding and jet ski operation near shorelines also creates erosion damage. In most areas the lake is not wide enough for a heavy wake to dissipate before it reaches a shoreline.

We the executive board and members of The South Dakota Canoe and Kayak Association feel it would be a disservice to the outdoor recreation community and the tourism industry to change the atmosphere of this gem of a lake. Many of our members travel to this destination annually to enjoy the camping, swimming, fishing, paddling and hiking Deerfield provides.

We respect the rights of motorized boats and many of us are owners of motorized watercraft as well. We respectfully request this change not be made and the solitude and uniqueness of Deerfield Reservoir be preserved for the enjoyment of all South Dakotans.

Regards,

Roger Foote
President
South Dakota Canoe and Kayak Association

Dane Finnesand

Fairburn SD

dane.finnesand@gmail.com

Comment:

This is the only lake No Wake Lake in the hills that has a boat launch large enough to launch a pontoon or fishing boat. There are many anglers and sportsman that want a lake like this to avoid all of the recreational boaters during the peak summer months. These high speed boaters have many options for larger lakes that have no speed limits. If you remove this restriction, anglers with larger boats will have zero options to avoid these groups. There are also many kayak and SUP enthusiasts that use this lake to avoid the sound of motors and wakes. Deerfield has been know for many years as a quiet peaceful lake to enjoy. I encourage you to leave the restrictions in place.

Dane Finnesand
Rapid City SD
dane.finnesand@gmail.com

Comment:

Why in God's name would you have a meeting about this on a weekday afternoon in Pierre SD?! Should the people local to the Black Hills not have any opportunity to voice their opinions? What do the locals in Pierre know about this subject? Do you expect people that live in Hill City and Custer to take a day off work and drive 3+ hours to make their voices heard? Have a meeting about this in Rapid City and gauge the reaction of the locals that use the lake frequently. This proposal is garbage. That is the only No Wake Lake of decent size in the area. If you remove this restriction, there won't be any no wake lakes left for people that have pontoons or fishing boats.

Sonja Merrow
St. Onge SD

Comment:

We don't need ANOTHER boat party lake! Keep one lake peaceful, PLEASE

Kassie Shiffermiller
Rapid City SD
kshiffermiller@lynnjackson.com

Comment:

I strongly oppose lifting the Deerfield Lake Reservoir wake restrictions. This lake is frequented by fisherman, canoeing enthusiasts, kayakers, and stand-up paddleboarders. All of these activities, as well as wildlife and local vegetation, would be better served by a no-wake restriction that is already in place. There are plenty of lakes in Western South Dakota where one may go jet-skiing, water-skiing, and the like. Leave Deerfield Lake as is.

Christopher Kattke
Hot Springs SD
c_kattke@hotmail.com

Comment:

Absolutely not. Deerfield is one of the last great places to get away from all of the noise in the Hills.

Ralph Mumm Jr
Hill City SD
boojmumm@msn.com

Comment:

When I go fishing on Deerfield Lake the peaceful atmosphere of the Lake is as much of the enjoyable experience as is catching a fish. It takes a person at least an hour to pull your boat up to Deerfield from Rapid City why would you be in a big hurry to get to a certain spot on the Lake. Slow down, enjoy the experience, fish while you putt to where ever it is you want to be on the Lake, you more than likely will catch fish on the way.

Nick Lindsley
Rapid City SD
nmlindsley@gmail.com

Comment:

If you have been at any of the other hills lakes during the summer and seen or been a part of the boating chaos you would understatnd my oposition to lifting the speed restriction. We sold our boat becasue the lack of law enforcement, chaos, and danger. Deerfield is the only lake No Wake Lake in the hills that has a boat launch large enough to launch a pontoon or fishing boat. There are many anglers and sportsman that want a lake like this to avoid all of the recreational boaters during the peak summer months. These high speed boaters have many options for larger lakes that have no speed limits. If GFP removes this restriction, anglers with larger boats will have zero options to avoid these groups noise and chaos. There are also many kayak and SUP enthusiasts that use this lake to avoid the sound of motors and wakes. Deerfield has been know for many years as a quiet peaceful lake to enjoy. So please consider keeping this gem of the hills peaceful.

Terry Long
Custer SD
tlong53.tl@gmail.com

Comment:

Speed boats etc have enough places to enjoy their recreation. Leave Deerfield the way it is for those that prefer it's no wake designation.

Vicki Franzen
Rapid City SD
kivimi@msn.com

Comment:

I would support an increase to a lower speed limit; i.e. 10 to 15 mph since the goal is to "get across the lake faster".

Mike Ray

Rapid City SD

Cmichaelray@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please keep motor boats off Deerfield lake.

Thomas Baffuto

Rapid City SD

bbaffuto@aol.com

Comment:

I oppose because:

- 1) only large lake with peaceful tranquility and NO-WAKE policy.
 - 2) only large lake my wife and I can float tube without being swamped!
 - 3) Infrastructure would be costly to accommodate the added boaters and traffic under the proposed policy.
 - 4) Funds should be used for improving the fishery not boat ramps, drives, parking lots, etc.
 - 5) NO speeding Jet skis!
 - 6) LEAVE GOOD ALONE!
-

Bethann Baffuto

Rapid City SD

bbaffuto@aol.com

Comment:

I have always appreciated fishing at Deerfield because it is an ideal family atmosphere. It feels safe for people with young children and also the Eagles that live there. We float tube and need an environment that is not deluged by boat wakes, and loud racing engines. I know it is ideal for a quiet, peaceful day of fishing. Please don't make any changes, except to improve the fishery. Thank you.

Mike Sherry
Rapid City SD
mjsherry13@gmail.com

Comment:

I beg you not to remove the no wake restrictions on Deerfield Lake. It is a tranquil spot treasured by those of us that need a quiet lake in the Black Hills to escape to. The serenity and quietness of the spot is therapeutic when we have to escape the pace and stress of everyday living.

I have had to good fortune to fish in places like Maine and the Adirondack Mountains in New York and I think Deerfield Lake has the cleanest water I have ever seen. If you lift the no wake restriction, oil and gas pollution in the water will markedly increase. There is no denying that. Shoreline trash will also increase, (styrofoam worm containers come immediately to mind because I see those eyesores littering the shore line of almost every lake I have ever fished). Lake bottom pollution will also increase (beer and soda cans).

Why would you want to pollute such a beautiful place?

More fishermen rushing from one end of the lake to the other will mean more trout will be caught and more trout caught means more accidental trout kills (because they are difficult fish to catch and release safely).

I question the petitioner's motives for trying to overturn the restriction. It is not a big body of water and my wife and I often traverse the length and width of the lake in our kayaks multiple times every time we fish there. And, I am 60 years old. So I think the rationale about improving his fishing experience may be disingenuous.

I am worried that the power boat retailers are eyeing Deerfield Lake as an asset that will help them sell more fishing boats.

I also worry that the jet ski crowd will discover the lake and test the 25 mph limit every chance they get. In my experience, jet ski operators are the least considerate people on any body of water. They seem to have a need to perform their "stunts" as close to an audience as possible. And that audience, in my experience, is usually people in canoes and kayaks.

In summation; if you lift the no wake restriction, noise pollution is not the only downside to consider. You will be ruining a unique resource.

Mindy Holsworth
Hermosa SD
Mindy.holsworth@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Elysia Hunter
Rapid City SD

Comment:

I spend time at deerfield lake BECAUSE it is a wake-free lake - it is nice to escape the noise and chaos of other lakes like pactola where, frankly, people are obnoxious with their boats.

Toby Madsen
Rapid City SD

Comment:

There are plenty of other lakes in the area that can be used for sport boating!

Melissa Cosme
Spearfish SD
mela.cosme@bhsu.edu

Comment:

Good Morning! I oppose the replacement of Deerfield Lake's no-wake restriction with a 25mph restriction. This is the only lake in the Black Hills I can feel safe while paddleboarding or kayaking. I can go without having to worry about the dangers of speeding boats, especially drunk drivers that usually take over the lakes in the summer or jet skiers. This is also the only lake I trust and love to take my friends who have never tried kayaking before, not having to worry about speeding boats with the added calm and relaxing atmosphere makes Deerfield a perfect lake to try water sports in. This lake a hidden gem for us Black Hills locals! Please keep the lake with no wakes.

Roger Jackson
Custer SD
jacksonrogera@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Iver Finnesand
Grenville SD

Comment:

This is not a good decision for anyone !!

Colin Zilverberg
Rapid City SD

Comment:

I take my daughter to this lake to enjoy fishing, kayaking, and swimming. Lifting the no wake restriction would greatly hinder many people's enjoyment of this peaceful body of water. Please leave the no wake restriction in place.

Jim Thompson

Madison SD

thompsji.69@gmail.com

Comment:

I love Deerfield for the piece and quiet. Jet skis and ski boats would ruin the mountain lake essence. The pleasure boaters have other lakes to play on. Leave Deerfield alone.

Jason Renken

Rapid City SD

jasonrenken@hotmail.com

Comment:

Please do not increase the speed of boats at Deerfield. The Lake is a great spot for quiet, calm, peaceful relaxation. Kayaking, paddle boarding and boat fishing at the no wake speed are perfect for the lakes setting. We camp there on the north side at least 5 to 6 times per year and call Deerfield our favorite lake in the hills. I own a boat and know many big time lake and river fisherman. There would be no benefit in my eyes to go flying across Deerfield to catch the normal trout or perch catch. The lake trout are much smaller that can be caught in Pactola. Again please leave it a no wake lake!

Dave Oyler

Rapid City SD

daveo@theclubforboys.org

Comment:

My family and friends spend a lot of time at Deerfield Lake because of the quiet, peaceful, serenity you find there. Unlike Pactola and Sheridan lakes where boaters, jet skis, and party-goers dominate the scene. Deerfield Lake needs to remain as it is. Please leave it alone. Besides, putting a 25 mile per hour restriction will be impossible to enforce on a regular basis. We need to leave Deerfield Lake alone.

Tim Walton

Rapid City SD

Imperial_sun@yahoo.com

Comment:

We need some lakes that people can enjoy their peace and quiet. Fishing. Family time. Putting these boats on the water ruins that experience.

Pamela Weinzapfel

Waccabuc NY

pamdem@optonline.net

Comment:

This is unconscionable. Not on our public lands. Thank you.

Bill Brisk

Custer SD

bbrisk@goldenwest.net

Comment:

I would suggest Edel re-evaluate his retirement. It is utterly ridiculous that he is on such time restraints to go fishing and that he can't take the time to enjoy the tranquility of the area. He is a hypocrite in Rapid City Journal article as he says he can't fish after 11 AM on the other lakes because of power boats and jet skis. A 25 mph limit would do the same at Deerfield! I have been going to Deerfield Lake for over forty years. LEAVE DEERFIELD LAKE ALONE!!!!!!

Chris Valencia

Summerset SD

chris@egmrc.com

Comment:

Please keep Deerfield a No Wake Zone! It is the only lake in the Hills that we can enjoy kayaking, canoeing, paddle boarding, etc without being harassed by large wakes, fast boats, and jet ski's. Please keep Deerfield open to us other sportsmen.

David Coleman

Rapid City SD

COLEBUDDY@OUTLOOK.COM

Comment:

changing this tranquil setting of kayaks and slow fishing boats would completely destroy the ambiance, wildlife, and clean water and general boating safety of this lake. This clearly has not been thought through. i can't imagine who it is that wants party barges and jet skis on this. My friend and I are placing petitions at bait shops and sporting goods stores and will see you at the meeting in Pierre on June 6. The very least you can do is hold this hearing in Rapid City. I will be requesting that the governor step in and begin an environmental impact study.

Andrew Craven

Belleville WI

AndrewCraven23@gmail.com

Comment:

Please do not change the current no-wake restriction at Deerfield. It is one of the few remaining peaceful lakes.

Andrew J Jackson
Rapid City SD
Getandyjackson@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is not big enough to support boats that go fast enough to create a wake. Please leave the lake as is. It is nice to be able to go somewhere and appreciate nature without the roar of pwc and power boats! Enforcement will be an issue, too

Joshua Hewett
Custer SD

Comment:

After reading the article in the Rapid City Journal, I was surprised to see that the wake/speed limit on the lake was suggested to be increased. Deerfield Lake is the only larger lake in the Black Hills that serves as a peaceful retreat for all the outdoors people that do not want to hear loud engines, fast speeds, and loud people. Edel stated that he dislikes the choppy waters of other lakes. So if the no wake was lifted at Deerfield it would be the same as the lakes that he does not enjoy. In my opinion Edel is a hypocrite, and wants the rules and laws to apply to his own interests and agenda, not to the well-being of all the outdoors people. All the water sports that Edel mentioned, that create choppy water, are achievable at 25mph. As a local, born and raised in the Deerfield area I strongly oppose lifting the no wake law that exists.

Jodi Brisk
Burke SD
jbrisk@goldenwest.net

Comment:

Keep No-Wake Law in place at Deerfield Lake! In regards to the Deerfield Lake proposition of doing away with the No-Wake law, I cannot OPPOSE this enough. Mr. Edel speaks about how other lakes in the Black Hills, which do not have the No-Wake laws, can't be utilized past 11:00 a.m.

Jayme Scherr
Rapid City SD
jaymescherr@hotmail.com

Comment:

I am in favor of removing the no wake zone in deerfield with a speed limit in place for the whole lake. I believe this will open the lake up to more people who want to use it for recreation and help decrease the congestion on sheridan lake. We still have many other small lakes in the hills like sylvan that will never allow boats and can be used by people who are looking for that kind of recreation or atmosphere. This will be a strong economic increase for the areas business as well as those other people bringing motorized vehicles will spend money.

Tom Frank
Hill City SD
tomfrank.hillcity@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake preserves the peace and tranquility for non motorized water sports in the Black Hills, there are plenty of other water bodies where boaters have access already

Don Wrede
Rapid City SD
Dangerdon5500@gmail.com

Comment:

A 25mph speed limit on Deerfield will have jet skiers, wave runners and other boats screaming around the lake. 25 mph is fast for boats.

Michelle Fischer
Custer SD
goodys86@hotmail.com

Comment:

opposed to no-wake restriction

Jennifer Kirk
Rapid City SD
johnjsjenn@msn.com

Comment:

Please Please Please keep the no-wake zone in place at Deerfield Lake. It is so beautiful, calm and quiet there. It is a place that restores peace to our souls and we need more not less of them. No one loses anything with retaining the no-wake zone but many lose their quiet enjoyment of the lake with the elimination of the no-wake zone. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. J. Kirk

Myrna Garhart
Black Hawk SD
wolfdreamin69@yahoo.com

Comment:

I oppose lifting removal of the no wake zone on Deerfield Lake, because we enjoy fishing, camping, kayaking on the lake and not having to worry about boats speeding towards us not seeing us running over us. Or our fishing lines. Please leave Deerfield Lake as it . Peaceful and fun

Cheyne Cumming

Rapid City SD

Redtrigirl@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose any change to the no wake designation at Deerfield Lake. The beauty and peace and quiet of this lake would be ruined. I go there to hike in a quiet place and listen to nature's sounds. Allowing loud motors would destroy that experience. We need places that are not noisy!!

Lonnie Schryvers Schryvers

Custer SD

lschryvers@bhec.coop

Comment:

I think taking the no wake law off from Deerfield lake is not a good idea keep the lake peaceful.

Jesse Sorenson

Custer SD

jsorenson@bhec.coop

Comment:

I am not in favor of an increased speed limit on Deerfield Lake, it is a very peaceful lake to enjoy without large wakes.

Amy Fahey

Rapid City SD

amytoe2012@hotmail.com

Comment:

This is the only quiet large size lake in the black hills area. Please leave the 5mph speed limit and no wake. Safer for kayakers and dogs. It is a nice quiet place to camp especially where they do not allow fireworks over the 4th if July.

Andy Bernard

Rapid City SD

ajbernard48@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield is a pretty incredible spot, tranquil, and peaceful. A lot of folks out here in the Hills head up there on hot days to swim, fish, kayak, canoe, and paddle board. The lake is not that big, I canoe around it. There is no reason to need more speed boats up there. GF&P would just be asking for more trouble, you would consistently have people break the 25 mph speed limit. Keep it quiet, keep it slow, keep it how it has been. We already have too many UTVs and ATVs buzzing around, leave the jet skis and the motor boats to Pactola and Sheridan.

Sincerely,

Andy Bernard
City Forester
Rapid City Parks and Rec
Citizen of the Black Hills

John Newland

Rapid City SD

spotsplace@rushmore.com

Comment:

Having lived in the Black Hills since the early 70's I have always loved driving to remote Deerfield Lake to hike and fish enjoying its peace and quiet and relative uncrowded shorelines. I was sorry to see the gravel road paved years ago and houses pop up in the beautiful meadows leading up to the lake and today we have ATV's buzzing everywhere you go in the Hills so this one spot of tranquility is especially treasured. With the lake measuring less than two miles between its farthest points it seems odd that Mr. Edel needs 25 minutes to boat anywhere on the lake depending on where he puts in but if so I suggest he plan his time more wisely and not be in such a hurry.

Michelle Booze

Hartford SD

DrMLBooze@gmail.com

Comment:

Please do not lift the no wake zone on Deerfield lake. We love to fish and have been going to Deerfield for over a decade as a family. Having speeding boats and jetskies and the like racing across the lake will severely hamper our fishing to the point that we may not visit or camp at the lake again. Why does South Dakota need another lake with crazy boats?

Keifer Huntley

Spearfish SD

Comment:

Leave Deerfield lake as is. There are plenty of boating lakes in the hills without upping the speed limit there.

Jo Kallemeyn

Spearfish SD

joandlarry87@hotmail.com

Comment:

Please - let there be a few places in this state where there is no motorboat or jet-ski noise- where people can go to experience the natural noises of the environment and commune with nature. Fishermen have plenty of places to run their motorboats, they don't need one more place where they can speedily get to their fishing spot. I have no objection to quiet electric motors, and the sound of a canoe or kayak paddle in the water is the way to enjoy Deerfield Lake.

Sean Fahey

Rapid City SD

sfaheysd@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield lake on any summer day is a haven for paddlers, shore fisherman, and anyone who enjoys being on or around the water without speed boats flying around. A calm body of water is treasured by people who enjoy shore-fishing, canoeing, kayaking and other activities. Deerfield lake is the only large body of water in the hills where these people can go and enjoy a wake free lake.

I understand that it may take motor boats longer to work their way across the lake. I myself fish the lake from a motor boat on occasion. But I also enjoy fishing from a boat on a quiet lake in calm water. I do not see the sense in denying so many people the opportunity to enjoy this one of a kind lake just so that they can get across the lake a few minutes faster.

25 mph also opens the lake up to water skiers and wake boarders who create huge chop on a lake that size.

Please do not ruin this quiet, peaceful lake experience by allowing the 25 mph limit.

Andy Ainslie

Rapid City SD

andy@andyainslie.biz

Comment:

I oppose revising the no wake rule in place currently. please leave this pristine lake peaceful and quiet. Motor boaters have Pactola, Sheridan and Angostura already.

Kevin Forrester

Sturgis SD

k4ester@yahoo.com

Comment:

Why can't the SD GFP support anything but increased motorized use

Laura Korogi
Sturgis SD
zebrokilaura@gmail.com

Comment:

I am writing to ask that you keep the no-wake zone in place. My children and I look forward to fishing and using their Kayaks this summer and it has always been easy for the kids to kayak her

Marge Maken
Rapid City SD
Margem@rap.midco.net

Comment:

It is such a beautiful lake so why spoil it with big waves. Let the big boats go where there are lakes that let you speed.

Bill Baker
Rapid City SD
bbakesd@gmail.com

Comment:

We have plenty of lakes where we can go fast. Please keep this one for the canoes ,kayaks ,float tubes and small fishing boats. Thanks

Jessica Smith
Rapid City SD
jsgibben@gmail.com

Comment:

Deer field Lake, we need to have a lake where you can go up and relax or take kids to go kayaking, without boats trying to run you over.

Dennis Bernal
Rapid City SD
bernal tire@midconetwork.com

Comment:

If you want to go 25 miles an hour go to any of the other lakes. We don't need water skiing on Deerfield

Buddy Seiner

Pierre SD

buddy@fishstories.org

Comment:

I am animately opposed to this proposal. Please do not allow the serenity of Deerfield to be ruined by recreational wake making machines. Leave the area as it is please. Thank you.

Casey Ellerton

Custer SD

cellerton@hotmail.com

Comment:

I strongly oppose the change proposed of taking the no wake law off of Deerfield. Great way to ruin this lake.

Catherine Frey

Hill City SD

cathyatdeerfield@yahoo.com

Comment:

We live at Deerfield Lake and it would be a sad day to see some boat cruising across the lake at 25mph - we have fly fishers in floaters, kayak-ers, and paddle-boarders who would appreciate the present speed left alone - as would I.

Rob Taylor

Deadwood/Galena SD

Comment:

This is saddening. As a Blacks Hills resident, we are seeing more and more infiltration of motorized vehicles. This keeps proving that money talks and paddling/walking.....doesn't. This is our last big lake in the Hills with no wake. Please leave Deerfield Lake as is for the enjoyment of the rest of the populace that does not need to go too fast to get where we want to be. We are already there. The gentleman in the RC Journal article that wants the restriction removed even stated that the motorized lakes are too busy already. There are four lakes for "fast fishing" and pleasure boating skiing to include Angostura and Orman. Please do not add another one to that mess. Please leave Deerfield, the last big beautiful peaceful lake in the Black Hills, as is.

Dennis Anderson

Deadwood SD

Dennis_Anderson198@yahoo.com

Comment:

I have fished Deerfield for 60+ years and would hate to see the no wake requirement removed. That would destroy the serenity and peacefulness of the lake. We do not need any speed boats on that lake. Pactola and Sheridan are a zoo because of boat traffic and disrespectfullness of the boaters. Leave Deerfield the way it is, at least we can get away from the rat race that exists on the other lakes. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

James Girard

De Smet SD

jlgirard75@gmail.com

Comment:

Please do not lift the no wake zone on Deerfield Lake. Deerfield is such a beautiful and serene environment, we don't need high speed traffic on every lake in the state, let's keep this one pure.

Ken Parker

Custer SD

Comment:

Would really like to see this lake left alone on the speed and wake zone. It's a great place to take my family and enjoy no concerns of high speed watercraft around, as we kayak and fish from shore. We have a bigger fishing boat as well, and there is a place for them also. But it nice to have a go to place in the hills to enjoy peace and calm!

Travis Carlin

Custer SD

Comment:

This is one of the most peaceful lakes in the hills. No loud boats. Don't have to worry about getting swamped in my canoe. Please don't change it.

Telca Paprocki
Hot Springs SD

Comment:

LEAVE THE NO-WAKE RULE!!!!!!!!!!

Deerfield is peaceful the way it is. That is the reason my family goes there. We can have PEACE, SOLITUDE, SERENITY and kayak in a dreamland area. Taking that away will be the same as ME finding where you plan to spend a restful/relaxing/peaceful night of sleep in your bed and I WILL come around to make as much irritating LOUD noise as possible outside your window as you try to enjoy the comfort of your house. It is sad that public land agencies do not have strong leaders to protect the resource so badly deserving of protection and have lost the concept of preservation.

Bob Mayson

Lead SD

bobmatson750@gmail.com

Comment:

There are three big reservoirs in North- Mid and South Black Hills. These are big waters. Deerfield is a quiet respite for those who DO NOT want to contend with jet skis, big boats, fast speeds and big wakes. It is a place which offers refuge from that crap.

That guy from Rapid who wants to get across faster can go to the others or Sheridan Lake... OR he can get a kayak or canoe like those of us who like that way to fish and boat and paddle his ass out to where there might be some fish feeding.

That self serving attitude is what is threatening our terrific Black Hills. ... not only at Deerfield but with all of the 4 wheel bastards who get their thrill by shredding up the forests and meadows.

DO THE RIGHT THING... serve all and protect our Hills at the same time.

Thanks... Bob Matson

Tim Bjork

Rapid City SD

Bjork10@pie.midco.net

Comment:

Deerfield Reservoir is a quiet, beautiful place to get away in the Black Hills. Please leave it that way by rejecting the request to increase the speed limit. Thank you.

Ashlee May

Fairburn SD

Comment:

Keep peace at Deerfield Lake

Shawn Zinda
Edgemont SD

Comment:

keep to a no wake zone. It is the only enjoy lake around jet ski wave boats.

David Brooks
Black Hawk SD
dabrook20@gmail.com

Comment:

Boat wake would ruin the recreational activities for all the kayaks and paddle boards

Laurie Montgomery
Rapid City SD

Comment:

There are very few peaceful lakes in the Black Hills. Pactola and Sheridan have become very busy on the weekends. Deerfield needs to be left as it is, allowing those looking for serenity and quiet the one place that still offers that. Many people fish here but they don't need speed in order to do that Raising the speed limit will bring out the jetski's and power boats towing skiers and tubers. There will be more need for oversight and patrols. Don't ruin a gem. Enough of the Hills is ruined already.

Rick Mines
Laramie WY
pukwana63@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield has always been a very quiet, peaceful lake. Let's keep it that way.

Kenneth Booze
Madison SD
ken.booze@outlook.com

Comment:

I though one of the reasons for the no wake zone was to reduce the erosion of the shore line. In addition, we need to have a decent lake in the hills that we can go fishing at and not have to worry about water and jet skiers making it so that we can't fish.

Chris Stover
Rapid City SD
cbstover@outlook.cm

Comment:

Raising the speed limit on Deerfield Lake will result in one more busy, over-crowded lake. There are very few quiet places left in the Hills; let's keep Deerfield a quiet place.

Micheal Brickman
Black Hawk SD
msbrickman@hotmail.com

Comment:

Deer Field Lake is a great place to shore fish and enjoy the quiet of the area without the noise of a boat cruising across the lake. A trolling motor or rowing is adequate enough on the lake and there is no two stroke oil pollution.

Kent And Zindie Meyers
Spearfish SD
kzmeyers@spe.midco.net

Comment:

Department of Game, Fish, and Parks:

We are writing to urge the GF&P to maintain the no-wake rule at Deerfield Lake. It makes no sense for a person to argue that a quiet and peaceful, 25-minute boat ride across a quiet lake is a hardship when, at the end of the ride, he wishes to engage in quiet and peaceful fishing.

We have camped and canoed at lakes that allow speedboats. The noise and activity degrade the experience, and their unregulated allowance discriminates against people who seek the diminishing resource of quiet in our public realms. Changing the no-wake rule will attract more boats, more speed, more noise, and eventually a request for even higher speeds. There are plenty of lakes in the Black Hills where people can operate their boats at any speed they wish. Please keep Deerfield Lake one where people can enjoy the water and the surroundings as they wish, without the intrusion of mechanical noises and unnatural speeds.

Sincerely yours,
Kent and Zindie Meyers
1745 Third Street
Spearfish, SD 57783

Jukka Huhtiniemi

Hill City SD

jhuhtiniemi@gmail.com

Comment:

Dear Gary Jensen and Commissioners,

I'm writing in response to the Deerfield Lake petition for rule change which proposes an increase in boat speed from 5 to 25 mph. I strongly oppose this petition.

Deerfield Lake's length is only a little over 2 miles from the dam to Castle Creek outlet. Average width is about 0.25 miles. With 5 mph it takes only 30 min to reach any point of the lake.

I'm fishing year-round at Deerfield Lake. In the summertime, the lake's steep shores gives excellent fishing. Wintertime it is normally easy to walk to any point on the lake. Best fishing spots seem to be by the Dam and at Gold Run, which are about one mile apart.

Pactola Reservoir and Sheridan lake has been spoiled with fast boats and other gadgets. Deerfield Lake is the only one left where you can still enjoy serenity and peace, and you can safely swim, use kayaks, canoes, paddle boards etc.

Deerfield Lake is the highest elevation and has the coldest and cleanest water of all Black Hills lakes. It is one of the main drinking water sources for Rapid City. Let's keep it that way! All motorized vehicles (motorboats, ATVs, snowmobiles) are endangering the lake's situation.

Please keep Deerfield lake at 5 mph speed restriction. It is the best utilization of this resource by allowing all users the right to a serene water activity in the Black Hills. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Jukka Huhtiniemi

John Wolf

Rapid City SD

johnwolf1940@midco.net

Comment:

do not change speed on Deerfield lake. have fished the lake for 50 years without a problem. like it the way it is. five mph fine.

Ethan Stoner

Rapid City SD

ems328@me.com

Comment:

Deerfield is one of the best lakes in the hills for lazy day canoe and kayak paddles around the beautiful scenery. It's one of the few places that this can be enjoyed without having to be disturbed by jet skis and boats being operated by idiots who almost hit you every time you go out. Anyways it's a place where I have a lot of fond memories and I'd hate to see a future where those memories aren't the same.

Brett Hunter
Rapid City SD
Brettalberthunter@yahoo.com

Comment:

oppose

Julie Erickson
Rapid City SD
julie.janderso@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake provides access to quiet, peaceful lake access. Please do not change the current status.

Cher Burgess
Sundance WY
TEAMchark74@gmail.com

Comment:

Part of the charm of Deerfield Lake is the "no wake" status. The quiet, the ability to use canoes and kayaks without fear, the peacefulness of the area all contribute to the allure of the lake. Changing to allow larger motors will generate noise, attract a different clientele, and make the lake less attractive. There are lots of other places for folks to go and speed around the lake, but there is only one "no wake" opportunity in the area. Please don't change this!

Patsy Carney
Rapid City SD
tigerrose.pcs.1968@live.com

Comment:

We fish Deerfield just because there are no speed boats, party boats or jerks who just don't care about fishers.

Robert Zimmerman
Rapid City SD
Szimmerman2006@gmail.com

Comment:

I enjoy fishing, boating, and camping Deerfield reservoir. It is quiet and a very peaceful place to be in the outdoors. I often see kayaks, canoes, and other small craft because it is a nice lake where people can enjoy a lake without disturbance. It would be horrible if it were destroyed by wake board boats and other noise makers when they already have places to do closer to Rapid City. I can't understand why this rule change is even considered - please leave one lake where we can still enjoy nature.

George Kreber
Piedmont SD

Comment:

Please leave it as it is , quite and calm

Allen Harwood
Spearfish SD
Uj7895@gmail.com

Comment:

There is not enough slow speed fishing water in western SD. Removing the biggest body of water would be terrible for the users looking for peaceful fishing opportunity.

Michael Burgard
Rapid City SD
mikeburgard15@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please do not ruin a nice quiet lake. Keep the ref boats to the other options.

Lisa Modrick
Rapid City SD
Lisa@modrick.com

Comment:

Oppose allowing Wake at Deerfield Lake.

Keep the NO WAKE

Michael Beutler
Rapid City SD
rapidmikeb@yahoo.com

Comment:

It's been great having a lake to relax and fish without being bothered by other boats coming by at faster speeds. If people want to drive their boats faster they can go to Pactola or Sheridan.

Tim Brumbaugh
Rapid City SD
dakotatim@yahoo.com

Comment:

Deerfield lake 25mph. don't even try and make it more than a no wake lake it is the only one in the Black Hills where you can paddle board and kayak without fear!

Angelia Dale
Sturgis SD
imaginedale@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield has always been a quiet lake that you can get out and kayak on, take in nature without the worry of boats roaring past you.

John Roberts
Spearfish SD
jroberts256@hotmail.com

Comment:

I oppose the use of noise making, polluting, wake making vehicles at Deerfield Reservoir.

Jeanette Flood
Rapid City SD
Jeanettegg@rushmore.com

Comment:

I strongly oppose removing the no wake zone.

Dylan Laughlin
Rapid City SD

Comment:

oppose

Elijah Bezpaletz

Lead SD

Comment:

This is the one lake of solitude for everyone who enjoy peaceful camping, fishing, and any other water sport that is hindered by the wakes and noise of water sports. It is also a place where people can go and actually feel safe while using. Comparing the numerous accidents that other lake experience each year around the hills. I hate to see this lake lose it beauty. Especially due to improper representation on the subject from the populous that use the area the most. It just shows how unjust and knifing even the local government of South Dakota is anymore. Having a meeting about something so far away in the middle of a work week, without any concern of what the people acually feel. Unbelievable!

Glenda Jenniges

Custer SD

Comment:

I would like to ask you to keep in place the no-wake restriction at Deerfield Lake. As the Black Hills becomes more populated as time goes on, it is harder to find quiet places to go. Please do not change the peacefulness we still have at Deerfield. Faster and nosier fishing can be found elsewhere.

Kristina Ward

Rapid City SD

wardson@rap.midco.net

Comment:

oppose

Kevin Jenniges

Custer SD

Comment:

I am 68 years old, born and raised in the Black Hills and I am against changing the no- wake restriction at Deerfield Lake I have many fond memories of spending time at Deerfield Lake with family and friends. I feel that a change to the current ambiance of this area would be a terrible mistake. Please do not consider replacing the no-wake restriction. Thank you.

Leroy Rohrer
Rapid City SD
mlenter@yahoo.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is the only larger lake in the Hills that one can enjoy peace and quiet while fishing, kayaking, canoeing, or hiking. I go there because of this, to be away from the noise and speed of fast boats. I canoe and can reach most parts of the lake at a speed slower than 5 mph. Even though other lakes have no wake areas there are still some wakes and the noise. I shore fish mostly and wakes definitely disturb this. Once a lake is open to higher speed boats the numbers will increase and it is back to wakes splashing the shore constantly. We need one larger lake in the Black Hills that has the current tranquility of Deerfield Lake. Therefore I strongly oppose removing Deerfield Lake from no wake boating.

Kief Hansen
Rapid City SD
kiefhansen@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Emily Asher
Pierre SD
emilynasher@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please keep Deerfield as a NO WAKE lake -- the peace and serenity of this special place will be lost and buried by the roar of outboard motors, we have enough of that everywhere else.

Donna Waite
Custer SD
dkw652003@yahoo.com

Comment:

Deerfield lake is my absolute favorite lake to camp, fish, hike and horseback ride around. It is beautiful, quiet and serene. People are seen enjoying this lake by kayaking and fishing, while I'm riding one of the most beautiful trails available by horseback. We share this with bikes and hikers. There are plenty of lakes available to do speed recreation on. If someone wants to fish faster (a moronic statement really) then visit Sheridan, Pactola, Angastora or Stockade. It would increase the need for law enforcement as speed sports brings out the parties and partiers. Please leave one lake for quiet serenity and natural enjoyment. Without the sound of motors, yelling, screaming and all that goes with this. The lake trail must follow a portion of the highway also and having the increased speed boat and sports type traffic is surely going to run into some issues with this. There are enough lakes that have speed accidents, along with drownings and death, leave one that rarely sees these kinds of issues. That rarely needs the sheriff's office called for loud parties and drunken brawls. Thank you for your consideration

Tim Villa
Rpid City SD
tkgb4@hotmail.com

Comment:

Please maintain the quiet and serenity this lake provides by keeping boats at no wake speed. Even the proposed 25mph would not be adhered to on the excuse that they are just going to "fly"over there and then slow down. I have observed may times, folks not following the "No Wake" law in the marina without consequences. How could you possibly enforce this on a lake the size of Deerfield. This would leave it up to sportsmen having to turn in these offenders which would be more difficult to prove than a possession limit violation. I believe the lake access at current boat ramps give convenient access to all areas of the lake. NO WAKE!

Sarah Sharp
Rapid City SD

Comment:

This lake is a peaceful place for fishing, canoeing, and kayaking. Changing the motorboat restrictions would ruin Deerfield Lake.

Bonnie Jenniges
Rapid City SD
nmblj@hotmail.com

Comment:

Do not remove the no wake restrictions for boats on Deerfield Lake

Kathie O'Donnell
Rapid City SD
chatkat.odonnell@gmail.com

Comment:

I truly hope you will not change the no wake, 5 mph designation for Deerfield Lake. This is the only lake in the Hills that I have felt safe on in a canoe or kayak. It has also keep this area peaceful and a good place to observe eagles. I've been camping at Deerfield since the 1990's and have seen the increased use of canoes and kayaks as people seeking a quieter experience compared to Pactola and Sheridan Lakes. Please don't make this change!

Kevin Lyons
Custer SD
kmlyons1964@gmail.com

Comment:

Please keep Deerfield no wake. I enjoy the serenity of it the way it is.

Jenna Carda
Rapid City SD
jenna.carda@gmail.com

Comment:

Please keep Deerfield Lake wake free! There are SO many lakes in the Black Hills that sport fishing and speed boats can access. It's awesome to be able to take kids paddleboarding and kayaking at Deerfield without worry of a fisherman racing to "his

Lori Biel
Summerset SD

Comment:

No wake, Deerfield lake!!

Willie Hasart
St. Lawrence SD

Comment:

Both my husband and I want to vote no on changing the no wake zone on Deerfield Lake. We spend 18 years living at Hill City and spent many hours enjoying the peace and quiet there. We now live on the East side of the state where we grew up and return to Deerfield Lake to camp in the summer and the fall. We will be there in June. Even in your webpage you write "travel on the reservoir is limited to 5 miles per hour and there is a no wake restriction which provides for peaceful fishing and boating experiences. Thanks you for listening.

Edward Hague
Hill City SD
ebhague@wildblue.net

Comment:

Deerfield is one of the few places in the Hills that you can fish or enjoy the wildlife in peace. Please keep it that way!
Ed

Jim Phillips
Deadwood SD

Comment:

This correspondence is in regard to the SD Dept of GFP. Consideration of lifting the no wake zone on our beloved Deerfield Lake in the Black Hills! I have been utilizing the lake for over 60 years as have many of my relatives, friends, neighbors and visitors to our Black Hills. The main draw of the lake is the peaceful serenity and not having to put up with the high speed non-considerate, sometimes intoxicated, wake making, noisy, high powered speed boats. It boggles my mind that with the availability of Pactola Lake, Sheridan Lake, Belle Fourche Res (Orman) and Angostora that the GFP would even consider taking away the Lone Lake where people like me, my family, my friends, visitors can get away from the insane power boaters! Thanks for you time and consideration.

Judith Wegner
Pierre SD
judith.l.wegner@gmail.com

Comment:

We go to the Hills regularly and have been to Deerfield Lake many times. I'm asking the GF&P not to take the "no wake" from The Lake. The peace and serenity of keeping motorized boats off the lake is a wonderful thing. I love kayaking here and hope you listen to those of us who want to keep it as it is. Thank you.

Jason Steele
Hill City SD
js3dantkd@gmail.com

Comment:

Th

Bob Puetz
Rapid City SD
hdfatby67@yahoo.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Heather Cooper
Rapid City SD

Comment:

No comment text provided.

John Hopkins
Hill City SD
jh420900@gmail.com

Comment:

Not everything in the world has to be dictated by speed. Deerfield Lake is one of the few bodies of water where a person can safely canoe . Additionally, I am a shore fisherman and don't need continuous wakes eroding the shore, as well as disturbing the fishing.

Kara Bradeen
Custer SD
owenandmommy@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Sarah Shoop
Lead SD
ss38958@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Glenda Robertson
Rochford SD
rochfordracer@gmail.com

Comment:

The big boats already have Pactola. Deerfield is one of the few lakes that is big enough for a good kayaking run but small enough to be manageable. With big boats & wakes that would no longer be true. Please don't run this great safe & quiet waterway !!!

Wayne Burleson

Lead SD

Comment:

We just heard that people want to have the wake speed limit changed on Deerfield Lake so they can go faster. We think it would really affect all the people who like to go to the lake to camp, fish, ride their kayaks, and boat in a calm lake. It would be noisy, waves would be horrible, couldn't fish from shore. We went to Sheridan Lake once. they were having something for Fathers Day, so we went. The boats were bad enough, but the wave runners (I think that is what they are) were awful and had no respect for anyone fishing off shore. We finally pulled in our lines and left the lake and went to Deerfield for the rest of the day. Wayne is 91 and I'm 86, we have been going to Deerfield for 60 years camping with our kids when small now its grand kids (12) and great grand kids (12). What great times we have had out there. Surely there enough other lakes individuals can go to do their wild boating. Yes! we do only live about 15 miles from Deerfield which also makes it special for us. No matter where we have lived in the Hills, Deerfield has always been our destination. This has nothing to do with the speed limit, but Deerfield is also the best place in the world to ice fish. Once the ice is good we never worry about falling through always have ice house out there. Please, Please don't allow this speed limit change, We pray you hear a lot on this subject.

Jeremy Coller

Rapid City SD

Coller.jeremy@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Greg Evans

Pierre SD

Gregcarolevans@aol.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Johanna Hohle

Rochford SD

johanna.hohle@gmail.com

Comment:

Please don't allow the boaters to ruin another lake in the Black Hills

Kelli Ford

Pierre SD

Kelliford77@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Brian Felde

Lead SD

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Gerald Powers

Sturgis SD

jerry-deb@rushmore.com

Comment:

I would rather put up with 5 mph with no wake rather than have to fight someone else's wake at 25 mph. I'm been fishing at Deerfield Lake for 65 years. It is hard to still find a place to fish and enjoy using a canoe, kayak, paddle board or float tube without boats with wake boards and skiers, and jet skis trying to take you out. Yes, it does seem to take a long time to get from one end of Deerfield to the other, but I would dislike much more having to fight another boat's wake. If I want speed, there are many other lakes that I can take my boat to. Leave Deerfield the way it is, it works.

Roseanne And Mike Pahl

Custer SD

Comment:

We agree with those who were interviewed in the Rapid City Journal who opposed removing the no-wake restriction on Deerfield Lake, particularly the one who said, "The Black Hills needs places for those of us who aren't in love with motorized vehicles and want peace and quiet." Please keep Deerfield Lake peaceful and quiet.

Mark Vickers
Rapid City SD
wbg@rushmore.com

Comment:

I have lived in the Black Hills my entire life, and have fished the area extensively. I have supported trout habitat projects for the past thirty-six years.

Deerfield should maintain its 5mph speed limit for motorized watercraft. To change this regulation would effectively "ruin" the lake for many, many people. For those that wish to run jet skis, fast fishing boats, etc., there are many other lakes that can accommodate them. Thanks.

Thomas Main
Rapid City SD
mainusthm1@gmail.com

Comment:

Think of the number of the public users vs. boaters with large enough motors to run at 25 mph. Since this is a public lake do not discriminate against those hikers, kayakers, canoeists, shore fishermen in the interest of a small portion of boaters. We need at least one lake with no-wake restrictions.

Karen Perry
Pierre SD

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Linda Sandness
Rochford SD
lsandness@hotmail.com

Comment:

We have four kayaks and love to paddle at Deerfield because we don't have to fight the waves and motor noise we have experienced on other lakes in the Hills. Please, please let non-motorists have a place to enjoy. Keep the no-wake policy, please.

Misty Fish
Custer SD
Misty-may@hotmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Carla Laun
Deadwood SD

Comment:

I oppose the proposed replacement of the no wake at Deerfield Lake to the 25mph limit.

Jamie Kelley
Custer SD
Acmc700@yahoo.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Juan Rascon
Spearfish SD
juanjrasconco@gmail.com

Comment:

NO WAKE!

Marilyn Jacobsen
Canova SD
marilynjacobsen@triotel.net

Comment:

People go to Deerfield Lake to enjoy the serene beauty of the lake. If you have boats going 25 mph, we may as well give up on shore fishing which is what we can afford to do. Please do NOT lift the no wake status of the lake. Preserve what we have....PLEASE!

Lorene Bowling
Rapid City SD
lorenebowling4@yahoo.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Don Burger
Rapid City SD

Comment:

People go to Deerfield to camp hike, canoe, etc. because of the solitude. It is still available to all to use, if you're fishing it may take a little longer to get to your spot. Please do not remove the restriction!!

Vickie Dowdy
Spearfish SD

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Paul Nelson
Rapid City SD
wmbell1772@gmail.com

Comment:

Please keep the Deerfield Lake no wake rule in force. Keep Deerfield Lake a quiet place to visit.

Wendy Siroshon
Hill City SD
Manager@mtmeadow.com

Comment:

As manager of Mt. Meadow Store and Campground, located across the road from Deerfield Lake, I do not want to see the no wake restriction lifted. Deerfield Lake is home to many in the area that enjoy the peaceful serenity Deerfield Lake has to offer. We have many returning campers and hunters in the area as well fisherman, come here for the sportsman atmosphere the lake has to offer. To lift the restriction means the kayakers and paddle boarders and the shore fishing enthusiasts will have to find a different spot that doesn't disrupt the serenity and tranquility Deerfield Lake offers. There are plenty of other lakes for boaters that want to speed through to enjoy themselves! Lifting the wake restriction will also cause an increase in accidents and I foresee problems with patrolling the lake to enforce any speed limit over 5mph.

Please consider this when voting about lifting the no wake restriction. Please don't take away the peaceful, serene beauty and family enjoyment of Deerfield Lake!

Do Not lift the restriction!!!!

Rick And Susi Ehrett
Alliance NE
sydney4321@msn.com

Comment:

Oppose

Moses Ward
Lead SD
moses.ward@gmail.com

Comment:

My family and I frequently enjoy kayaking and fishing on Deerfield Lake and we do not support raising the speed limit on the lake to 25mph. There are other lakes in the Black Hills that are closer to our home but we always make the trek to Deerfield because it offers the quiet, peaceful recreational experience that we cannot get anywhere else. Keeping the speed limit at 5mph will not prevent anyone from enjoying the great recreational opportunities at Deerfield lake, but raising it to 25mph will have a huge negative impact on the people who are there to enjoy the peaceful, natural beauty of the lake and surrounding land.

Mr. Edel states in his petition, that he is requesting this change because he finds the fishing conditions at Pactola and Sheridan unacceptable because of the wakes caused by the ski boats and jet skis. I am not sure how he expects the very same conditions he complains about on the other lakes not to occur on Deerfield if the speed limit is raised. This position seems completely illogical.

Additionally, how would the new speed limit proposed by Mr. Edel be enforced? Currently it is not difficult for GPF employees to determine if a boat is making a wake or not while traversing the lake. How would GPF employees determine whether a boat towing a skier is going 25mph or 35mph? Would this change require there be additional personnel, equipment, and training at taxpayer expense?

I hope you will consider carefully, the unique recreational environment that Deerfield Lake offers and reject this proposal.

Very Best Regards,

Moses Ward
Lead, SD

Jennifer Becker
Rapid City SD
Jnjbecker@icloud.com

Comment:

This lake is small and does not need to be turned into a speedway for boats. It is the right size for kayaks and if you get multiple boats speeding around who knows what could happen... nothing good that's for sure. We go to Deerfield to relax and take in the beauty of the stillness, if we want to boat we go to a bigger lake. PLEASE DO NOT remove the no wake status.

Matthew Heard

Burbank SD

matthewdheard@gmail.com

Comment:

It's silly to propose such a thing. One of the gems of the hills. Don't ruin it by allowing wakes.

Dana Daniels

Alliance NE

daniels.dana63@gmail.com

Comment:

We own a vacation home at Mt Meadows Resort and use the lake frequently year round. We love the quietness of the lake and the surroundings and feel that the increased speed would be not only noise pollution but will ruin the lake as a fishing and kayaking lake.

Steven Pierce

Hermosa SD

Comment:

oppose

Liz Daniels

Alliance NE

danielsliz66@outlook.com

Comment:

We own a vacation home at Mt Meadows at Deerfield Lake. We use the lake year round. We love the quietness of the area. We enjoy the fishing and kayaking that the lake provides and feel that an increased speed would ruin the quietness and the lake itself. As well as be a negative impact to the wildlife, especially the eagles that nest in the area.

Eleisha Dooley

Custer SD

erdooley49@hotmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Heather Harvey

Gillette WY

heatherharvey@hotmail.com

Comment:

I strongly oppose the proposed replacement of Deerfield Lakes no-wake restriction. Our family travels to the Deerfield Lake area almost every weekend April-October. We are from Wyoming and we bring revenue to the area via boat registrations, ORV permits, lodging, Michelson passes and Park passes etc... We are avid outdoor enthusiast and enjoy the peace and solitude that the Deerfield area provides. The hiking trails around the lake provide a tranquil hike listening to the birds and wildlife. We thoroughly enjoy kayaking and fishing on the lake and have seen a significant increase in kayaking, paddle board and canoeing over the past couple of years. The magic of Deerfield lake is that it offers non-motorized water enthusiasts to enjoy the water peacefully. This also allows people to canoe and kayak across the lake more safely as the fishing boats are going slow. Fisherman typically prefer a more quiet atmosphere while enjoying there sport. By providing this to the population, this provides options for all outdoor enthusiasts.

There are lakes for waterskiing, jet skiing and boating for those who enjoy that. For example, Pactola Reservoir and Sheridan Lake. These lakes are well known for water sports such as tubing, waterskiing and jet skiing. When you visit these areas, you will notice the noise level from the boats, people etc... which is wonderful, if that is what you prefer. Not everyone enjoys that atmosphere though. By keeping the no-wake restriction on Deerfield Lake, you are providing a peaceful retreat for the non-motorized water enthusiast to enjoy their sports in a tranquil setting.

Please consider this proposal carefully as I truly believe that the no-wake restriction is what draws so many of us to the area. Please keep this option open for those who prefer solitude.

Sincerely,
Heather Harvey

Darrell Pulscher

Sturgis SD

dpulscher@gmail.com

Comment:

Speed boaters have enough places to play. Nice to have a quiet place for folks to enjoy.

Connie Wolters

Hill City SD

conniewolter@gmail.com

Comment:

My husband occasionally fishes the lake and I have done swimming and kayaking. It is a relatively small lake and a tranquil site in our beloved Black Hills. Boating will contaminate the atmosphere, the water and the pristine beauty of the lake. The noise level will explode, the fishermen will leave, the eagles will leave, the deer will leave, and all the other natural beauties will be robbed of their living and nesting sites. Please oppose this change that is being introduced!

Scott Gengler
Rapid City SD

Comment:

I am VEHEMENTLY OPPOSED to petitioner Ken Edel's proposal. Deerfield's most valuable resource is its tranquility. His proposal would ruin this Black Hills haven with increased noise and traffic, just like countless others already destroyed by the exponential increase in ATV's.

Jessica Gladson
Gillette WY
Jgladson4@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Shane Augeson
Milan MN
saugeson@icloud.com

Comment:

When we originally decided on a place in the BlackHills to have our home away from home the quiet calm waters of Deerfield were at the top of our list. If it were up to me a complete ban of any motor on the lake would be fine with me. We need places free of the modern conveniences of everyday life. I love the fact that I can spend time at the lake away from crowds of fishing boats or recreational joy rides at any time of day. Please leave well enough alone and keep the NO WAKE LAKE rule in place!!!! There are hundreds of other lakes to take your fishing boats on. Enjoy the fishing at DeerField from the shore or in a canoe. I know the trout wouldn't mind either!!

Shane Augeson
Concerned Resident @ Mt Meadow

Walter Thompson
Rochford SD
Hippiesbo@gmail.com

Comment:

I believe we need at least one lake where you don't have to worry about getting run down by boats going o we idle

Amber Linneweber
Box Elder SD

Comment:

No wake at Deerfield!!

Phil Harvey
Gillete WY
Bighornhiker@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is a special place. In addition to its beauty and ample fishing, it provides a quiet place to slow down and enjoy nature.

My wife and I love to kayak on Deerfield Lake. The tranquility we find there is priceless. We live in Wyoming, but spend a lot of time in the hills of SD. We have tried kayaking at Pactola and Sheridan Lakes, but the larger, faster boats make it difficult to enjoy.

I understand some people like the larger boats and like to go fast; that's fine, and there are places for that.

However, there are also a lot of people that like to slow down and enjoy the outdoors.

Please keep the no-wake restriction in place.

Sincerely,

Phil Harvey

Mark Thalacker
Rapid City SD
healinghands@rap.midco.net

Comment:

There needs to be a quite place in the Hills to paddle.

Jack Gray
Rapid City SD
jackosgray@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose lifting the no wake restriction. Deerfield is the one lake in the Black Hills that is peaceful for shore fishing and paddle sports such as kayaks, canoes, paddle boards. Paddlers don't have to fight waves made by boaters that are in a hurry to get somewhere. Sheridan, Pactola, Angustora, Orman all allow speed boats and jet skis. Deerfield is the one peaceful lake where you don't have to listen to a boat motor and its noise pollution. Please keep it the way it has been for many generations to come.

Duane Claypool
Miles City MT
claypool@midrivers.com

Comment:

I request that the Commission deny/vote down the proposal to change Deerfield Lake from a No Wake lake.

Heather McNitt

Hill City SD

Heathermarie28@hotmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is a quiet peaceful lake people love going to. I work at Deerfield lake resort and campground, I have been working there for about 5 years now, I get calls all the time from people excited that there is a no wake lake they can come to get away from all the speed boats and water skiing. I also love to take a drive and sitting there and it's so peaceful

Kevin McNitt

Hill City SD

mcnittk@hotmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield lake is a beautiful lake as it is, I routinely take my canoe up there fishing and if the boats are allowed to make a wake it will make taking my canoe out on the lake difficult. There are plenty of lakes in the black hills that allow a wake, we don't need another one. So put your boat in the water and drop a line and troll around and enjoy what makes this lake unique.

Aaron Ladner

Whitewood SD

aaroneggs@yahoo.com

Comment:

Speeding boats and jet skis pose a major nuisance and potential safety hazard. There are other reservoirs in the area to accommodate those who wish to boat or ski. Deerfield is the last reservoir in the hills for anglers trying to get away from jet skis and speedboats and spend a peaceful day fishing. Please keep it that way.

Debby Crowley

Custer SD

Petsville5@aol.com

Comment:

It will not be a pleasurable place to kayak, canoe or swim if higher powered boats are allowed on Deerfield Lake.

The calmness and serenity of a no wake lake will be ruined. You see lots of wildlife and waterfowl on a quiet body of water.

Some things are not meant to be combined.

Ami Schlosser
Spearfish SD
schlossa11@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose removing the no wake restriction on Deerfield Lake. Deerfield lake is a tranquil and peaceful get-away that will be negatively impacted by noise and speed of motor boats. It's deep in the hills and away from towns and population - and that's what makes it the most relaxing lake in the hills. Please keep the Deerfield Lake no wake restriction in place.

Reda Chambers
Custer SD
missreda@cox.net

Comment:

The last thing the Hills needs is another lake crammed full of drunken jet skiers and party animal speed boaters. Deerfield is and always has been a quiet fishing lake. Don't take this last refuge for the serious outdoorsman (and woman) away!

Matthew Scott
Whitewood SD
matthewcscott81@gmail.com

Comment:

Keep this lake a no wake zone. The black Hills are overrun with to much noise as it is.

Richard Lambert
Hill City SD
lambertbj_2@hotmail.com

Comment:

The only reason we bought a place across from Deerfield Lake was for our grandchildren to enjoy the lake with fishing and kayaking. We have enjoyed the peacefulness of the lake and beauty of it. Please do not remove the no-wake! There are a lot larger lakes around for people who wants speed to enjoy.

Nichole Oldani
St Charles MO
spamfree78@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Cody Asher

Pierre SD

cody.asher@state.sd.us

Comment:

Let the canoes and john boats reign! and have their peace and quiet :)

Valerie Brandsted

Rapid City SD

Valerie.brandsted@yahoo.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Troy Emerson

Hill City SD

troy@msn.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

David Braun

Pierre SD

trackertarga2002@yahoo.com

Comment:

I am from the Black Hills and have fished Deerfield Lake many times. Simply stated Deerfield is not large enough to allow a wake zone upon the water. Please do not pass this change. Thank You

Sharon Frohme

Hill City SD

sharonfrohme@gmail.com

Comment:

First, Deerfield was made for a "fishing" lake. If boaters want to speed, go to one where they can. Leave Deerfield alone, it gets enough traffic as it is. Also speed boats are disruptive to shore fishermen as well.

Tony Hague

Piedmont SD

thague@commoncentsstores.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Kelsey Bean

Custer SD

Beankelsey07@gmail.com

Comment:

Please keep this lake a quiet and beautiful place.

Bonnie Guerre

Hill City SD

bonnieguerre22@gmail.com

Comment:

Please keep Deerfield Lake a no-wake lake as it is now. It is ideal for kayaking and canoeing whereas it is too dangerous to enjoy these activities at Sheridan and Pactola Lakes. Thank You.

Lander Legge

Rapid City SD

lander.legge@outlook.com

Comment:

As a fisherman I already have a hard time finding any places in the Hills that are semi quiet to fish. Pactola and Sheridan are both ruined for 3/4 of the year during tourist season because of the higher speed limits. Keep Deerfield pure and quiet. The hills are supposed to be a place to avoid the loud noises of engines and everything. And we're running out of those quiet spots because of silly rules and tourists... If the tourists and people making these rules obey'd the rules to begin with that would be one thing but they never do. They come to the hills litter, be loud, and ruin the beauty my home. Please keep Deerfield's speed limits at 5mph max from now to the end of time. We need to have one QUIET major lake out of the 3. Balance in everything. Please don't make this massive mistake.

Darwin Sage

Pierre SD

egasniwrad@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Dawnette Owens

Hill City SD

Comment:

I read with horror, the article in today's Rapid City Journal regarding the proposal to remove Deerfield Lake's no-wake restriction. I urge you to keep Deerfield as a no-wake lake. As a long-time resident of the Hill City area, I love being able to visit Deerfield Lake for a quiet, relaxing experience. I actually spent some time at Deerfield last Wednesday afternoon and snapped a picture of the lake that was almost identical to the one that appeared on today's cover of the Journal. My husband and I own and operate the Annie Lode Coffee Cabin outside of Hill City. Many of our customers stop by the coffee shop on their way to or from Deerfield Lake with their kayaks or fishing rods in tow. They choose Deerfield specifically because of the no-wake policy. The Black Hills area is becoming noisier every summer (the Sturgis Rally, the increasing popularity of side-by-side four wheelers) I love living in the Hills because of its beauty, which includes its natural sights as well as its sounds. Nature's "voice" in the Hills is becoming harder to hear every year. Maintaining Deerfield Lake's current status is not a life or death situation. People on both sides of the issue will survive either way. However, it is a quality of life issue, and I hope that our beautiful Deerfield Lake remains no-wake.

Dennis Tuschen

Sioux Falls SD

Dtuschen@sio.midco.net

Comment:

This is a fishing lake, let's keep it peaceful

Patricia Nelson

Hill City SD

pknelson1231@hotmail.com

Comment:

Do not change the no wake restriction at Deerfield Lake.

Cheryl Whetham
Hill City SD

Comment:

I'm writing in response to the Deerfield Lake petition for rule change which proposes an increase in boat speed from 5 to 25 mph. I oppose this change. Deerfield lake's current no-wake restrictions allows a calm body of water for different water activities; fishing, canoeing, kayaking, swimming, floating on air mattresses, etc. Speed in getting from one fishing location to another is not mandatory and therefore allows all participants to enjoy the lake. The maximum distance from the east end of the lake to the west end is 2.3 miles and the average width of the lake is .25 miles. Therefore, it requires less than 30 minutes to go anywhere on the lake at 5mph. It is getting harder and harder to enjoy the serenity of the Black Hills. Whether hiking, biking, or kayaking in the hills, it seems the noise pollution from ATV's, dirt motorbikes, motorboats, jet skis and other motorized vehicles increases yearly on forest roads, lakes and even Centennial Trail (the damage caused to our forest roads and trails will be around for generations and the cost to the taxpayers is far greater than the tax revenue generated from these permits.) It's extremely difficult to enjoy kayaking on Pactola or Sheridan lake where the speed boats and jet skis with the consequential wakes and traffic make for dangerous kayaking. Keeping the lakes at different speed restrictions is a good compromise for all users. Please keep Deerfield lake at 5mph speed restriction. It is the best utilization of this resource by allowing all users the right to the serene water activity in the Black Hills. Thank you.

Sharon Allard
Spearfish SD
hagar03@midco.net

Comment:

Part of the beauty of Deerfield Lake is the peace and quiet of not having boat motors and jet skis roaring around. Please do not take that away.

Carol Evans
Pierre SD
Gregcarolevans@aol.com

Comment:

Leave as is there are plenty of lakes for wakes

Nick Jenniges
Rapid City SD
nmblj@hotmail.com

Comment:

We need to keep Deerfield lake a no wake law lake. We have three lakes in and around the Black Hills where people can go to ski or just to use speed boats. Keep Deerfield a no wake lake. It would ruin the peace and quiet that Deerfield Lake now offers if this law is passed.

David Guerre

Hill City SD

daveguerrearts@gmail.com

Comment:

No-wake speed should remain at 5 mph to allow maximum use of the lake by all motorized and non-motorized water activities. The lake is approximately 2.3 miles long, but only 0.25 miles wide. My driveway is 0.25 miles long and I walk it every day. Surely a boater can boat that distance without it being a hardship. Also, 25 mph allows for intrusive jet ski and water ski wake and noise. I personally know of a local kayaking student who drown there due to wind and high waves. Incidents would increase with high speed motorized watercraft. Finally, please preserve the restricted eagle nesting area on the lake.

David Guerre

Hill City SD

daveguerrearts@gmail.com

Comment:

Leave it at 5 mph

Tom Inman

23535 Ditch Creek Rd. Dearfield SD

tom.inman@state.sd.us

Comment:

As a property owner by Deerfield lake (23535 Ditch creek Rd.) I strongly disagree with increasing the speed limit on the lake. It is perfect the way it is our family and friends paddle boat and kayak on the lake. For SAFETY reasons, for WILDLIFE habit, and to protect shore erosion Please leave the 5 MPH limit in place. Thank You

Rochelle Dokken

Pierre SD

docnrocky@icloud.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Larry Talley

Rapid City SD

larrytalley@rushmore.com

Comment:

I support restricting the spearing of largemouth and smallmouth bass year-round. In the past, Pactola had a decent bass fishery. Then came the option to spear these fish and now we have a depressed population of bass. I feel the commission has an opportunity to make this regulation change and it will provide angler opportunity for another type of fishing on Pactola.

Darci Collins
Hill City SD
drae1@q.com

Comment:

Please do not remove the No-wake restriction on Deerfield lake. The peaceful quiet of the lake is the reason so many people love it. I've kayaked, fished, camped and enjoyed the no- wake for over 45 years. it would ruin the experience if there are speed boaters on the lake. Please don't change the rules. Deerfield lake is like heaven

Karla Haagenson
Custer SD
karlahaagenson@gmail.com

Comment:

I love that Deerfield Lake is a no wake zone. As a year round resident, I love that we have a place to go to get away from some of the fast boats. Skiing, tubing, some of these get dangerous on a busy day. Maybe a 10 mph compromise would be good. Keep it under a skiing or tubing speed.

Larry Talley
Rapid City SD
larrytalley@rushmore.com

Comment:

I support changing the 5-mph restriction on Deerfield Reservoir to 25-mph. This lake is an under utilized resource because of this outdated & impractical speed restriction. Pactola and Sheridan Lakes are becoming so congested with recreational activity, we need to expand fishing activity to Deerfield, the second largest lake in the Black Hills.

Raising the speed limit to 25-mph would allow boaters to reach their fishing destination in a timely manner. Due to the condition of the roads down to the ramps, I do not feel that there would be a great increase in the number of boaters. And, the concern for serenity and peacefulness is a non-issue, as there are already snowmobiles and 4-wheelers speeding across the lake at unrestricted speeds during the winter.

This change should be made to allow the public a chance to use and enjoy this resource, not just the few locals that live by it.

Deb Murray
Chancellor SD
ddmurray_@hotmail.com

Comment:

We vacation summer and winter near Deerfield Lake and enjoy this Great Lake for fishing (shoreline and in inter tubes) canoeing and Kyaking. Why change it? You can still fish from a boat- just enjoy the tranquility while getting to that special spot.

Marsha McClain

Rapid City SD

marsha.d.mcclain@gmail.com

Comment:

I have a cabin close to Deerfield Lake specifically because it is a no-wake lake. We like to go fishing there and my family canoes, and likes to use belly boats. If those speed can't go fast enough, there are soooo many more lakes for them to go to. Please leave us our peacefull lake.

Gary Drewes

Rapid City SD

gary.drewes@gmail.com

Comment:

I am opposed to changing Deerfield Lake from a no wake zone lake.
Pennington County commissioner, Gary Drewes

Jo Nelson

Rapid City SD

Comment:

This is one of the last peaceful lakes in the Black Hills where you can hike, fish from the shore, kayak, canoe, or a host of other activities without hearing the roar of boat engines or fear of being run over by a speeding boat driver who fails to see you.

Eric Zimmer

Rapid City SD

ericzimmer@gmail.com

Comment:

Stay Glassy, Deerfield!

I strongly urge the SDGF&P not to change the speed limit or undo the "no wake zone" rule at Deerfield Reservoir. As you know, the Black Hills have four major reservoirs. High-speed boating is permitted at Pactola, Sheridan, and Angostura. Deerfield is the only lake where paddlers can go to avoid spending the whole day fighting waves from speedboats and their wakes. Kayakers, canoeists, and slow-boat anglers love Deerfield because it's the only large body of water that stays glassy and smooth. The water is clear, the lake is quiet, and the relaxation is there -- precisely because boat traffic is kept to a minimum.

Boaters should have ample opportunities to cruise. Luckily, they do -- at three lakes. The rest of us should also be able to keep our good place to paddle in peace. Please keep Deerfield glassy!

Aaron Costello

Rapid City SD

aaron_c_costello@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please keep the top boat speed at Deerfield Reservoir at 5 MPH. Deerfield is a unique and enjoyable place to quietly enjoy a peaceful body of water. The petitioner wishes to increase the allowable top speed so he can reach his fishing spot more quickly, yet he laments being driven off other reservoirs in the Black Hills by choppy water created by other recreational users. The petitioner's proposal has the potential to create that same situation at Deerfield. Keep Deerfield a gem of the Black Hills by denying the petition and retaining the 5 MPH top speed.

Rochelle Zens

Black Hawk SD

rochellenae@gmail.com

Comment:

Please keep the current wake restrictions at Deerfield Lake in place. My husband and I enjoy going camping at the lake, and we thoroughly enjoy the tranquility that it offers us. We often choose to camp at this lake (and pay the associated camping fees) specifically because it is more quiet than either Pactola or Sheridan. Deerfield is a little gem and lifting the wake restriction would ruin it.

Andrew Zens

Black Hawk SD

andrewzens05@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield has always been a nice, quiet spot to go to for camping, fishing, and canoeing. Lifting the wake restriction would ruin that experience. Keep the current wake restriction in place.

Glenn Graff

Rapid City SD

Comment:

keep the rule the way it is. very peaceful lake. keep it that way please.

Douglas Thomas

Black Hawk SD

dougt@rushmore.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is one of the few lakes left in western So. Dakota where one can fish, kayak and enjoy the peace and quiet of nature. I STRONGLY OPPOSE this proposal.

Jason Schneider

Spearfish SD

**Jason.R.Schneider@yellowjackets.
bhsu.edu**

Comment:

It allows a tranquil spot for the non-motorized outdoorsman to get away from the water sports. If the no-wake zone policy is removed than spearfishing could be allowed in the future. This would hurt the fish populations in a small lake.

Barbara Walker

Rapid City SD

Comment:

Greetings:

The news that the state Game, Fish & Parks Commission is entertaining a proposal to lift the no-wake restriction on Deerfield Lake is deeply troubling.

The proposal would limit speed on Deerfield Lake to 25 mph, but that begs the question, Who is going to enforce the speed limit? And why should those of us who love Deerfield Lake just as it is lose this precious and rare resource?

Moreover, as a kayaker who was once nearly plowed into head-on by an adolescent driving a personal watercraft on another South Dakota lake, I find the prospect of having to dodge powerboats on a lake that has long been a safe haven for paddlers alarming and unacceptable.

As Seth Tupper's May 19 story in the Rapid City Journal points out, operators of motorized watercraft have most of the area in the central Black Hills' two other large lakes in which to run at high speeds. According to the story, one such angler "resents being deprived of an opportunity to motor around Deerfield at a reasonably high rate of speed."

Yet this individual apparently has no qualms about depriving those who seek more-tranquil recreation of opportunities to enjoy their own outdoor pursuits in the peace and quiet they find at Deerfield Lake. I believe it's safe to say that attitude sparks plenty of counter-resentment.

Those of us who value stillness and find wholeness in listening to birdsong, observing wildlife (including aquatic life) and appreciating nature in a pristine, protected setting are as deserving as others of spaces in which to thrive and enjoy the benefits the Black Hills offer. South Dakota laws, policies and public-dollar expenditures must consider the recreational needs of all residents and visitors, not simply those who have the biggest, fastest, loudest toys.

Certain trails in the Hills are off-limits to ATVs and snowmobiles to accommodate the rights and wishes of hikers and cyclists to pursue their human-powered activities free of the noise, disruption and potential hazards of motorized vehicles. It is not asking too much that Deerfield Lake, whose use has long been restricted for the benefit of those who similarly seek to restore their spirits on the water, remain such a refuge.

A view expressed in the Journal story that no one benefits from the absence of noise- and wake-producing motorboats is not only preposterous and small-minded, it is also stunningly arrogant and insulting.

I implore the commission to leave Deerfield Lake's no-wake restriction in place. Once it's gone, it's gone.

Candy Allen
Hill City SD
Candyclaire1960@hotmail.com

Comment:

Please do not make Deerfield Lake like all the other lakes and remove the no wake status. I spend a great deal of time kayaking on Deerfield Lake and enjoy the no wake. There is nothing worse than being rocked because a boat went speeding past you. You at that point hope that you stay up right and don't get dumped. If I wanted that experience I'd kayak on Sheridan or Pactola lakes. I like the fact that I can take my grand daughter out in the kayak with me (she's 7) and not have to worry about a speeding boat rocking us to death or not see us and there fore hit us. Deerfield Lake is a wonderful lake just the way it is and I enjoy the fact that it is quiet and peaceful. We already have two lakes that allow fast boats, if I want to experience that I would go to those lakes. Please leave a lake where we can enjoy the Eagles, and Osprey and the peace and quiet and safe kayaking and canoeing! Thank you.

Dana Schubauer
Spearfish SD
Danaschubauer@outlook.com

Comment:

I oppose lifting the no wake restriction on Deer Field Lake. This lake is not large enough to support large wake creating boats and would ruin an otherwise docile place within our Black Hills. As kayakers we use this lake often as it offers safety and tranquility. Please continue wake restriction!

Kelly Strong
Rapid City SD
kstrong1234@hotmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Connie Fish
Rapid City SD
ean32nitrox@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Mitchell Joldersma

Sioux Falls SD

**mjoldersma@siouxempirepaddlers
.org**

Comment:

We make a family trip once a year to the hills. This reservoir is one of the last no wake lakes we can enjoy peace and natural beauty of the hills. Sometimes get lucky watching eagles. The hills has plenty of other places for boats speeding around like pactola. Unfortunately we can't paddle their after 11am for sake of my families safety so please consider all forms of recreation the hills can provide I'd Deerfield remains as a no wake reservoir.

To I Moriston

Sioux Falls SD

moriston_t@yahoo.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Paul Bosworth

Spearfish SD

pbosworth@fs.fed.us

Comment:

This would totally ruin Deerfield Lake. For the following reasons:

1. Currently it is a very peaceful lake. Motor boat and jet ski sounds travel long distance on water. The camping, hiking/mt biking on a Forest Service Trail around the lake, fishing on shore or in a float tube would be destroyed by the sound of boats motoring all around the lake.
2. This would turn into a water skiing jet skiing lake and be dangerous for float tubing and kayaking. I no longer will go to Pactola Lake because it is a zoo out there on the weekends and not safe.
3. Impossible to enforce the speed limit. I don't believe the Game and Fish has the money to station a CO on the lake and I know people would push the limit on the speed.
4. At 25 mph most boats create a huge wake. The whole lake will be rough and no longer fun to be on a kayak. Not to mention dangerous has mentioned.
5. Small boats will be overrun by the larger boats. This gives the people with a smaller boat the opportunity to enjoy the lake without the threat of being buzzed by a large boat. Believe me this happens on larger lakes and it will ruins my day.
6. Poor reasoning to change the rule just to save the guy with the 75,000 boat 20 minutes. Sometimes you should have to work for your fish.
7. Global warming is happening and we are causing it. Lets be proactive and not contribute to the cause by allowing motor boats to cruise all around the lake just because they can.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Kenneth Miller
Hill City SD
Millerkw@msn.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Glenise Mille
Hill City SD
Millekw@msn.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Michelle Detry
Albuquerque NM
mdetry@yahoo.com

Comment:

I grew up in South Dakota and I have many wonderful memories of fishing, swimming and hiking at Deerfield Lake. My parents still live in Rapid City and I bring my husband and two daughters to Black Hills to spend time in the beauty of the Hills. We love Deerfield Lake because it is peaceful and beautiful. We go to Deerfield because we don't have to listen to boats or worry about the wake from the motors. We can fish, nap, swim, float and picnic in peace. Please do not increase the wake limit.

Laura Bosworth
Spearfish SD

Comment:

I don't not want the no wake restrictions lifted on Deerfield lake. It is the only large lake in the hills that is no wake and i enjoy kayaking on it with out worry.

Lucille Howey
Hill City SD
lou-howey@q.com

Comment:

This is the one lake in the Black Hills that can be enjoyed with out all of the noise of loud boats. A lot of people enjoy kayaking and canoeing on a quiet lake. Hard to do with boats speeding by.

Amber Braithwaite

Sioux Falls SD

amber.braithwaite67@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose the lifting of the wake rule on Deerfield Reservoir. There are plenty of other options in the Hills for motorboats and other water sports. Please preserve the tranquility of this Reservoir for generations to come.

Roger&Barbara Nelson

Mankato MN

nelson1025@charter.net

Comment:

We want to see Deerfield Lake remain calm, quiet and pristine.
We do not want to see faster and noisy boats and jet skis on this beautiful pristine lake.

Josh O

Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

I am opposed to removing the no wake zone at Deerfield Reservoir. We need more areas that are paddle friendly in this state. Boats with engines have plenty of places to go otherwise and they are noisy and pollute the water and air.

Mike Chase

Custer SD

bechases@gwtc.net

Comment:

I am one who opposes the elimination of the no-wake restriction on Deerfield Lake. Deerfield Lake is the largest lake with the five-mile restriction and many of us who want a peaceful lake outing go there. There is no reason to have a higher speed limit on the lake. For those who prefer water sports, the Hills and the state have plenty of lakes where they can ski and jet ski. For those who fish, it is nice to have a quiet lake to fish, either from shore or boat. If the only reason you are looking at changing the no-wake restriction is so one retired person can get around the lake quicker, than think of the hundreds of people who prefer the no-wake restriction. I am not even retired and still have time to enjoy the smooth water of the lake.

Please keep the no-wake restriction on Deerfield Lake and give those of us who are not always in a hurry a peaceful place to spend our valuable time off from work.

Karl Schwab
Rapid City SD
Kmschwab77@gmail.com

Comment:

Please retain the no-wake zone on Deerfield Lake. Deerfield is the only lake in the Black Hills that is not overrun by motorized water craft. It is the only lake that provides respite from the incessant roar of boat motors. Please leave one lake where people can go to enjoy the peace and tranquility of nature.

Danielle Evers
Pipestone MN
dani.evers11@gmail.com

Comment:

Areas like these provide refuge for people who prefer to have some quality recreational areas to peacefully place to paddle, fish, and enjoy nature. Many quality recreational areas do not have wake restrictions so its nice to have an option without.

A C
Rochford SD

Comment:

There is NO reason this needs to change. It does not take long to get around and it would be a danger to others if the speed changes from no wake to wake.

Carie Schneider
Yankton SD
cjopolis@yahoo.com

Comment:

Something similar was proposed for Lake Yankton, and it was defeated. Keep at least some of our lakes calm and peaceful. And safer. If you're swimming or just a few inches away from the water's surface (kayaking), do you really want the roar, wake, and gas fumes of a drunk boater potentially drowning you, or polluting your air? I think not. Thank you.

Maud Hopkins
Rochford SD
sixcountysearchllc@outlook.com

Comment:

Please leave at least one area that is quiet and calm for people to enjoy. We have enough noise and speed in the hills due to ATVs, speed boats and snow mobiles. Fishermen and canoe advocates need a place to actually enjoy nature instead chaos.

Elizabeth Krueger

Spearfish SD

ekrueger@rushmore.com

Comment:

I would prefer to see the speed limit on Deerfield Lake stay at 5 mph. It's quieter and a better place for non-motorized boating this way. Those who want to go faster have ample opportunities at Pactola, Sheridan, Angostura, etc. Thanks.

Adrian Sween

Hill City SD

apsween@yahoo.com

Comment:

It is a pristine lake for campers, picnickers, canoeists, kayakers and fisherman to enjoy.

David Maudlin

Hill City SD

bhfinancial@aol.com

Comment:

Deerfield is a place for peace and quiet, fishing and family activities - always has been and always should be. Lived here and have enjoyed Deerfield for 62 years. The proposed 25 mph limit is TOO much for that area. That just invites the party crowds and water skiing. Those activities have their place available at Pactola.

Dan Miller

Pierre SD

Carlsbait@midconetwork.com

Comment:

Leave it alone!

Sybil Rounds

Rapid City SD

cwskrounds@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield is one of the few remaining serene outdoor activity areas and should remain that way. There are many opportunities for speedboat enthusiasts on other area lakes and reservoirs. Deerfield provides a wonderful natural outdoor experience for shore fishermen, hikers, kayakers, canoes, etc. The no wake designation should NOT be removed.

Carol Merwin
Rapid City SD

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is a wonderfully quiet place to restore one's spirit. There are plenty of other places to use faster boats. The noise will affect the hiking trails as well and being in nature is part of what keeps us human. Young people deserve the chance for non-human dominated experiences. I do not want to lose a place to more speed and noise. Please. Just say "no"

Nancy Clary
Rapid City SD

Comment:

We read your article in the RC Journal about lifting the "no wake" restriction on Deerfield Lake. We are opposed to the idea, and want it to remain a no wake area. Our family spent many weekends and summers at Deerfield Lake, fishing and camping. It was very nice to have smooth water and a quiet setting for our family outings with our little pontoon boat. Opening the lake to speed boats would cause this serene lake to be just as choppy as the larger lakes Pactola, Sheridan, and Angustora, increasing the noise level and the potential for capsizing smaller boats such as the kayaks and canoes that use the lake on a daily basis. Please keep Deerfield as a no wake area, particularly for smaller watercraft. There are many other lakes where speed is common, servicing those who ski and operate jet skis. We used both Deerfield and Center Lake for fishing, and skipped Sheridan and Pactola, as well as Orman Dam. It worked for our family. We look forward to going to the lakes again this summer and enjoy the varied activities offered. Thank you for these things!

Pat Casteel
Sturgis SD

Comment:

I am definitely against removing the no-wake on Deerfield Lake! That is the main reason we go to Deerfield Lake is because we can fish off the bank and we can also use the pontoon, our young kids can use their kayaks, water boards with out fear of being run over or tipped over. Four years ago, we went to Sheridan Lake and the camping was wonderful till we got down to the fishing ramp and a boat went by pulling an inner tube and the wave was so big it rocked the fishing ramp and my nephew lost his fishing pole into the water. The water was so dirty we could not even see the pole to retrieve it. I have not returned to there because of all the waves from the boats and ski-do's, also the noise is terrible. I love the quietness and calmness of the lake and am refreshed after spending weekends at the Deerfield Lake.

Jerry Casteel
Sturgis SD

Comment:

I am definitely against removing the no-wake on Deerfield Lake! That is the main reason we go to Deerfield Lake is because we can fish off the bank and we can also use the pontoon, our young kids can use their kayaks, water boards with out fear of being run over or tipped over. Four years ago, we went to Sheridan Lake and the camping was wonderful till we got down to the fishing ramp and a boat went by pulling an inner tube and the wave was so big it rocked the fishing ramp and my nephew lost his fishing pole into the water. The water was so dirty we could not even see the pole to retrieve it. I have not returned to there because of all the waves from the boats and ski-do's, also the noise is terrible. I love the quietness and calmness of the lake and am refreshed after spending weekends at the Deerfield Lake.

David Sisk
Spearsfish SD

Comment:

Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment on the proposed rule change to Deerfield Lake's no-wake regulation. I oppose any change to the current regulation. I support the 1964 memorandum "motor boats on the reservoir shall be limited to and not exceed a no-wake boat speed which is defined as normal docking and trolling speed." The current no-wake restriction does not limit my access to any part of the lake or hinder my fishing opportunities. I frequent Deerfield Lake numerous times during open water season and fish with a nine foot rubber raft propelled by a 40lbs thrust electric motor. Adhering to the current no-wake regulation three boat launch locations (Dutchman, Lake Shore, and Custer Trail) provide ample access to all locations of the lake within an acceptable time frame, which i feel debunks the argument that the current no-wake regulation limits fishing opportunities and lake access. The proponents who recommend changing the no-wake regulation to increase motor boat speeds to 25 mph at Deerfield Lake State that Pactola and Sheridan lakes become too rough to fish due to recreation boat speeds and activities. If that is true, my view is the same would be true of Deerfield Lake, Assuming motor boat speeds were to increase to 25 mph, affording the same water recreation activities (water skiing, tubing, and jet boating) can all take place at 25 mph motor boat speeds. This logistics of enforcing a 25 mph speed regulation should be considered in your decision. A no-wake regulation is a visual observation, while a speed regulation requires a type of feed detection device. As stated previously, I frequent Deerfield Lake often. On occasion, though limited, I have noticed the no-wake regulation violated. However, because no-wake is a visual regulation the rule is usually complied through peer pressure. Enforcing a speed limit is a much more difficult and time consuming regulation to enforce, if it is truly enforced. I have been fishing Deerfield Lake for 60+ years. Over the time the changes observed are mostly positive. Discarding the no-wake rule would be viewed as a negative change. I do not support the adoption of the proposed rule change from no-wake to a 25 mph motor boat speed regulation. Thanks you for considering my comment.

Laural Bidwell
Rapid City SD
labidwell@aol.com

Comment:

I looked at the uploaded public comment and saw me comment regarding the trapping season on public lands. I did not see my comment on Deerfield Lake. I am opposed to eliminating the "no wake" rules regarding Deerfield. It is important that citizens who enjoy quieter spaces get to retain a few of them. Jet skis and the like are noisy and peace disturbing. Save some space for those of us who enjoy nature quietly.

Lindsay Brown
Hill City SD
browniegirl1977@gmail.com

Comment:

Please don't lift the 'No Wake' rule from Deerfield Lake. It is the only body of water of decent size that you can paddle a canoe, kayak, paddle board or troll without worry of being run over by a speed boat. If you lift this ban, the Black Hills will be without a lake for this type of recreation. DON'T DO IT, PLEASE!!!

Gerald Thompson
Rapid City SD

Comment:

I am a retiree of 15 years and have been fishing Deerfield Lake, with great pleasure and success in my one man boat many many times each summer. The tranquility, serenity, beauty, and excellent fishing of this great lake of ours is due, in large part to the no wake rule. And Equally important is the fact that in no way does this rule inhibit or diminish fishing. In my one man boat, on any summer morning, I can cover before lunch, fishing the entire lake including every cove. The only things a 25 mph rule on Deerfield Lake would produce would be big wakes from all sizes of speed boats and jet skis along with much noise. It will not produce better fishing. Our other fine lakes are all good fisheries and they permit boats to speed to where ever they want to go. But Deerfield is different! And it should remain so. Many other local fishermen, kayakers, Canoes, and hikers well understand this. We greatly appreciate and prize Deerfield lake as is. It is truly unique. It should never be abandoned! Thank you!

Walker Witt
Custer SD
wwitt@bhec.coop

Comment:

I have enjoyed fishing at Deerfield Lake for over 40 years both from shore and from a boat. That enjoyment has been enhanced due to the no-wake restriction. Please keep the restriction in place.

Jeremiah Davis
Rapid City SD

Comment:

When i moved to South Dakota 45 years ago, I was told about a beautiful, secluded gem up high in the Black Hills, the mostly undiscovered Deerfield Lake. On a hot summer day, I check out the place for myself. This involved driving on gravel road from Hill City, but the lake was everything I had been told it was. Of course, it is not a natural lake, but it offers beauty and tranquility that is not found in many places. There are plenty of lakes in the Black Hills region that offer motorized recreation, among them Angostura, Pactola, and Sheridan. There is no need to allow faster moving boats on Deerfield Lake. Multiple use does not mean that every use is allowed on every inch of ground, or on every lake. Over the years, Deerfield has attracted the loyalty of residents and tourists who are seeking something special, and part of what they are seeking is peace and quiet. I strongly encourage you to reject the pending proposal to lift the "no-wake" restriction on Deerfield Lake and hope the Commission will respect the unique attributes of this special place. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Ray Degeest
Rapid City SD

Comment:

Having been a fisherman and having enjoyed the peacefulness and serenity of fishing at Deerfield Lake for over 50 years, I wish to express my strong disapproval of a change in the longstanding no-wake restriction of a 5 miles per hour limit to that of a 25 mile per house limit. I do have a larger boat that is capable of speeds of in excess of 40 miles per hour and still maintain that it is such a pleasure to have one lake in the Black Hills at which we do not have to experience speedboats, skidoos, and other recreational vehicles creating wakes, noise and otherwise disrupting the serenity of the lake. Please allow us at least one major lake in the Black Hills where we may find serenity in this otherwise fast paced world.

David Drobny
Rapid City SD
davidjen@live.com

Comment:

Way to many negative impacts of removing the no wake on the lake and I'm not sure what a plus would be. I highly doubt it would make a big difference on how crowded other lakes are. It would only ruin a great place, and make it just like the other commercialized lakes. Disturbing the habitats, the roads, noise, and many others. Please vote against lifting the no wake. My family has enjoyed going to Deerfield Lake for many years for the peace and beauty that is offered from this area. Thank you for your time!

Julia Emerson
Rapid City SD
emersjul@midco.net

Comment:

Leave the no wake restriction on Deerfield Lake. It is one of the few areas in the Black Hills were people ca go to canoe, kayak, paddle board, swim and fish away from noise and waves generated by speed boats and jet skis. This a SAFE place to go and enjoy these quite activities. Thank you.

Muriel Shepard
Rapid City SD
murshep@yahoo.com

Comment:

Leave the no-wake policy as it stands! Noise makers and speeders have plenty of other options.

Richard Lee
Rapid City SD

Comment:

An article in the newspaper about Deerfield Reservoir boat speeds prompted me to write. The proposal to allow boat speeds to be increased from 5 mph to 25 mph seems unnecessary to me. This lake of 414 acres or .65 square miles is about 1.5 miles long and up to .5 miles wide. A boat launched at the dock near mid lake would take about 9 minutes to reach either end. If the maximum speed were 25 mph and a no wake zone existed close to shore, the average speed would be about 20 mph which would then take about 2.5 minutes. This change creates more complications for administration and enforcement personnel while satisfying a few people in a hurry. I have seen walleye fishing tournaments where boat speed contributes to the chance of success. Let us not put trout fishing in that category.

Martin Bonorden
Custer SD
martinbonorden@gmail.com

Comment:

I am opposed to raising the speed limit on Deerfield Lake. This lake now has pristine water quality, minimal shore line erosion, an excellent cold water fishery, and abundant wildlife in the riparian zones.

As such, it has become a haven for small fishing craft, non-motorized craft from sailboats to paddle boards, swimmers, picnickers, and other recreationalists escaping the motorized mayhem of the other large Black Hills lakes.

I see no reason to upset the status quo so that Mr. Edel and company have to budget a little extra time to reach a favorite fishing area. Seems kind of selfish to me.

I urge you to keep the lake wakeless.

Thank you for allowing me to comment.

Larry Bowles
Rapid City SD

Comment:

I have fished Deerfield Lake several times a year for the last 30 years. I've always considered it a relaxing, stress relieving way to spend time. Some times I may catch a fish but the peace and quiet is priceless. It was no problem to relocate my favorite fishing spot to accommodate the nesting bald eagles. I've not seen them in the last couple of years but I always look to their nesting tree along the shore line. It would be a shame if we scared them away. One of my favorite recollections was early one morning as the sun was coming up and the lake surface was like glass. There were several geese silhouetted against the sun. I did not have a camera. I don't remember anything else about fishing that day but the peace and quiet was priceless. I have walked completely around the lake on the Deerfield Trail on more than one occasion fishing the bays and inlets, observing the forest and wildlife. I can't recall if I ever found a new favorite fishing spot but the stress relieving peace and quiet was priceless. I'd like to think I may have a few years left to enjoy the peace and quiet of Deerfield Lake as the experience is priceless.

Tyler Ford
Deadwood SD
tyfo83@gmail.com

Comment:

The worst thing you could do is remove the no wake rule. Been going there my whole life to get away from the norm of every other large black hills lakes of noise n choppy waters. Leave it alone so my children have a quiet relaxing place to fish and enjoy the outdoors. It says that there would be a 25 mph limit? Who's gonna enforce that? If it changes we will find out quick enough that fishing will go to the back burner and it will turn into another obnoxious lake just like Pactola and Sheridan lakes. Please don't do this. Keep it quiet. There's not much left of that around the hills.

Marcus Myers
Hill City SD
18marcusmyers@gmail.com

Comment:

Keep it a no wake lake for fishermen to enjoy

Paul Erickson
Sioux Falls SD
Erickbummels@gmail.com

Comment:

I prefer that we keep Deerfield Lake as a no-wake lake. We have more lake opportunities for motorized use and fewer lakes for quiet experiences. It is difficult to manage public use for everyone. Thanks

Janet Noble
Rapid City SD
noblest@rap.midco.net

Comment:

There are enough lakes in the Black Hills area where boaters can prove their masculinity by going as fast as they want without making Deerfield Lake another one. It is more remote and pristine than any other of larger lakes and needs to remain that way for others who want to enjoy nature in a quiet, relaxed environment. Please KEEP DEERFIELD LAKE BOAT SPEED AT NO-WAKE.

Lisa Monson
Sioux Falls SD
Lakneifl700@yahoo.com

Comment:

We have a second home at Deerfield Lake area and feel it would negatively affect the recreational activities that we enjoy there.

Kathy Stewart

Lead SD

cheyennecrossing@hotmail.com

Comment:

Please do not allow beautiful, tranquil Deerfield Lake to become another high wake boating lake. The current trend nationwide is non motorized kayaking and stand up paddle boards. Deerfield Lake is the perfect place for these activities because of the low wake rules that are currently in place. Please, do not change the current rules. Thank you!

Scott Zieske

Rapid City SD

SZeke1@aol.com

Comment:

To The GF&P Commission:

I have fished Deerfield Lake since 1976. I do so individually with a fly rod and from a float tube. One of the many reasons I enjoy fishing Deerfield is the tranquility and the opportunity to cast to rising fish occasionally because of the calmness of the lake. Therefore, I oppose the proposed change to the "no wake" rule. And importantly, I feel such a change would present a serious safety issue in that those of us fishing from float tubes present a very low profile and could literally be run over by power boats traveling 25--OR MORE--miles per hour. Deerfield lake is a unique still water fishery. To the best of my knowledge, there are no other major bodies of water in the Black Hills with similar restrictions. In my opinion, it is highly counterproductive for GF&P to try to manage all bodies of water for the preferences of ALL potential users. Such a change as proposed for Deerfield would result in mediocrity instead of excellence.

Thanks for listening!

Scott Zieske
Rapid City, SD

Chad Riesberg

Hill City SD

Comment:

I would be fine with no speed limit. The lake is hardly used.

Allison Caster

Silver City SD

allisoncaster@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Kathy Stiefvater
Sturgis SD
fun1@spe.midco.net

Comment:

Please, please keep Deerfield a no-wake lake.

Danielle Benne
Rapid City SD
bennedanielle.db@gmail.com

Comment:

One of my favorite memories growing up in the Black Hills is the camping trips my family would take to Deerfield Lake. It was always so peaceful and quiet no matter the time of year. You could enjoy time in the water with your family without it ever becoming crowded. It always felt like our own little sanctuary and there was something really special about that. I am strongly opposed removing the no-wake rule. It's one of the few lakes in the Black Hills that doesn't allow motor sports. Even if you kept the current regulation and allowed speeds of up to 25 mph, that leaves room for wake surfing boats to take the water and benefit, as wake surfing speeds are generally 10 mph and cap out at 12.5 mph. The waves that wake surf boats produce, would be disruptive to on fishing, kayaks, paddle boards and other non motorized sports.

Debra Jensen
Black Hawk SD
DEBRA@BLACKHILLSBAGELS.COM

Comment:

Please keep the no wake rule as it is.

Elaine Karsky
Rapid City SD
Skykar78@gmail.com

Comment:

This lake is one of only a few left where kayakers, paddle boarders, canoes, and fisherman can enjoy solitude and calm waters with no large motor boats. If removed, the jet skis will there in no time. Please leave the no wake Lake as is. There are plenty of larger lakes available in the Black Hills for that type of recreation with large motor boats. Thank you for listening.

Kim Zens
Rapid City SD
Zensk62@yahoo.com

Comment:

For years Deerfield Lake has been my family's favorite recreational retreat because of the wake restriction. Please do not lift the restriction. We love the quiet, solitude of the lake. We hike, camp, nature-watch, and canoe there. We have fishes as well. If the restriction is lifted we will need to find an alternative spot. I don't believe eagles will be as prominent and many shore fisherman and anglers who now use the lake will no longer chose to. Please consider this opinion.

Mike Zens
Rapid City SD
zens.mike@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please do not lift the restriction. We love the quiet, solitude of the lake. We hike, camp, nature-watch, and canoe there. If the restriction is lifted, those of us who enjoy the beauty and peacefulness of the lake will lose out. How many lakes in the Hills are there with a restriction compared to lakes without? Please leave Deerfield as is! Thank you!

Patrick Wyss
Rapid City SD
Patw@wyssassociates.com

Comment:

Not sure which to mark above. I support the no-wake at Deerfield lake and oppose allowing faster boating. "Quiet " is an important natural resource that should be protected in some of our public places.

Helen Ladner
Rapid City SD
gjladner@rushmore.com

Comment:

Do not increase the speed on Deerfield Lake. There are few places left in the Bkack Hills where one can enjoy the tranquility and quietness of nature

Helen Ladner
Rapid City SD
gjladner@rushmore.com

Comment:

Do not increase the speed on Deerfield Lake. There are few places left in the Bkack Hills where one can enjoy the tranquility and quietness of nature

Helen Ladner
Rapid City SD
gjladner@rushmore.com

Comment:

Do not increase the speed on Deerfield Lake. There are few places left in the Black Hills where one can enjoy the tranquility and quietness of nature

Helen Ladner
Rapid City SD
gjladner@rushmore.com

Comment:

Do not increase the speed on Deerfield Lake. There are few places left in the Black Hills where one can enjoy the tranquility and quietness of nature

Valerie Howey
Hill City SD
howeyvalerie@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Greg Hoffman
Rapid City SD

Comment:

How does raising the speed to 25mph help anyone enjoy this area more? Please do not ruin this peaceful, beautiful, tranquil, full of life destination because a small few want to get to their fishing spot quicker. Ridiculous, sad, greedy, and selfish.

Matt Fitting
Rapid City SD
mfitting@rushmore.com

Comment:

I oppose lifting the no-wake ban on Deerfield Lake. It is the best place that we have for kayaking in the Black Hills. It is a quiet and pristine place to spend a summer day. Let's leave it that way.

Joan Nelson

Rapid City SD

joni_katie28@hotmail.com

Comment:

Please keep Deerfield Lake the way it is. Our family goes there many times a summer because of the no wake rule. It is so peaceful and quiet up there, and we feel safer with our 4 children being in/around the water. Keep it the way it has been, otherwise it is just like all of the other lakes. Different is good ?

Michele Caswell

Rapid City SD

pontoongirl@live.com

Comment:

I feel that Deerfield speed limit should be left as is. This lake gives the kayakers, paddle boarders, small boats, fisherman, etc a quiet lake to enjoy their activities without the wakes that a higher speed limit may cause. We have Pactola and Sheridan near by for faster recreational activities. My husband and I have a houseboat on Pactola with a top speed of 18-19, so we realize that 25 mph speed limit is quite fast. This lake should be left as the peaceful, safe lake it is now for those wanting to enjoy more leisurely activities.

Bonnie Edwards

Rapid City SD

Bonnieedwards@rap.midco.net

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is a gem and has been for many years for those who like to get away from jet skis, motorboats, etc. It is safe for small children to fish, kayakers, drift boats. These are allowed on Pactola, Sheridan, Orman, Angostura. Isn't that enough? Deerfield should remain as is.

Kendra Groeneweg

Piedmont SD

Kendrakaegroeneweg@hotmail.com

Comment:

I believe removing the no wake restriction will bring pollution to the area and destroy the camp grounds tranquility.

Don Rausch
Rapid City SD

Comment:

The Rapid City Journal front page article should have been titled "Debating the serenity of Deerfield Lake." This lake is a hidden gem of the Black Hills that my friends & I have come to relish as the "getaway" Lake destination to recreate, fish, & camp & really refresh with its quiet beauty. It should be left as a no wake lake for boat fishing, shoreline & camping & walks. I appreciate the opportunity to express and share my thoughts for the decisions process.

James Mcreynolds
Rapid City SD

Comment:

Please, Please, Please do not change the no-wake policy at Deerfield Lake. There is so much noise in the hills with trail bikes, motorcycles, ATV's, helicopters etc that quiet in the hills is almost impossible. I fish at Deerfield and deeply enjoy the sounds of lapping water, wind in the trees, fish jumping, eagles calling. Again, keep Deerfield a no-wake lake. Thank you.

Conor McMahon
Rapid City SD

Comment:

I strongly oppose removing the no wake restrictions at Deerfield lake. I live in Rapid City and often drive the extra distance to take my family to Deerfield over Pactola and Sheridan for the specific reason that it is no wake. We enjoy the tranquility and being able to fish from shore or enjoy our kayaks without worrying about the wake from fast boats as well as the noise. Please do not raise the speed limit at Deerfield.

Kathryn Larsen
Spearfish SD
larsengirls@rushmore.com

Comment:

The fast boats have Pactola and Sheridan lakes to speed around and waterski and run their jet skis. All noise makers and unfortunately often times rude. Leave Deerfield for us that enjoy canoeing and kayaking and peace and quiet and nature. I believe law enforcement has enough to do controlling drinking and partiers on the two other lakes so please leave Deerfield alone.

Bill/Berlinda Lawson

Belen NM

Ber749@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Susan Froschheuser

Sioux Falls SD

suek_50b@hotmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake has been a favorite spot for my husband, adult kids and friends to frequent every summer and fall. We spend many weeks in the summer/fall kayaking on Deerfield, camping there, and in the area. We love Deerfield because of the fact that it is kayak friendly and we are not competing with speed boats and jet skis. We choose Deerfield Lake specifically BECAUSE it is such a beautiful, calm and serene place for us. It would be an absolute tragedy to ruin this Lake by allowing waterskiing, jet skis and faster boats on the lake. We are personally looking for land in that area so we can have a permanent home near our favorite spot to kayak. Please please consider not changing the speed limits. Deerfield is like the last frontier and we would like to keep it that way. It is so sad that all it takes is a few people to change something at the expense of others who want to keep the Lake as it is. Please reconsider and look at the big picture. Why ruin this Lake by promoting more boat traffic. Again, it would be a tragedy for us outdoor enthusiasts that want a quiet, serene, beautiful last Frontier.

Lois Stewart

Edgemont SD

loisdal@gwtc.net

Comment:

We own a mobile home at Deerfield Lake Resort and spend our summers there. We enjoy the peace and quiet of the lake as it is. We enjoy fishing the lake without the wake tossing us around. Our grandchildren also spend time at the lake kayaking and canoeing. This becomes a safety issue with the faster speed limit. We also enjoy watching the bald eagles that nest in the trees on the shore of Deerfield. Please do not take this away. Thank you.

Scott Wittrock

Hartford SD

wittrock.scott@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose the removal of the no-wake restriction on Deerfield Lake. That lake should remain a quiet lake that caters to the fisherman and canoe/kayak people. There would be no way to police a 25mph speed limit with any kind of credibility and trying to would take resources away from other pressing needs of the GF&P.

Please leave Deerfield Lake as one of the last quiet lakes in the Black Hills. People recreate there because it is quiet.

Gregory Forstner

Rapid City SD

gforstner@bierschbach.com

Comment:

I oppose the idea of lifting the no-wake restriction on Deerfield. I fish the lake with my son in a 14ft. boat with a 9.9 hp motor. The draw to Deerfield is the fact there are no boats or jet skis ripping around the lake. If you decide to change it to 25 mph who will police that? It's quiet and peaceful and it is also heavily used by kayaks. For the people who say it takes to long to get to one end of the lake to the other.....relax and enjoy the ride.

Dennis Mxkay

Summerset SD

dmckay@rushmore.com

Comment:

Dear Fish & Game Commission,

I have fly fished Deerfield Lake since the 60's and intend fish it until I am face down in the lake with a flyrod in my hand and have a trout on the end of my line. The "no wake" designation allows this pristine bod

Duane Martenson

Rapid City SD

duaneandcherrie@hotmail.com

Comment:

Please keep this pristine little lake for Anglers and non-motorized water recreation such as kayaking or paddle boarding.

Stephanie Zacher

Custer SD

rszacher@goldendwest.net

Comment:

Safety 1st!!

Gerald Butz

Rapid City SD

gmbutz@rap.midco.net

Comment:

Please keep Deerfield quiet, no motors, we need places that are peaceful in the hills!!

Sammi Langendorf

Pringle SD

LANG@GOLDENWEST.NET

Comment:

I have enjoyed many hours of wake-less boating at Deerfield and would like it to stay that way. Thank you

Mark Monson

Sioux Falls SD

mmonson62@q.com

Comment:

We have a second home near Deerfield, and increasing boat speeds and increasing wake will affect the lake we enjoy. No reason to increase speeds

Virgil Hansen

Rapid City SD

wghansen1@rap.midco.net

Comment:

Deerfield is perfect the way it is. No speeding boats and big wakes please. Thank You!!

Jean Schubauer

Black Hawk SD

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Gordon Gleed

Rapid City SD

gdgleed@aol.com

Comment:

i have fish this lake for over forty years,I think

I am the first person to fish the lake in a float tube & fly rod,I am 79 yrs old and go ,and still do please keep as is thank you gordon

Jim Bussell

Rapid City SD

Local1040firefighter@hotmail.com

Comment:

I am very much opposed to lifting the no-wake restriction on Deerfield Reservoir. I am an avid angler spending many, many days on the water in my kayak. Because of the high amount of large recreational boat traffic on Pactola and Sheridan lakes, Deerfield is my one of my preferred lakes to kayak.

Despite efforts by the PCSO and GFP to enforce boating laws and improve safety on area lakes, I am quite hesitant to kayak on either Sheridan or Pactola during the spring and summer months because of safety concerns. There is zero doubt in my mind that lifting the no wake restriction on Deerfield will cause the same issue.

Part of the allure of Deerfield to me is it's relative remoteness and lack of large, fast boat traffic. Sheridan, Pactola, Angostura, Orman and Stockade all remain viable options for those wishing to speed boat and jet ski. I hope that Deerfield is not also turned over to the speed boats and jet skis.

Eileen Desmond

Rapid City SD

edesrap@gmail.com

Comment:

Please keep the serenity of this lake. I want to sit in silence and smell nature. I can go to pactola and angostura and Sheridan lake for the noise of motor boats and the smell of engine gasoline. They have 3 recreational waters. Please keep Deerfield as it is.

Brad Lawson

Plano TX

Comment:

As an avid shoreline lake fisherman, I am vehemently opposed to the removal of the no-wake restrictions on Deerfield Lake.

Edith-Maria Redlin

Rapid City SD

edithmaria@rap.midco.net

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is the only big lake in the Black Hills that is quiet and undisturbed by motorboats. I go swimming, canoeing and hiking there. Don't destroy this last refuge by faster speed motorboats!

Tamara Studioso

Piedmont SD

tamara@openbiblerc.org

Comment:

Please do not destroy one of the few places we can kayak or canoe in a peaceful lake without the threat of wakes from a boat tipping us over. We enjoy the serenity and peace at Deerfield lake

James Studioso

Piedmont SD

studiosojt@gmail.com

Comment:

We enjoy kayaking and canoeing on a peaceful lake we do not want boats at 25 mph disturbing the peace. Fishermen can fish from a kayak or canoe and there are other lakes that boats may travel at 25mph

Kent Hyde

Rapid City SD

hyde@nvc.net

Comment:

A day at Deerfield Lake promises a quiet day of communing with nature. Users of the lake—whether they are fishing, canoeing, kayaking, swimming, or simply picnicking on shore—enjoy it quietly, peacefully. We always come home renewed and feeling that our day there has been well spent. As canoeists, we tend to avoid the other major Black Hills lakes, such as Pactola, Sheridan and Angostura, expressly because of the wakes created by faster boats, the noisy jet skis and the general risk that comes of adding haste to quiet waters.

While canoeing Sheridan Lake a few years ago, we were capsized when hit by the wake of a fast boat and suddenly found ourselves upside down underwater, looking up to the surface. We lost a lot of precious cargo that day. And received no help from the passing boat. Please don't let Deerfield Lake become such a lake.

Just as the administrators of the Boundary Waters of Minnesota have set aside some lakes where motorized boats are allowed and some that are left to the canoes, the quiet users of the waters of the Black Hills need a refuge as well. Let Deerfield Lake remain a wake-free lake.

I'm not asking that motorboats be banned, just that they not create a wake as they travel.

Krista Rear

Spearfish SD

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Kay Rear

Lead SD

k.rear@wildblue.net

Comment:

Many enjoy the "quietness and natural environment" of the lake. Always has been a favorite. Would ask that this proposal not be supported by the board. Thank you.

Richard Bell

Rapid City SD

etyview@yahoo.com

Comment:

I treasure Deerfield Lake the way it is. I like to enjoy shore-fishing, canoeing, and kayaking on the lake. I want a place that is serene, away from the noise and choppy water generated by speed boats and jet skis. You should stick to the no-wake restriction in accordance with the 1964 MOU.

Tim Brisk

Henderson NE

timbrisk@gmail.com

Comment:

You have a lake that is about as perfect as it gets for relaxing and nice quiet fishing . Anybody that thinks that you have to go fast to get to a fishing spot is not a person who enjoys fishing or nature he is only thinking about him self with no regard for nature or others.I sixty years old and live in Nebraska now but come to the hills every year to go to Deerfield lake have been enjoying the lake and the quiet of the area since the late 1960s hope it stays the same for ever.
AND FUTHER MORE I WOULD HATE TO SEE WHAT THE IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE HABITAT WOULD BE!!!!!!!

Nancy Brisk

Henderson NE

nancybrisk@gmail.com

Comment:

As a resident of Nebraska I can tell you that while we may be sitting on top of the Ogalalla Aquifer with plenty of groundwater we are in a "water desert" when it comes to rivers or lakes that support water recreation. As am avid boater I understand the need to find places to boat. What I don't understand is why anyone would want to destroy one of their greatest natural resources by allowing speed boats on Deerfield Lake. This is the most pristine lake I have ever been on. My husband is a native of South Dakota and we still have family there. Deerfield Lake is a destination for us when we visit. Fishing there is amazing! I am also concerned about what speed boating will do to your native habitat! PLEASE do not ruin one of your State's treasures just to satisfy a few. Your state has many places already for water recreation.

Hans Stephenson

Rapid City SD

hansrc@gmail.com

Comment:

I strongly oppose the increase in speed limit from 5 mph to 25 mph on Deerfield Lake. The current speed limit provides a solitude lacking in other large lakes in the Black Hills. Please preserve this unique opportunity for those who prefer quiet over the sound of boat motors. Wake boats and jet skis can operate under 25 mph and will change atmosphere drastically at Deerfield. I don't believe that fishing is hindered by the current speed limit. Please preserve the the current speed limit and preserve the quiet outdoor experience at Deerfield. There are no places like it left in the Black Hills.

Linda Pietz

Rapid City SD

Pietz_linda@yahoo.com

Comment:

Don't do it

David Stonefelt

Nemo SD

dstonefelt@gmail.com

Comment:

Trying to fish from a canoe, float tube, or kayak would be very dangerous if speed boats are allowed. We water skied on Pactola years ago with a forty five horse motor going 25 miles an hour and caused quite a wake. The gentleman supporting this doesn't realize that there are many other people using the lake besides him because of the serenity here.

Michele Blum

Walton NE

Comment:

This is a beautiful, quiet, pristine lake. Please leave it as is. If you raise the wake limit it will encourage skidoos, water skiers, boats etc and just ruin the whole atmosphere. There are plenty of lakes for those other activities. Please, please, please save this lake!

Kerri Stover
Rapid City SD
Kerri.berry@hotmail.com

Comment:

Leave the speed limit on Deerfield as is, please. There is no need to further reduce access to stillness, quiet, and tranquility in our beautiful Black Hills. If people want to boat at higher speeds, there are other lake options available.

Robert Beck
Sioux Falls SD
rbeck@flashesofspeed.com

Comment:

Am very concerned that the proposed changes to the no wake zone at Deerfield Lake will result in adverse changes to the pristine and calm nature of one of the best recreational opportunities in South Dakota. I've always have kiddingly called Deerfield Lake one of the best kept secrets in SD. I'm afraid that changing the no wake zone to a 25 mile an hour limit, or whatever, will draw so many more people interested more in ripping around the lake and seriously diminishing the experience of shore fisherman, kayakers and others who enjoy the lake that no longer will Deerfield Lake be that best kept secret. Also, I'd like to make the argument that boaters have several other choices in the Hills to boat at greater speeds. Lake Pactola is an example. But, those interested in a calm, peaceful environment have few places to enjoy that. I've been fishing and enjoying Deerfield Lake for 35 years. I so hope to enjoy it for many years to come under the rules and restrictions concerning a no wake zone as has been in place for so many years.

Rolland Owens
Hill City SD
purdybird@live.com

Comment:

As a resident of Hill City since 1979, I do not support replacing Deerfield Lake's no-wake restriction with a 25 mph restriction. Keep Deerfield Lake a no-wake lake.

Dennis Beck
Sioux Falls SD
dabecks4616@msn.com

Comment:

there are enough lakes in the Black Hills for regular boating. the current wake rule at deerfield lake is great. It is a calm piece of heaven for water sports in the black hills.

Sue Jorgensen

Rapid City SD

Shoppingsue@hotmail.com

Comment:

Please don't allow a Retired man, that has all day to find his fishing spot, change the only place for the working man and his family to go for a peaceful day. Please do not allow Deer Field Lake to change.

Brenda Jones

Rapid City SD

bjdj0313@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please keep it as a No Wake lake!!

James Frost

Rapid City SD

frosty283@rap.midco.net

Comment:

I oppose abolishing the no-wake restriction at Deerfield Lake. The serenity and peace of this lake is very special. It is the only good place for lake kayaking in western South Dakota.

Judy Frost

Rapid City SD

jcarsonfrost@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose getting rid of the No-Wake Zone for Deerfield Lake. This beautiful place is a sanctuary for kayaking, paddle-boarding and peaceful fishing boats and should be left that way. Please do not change the speed zones.

Kathy Cornelison

Rapid City SD

kac@rushmore.com

Comment:

I will also be sending a written letter by mail to further elaborate my position. Thank you

Bonnie Mccaskell

Rapid City SD

mommccaskell@yahoo.com

Comment:

I oppose lifting the no-wake restriction at Deerfield Lake. The sound of boat motors would destroy the peace and tranquility we love about Deerfield.

Millie Holle

Rapid City SD

millieholle@gmail.com

Comment:

Please leave this beautiful and peaceful lake as it is! There are plenty of other lakes for speed boats and not that many peaceful places left. I strongly oppose raising the speed limit on Deerfield Lake.

Virginia Olson

Rapid City SD

Gingerlacey54@gmail.com

Comment:

I have lived in the Black Hills for 41 years, raised our family and now take our grandchildren out to enjoy the hills, too. If we want speed on a lake we go to Angostura, Sheridan , or Pactola. If we want to kayak or canoe we go to Deerfield. Even when we take the boat to Deerfield we enjoy the quietness by using the trolling motor to get around. I'd sure hate to see this lake be wrecked by boats speeding all over and churning up the water at Deerfield. Please keep the no wake or 5 miles an hour.

Nancy Johnson

Rapid City SD

jdnkj412@hotmail.com

Comment:

LIKE THAT DEERFIELD IS NO-WAKE. MAKE THIS DESTINATION PEACEFUL AND RELAXING. THERE ARE OTHER LAKES IN THE AREA THAT ALLOW WAKES

Jeff Johnson

Rapid City SD

jdnkj412@hotmail.com

Comment:

I have been enjoying Deerfield lake for the past 40 plus years. My family and I like the peace and quiet to camp and fish. I have fished from shore , canoe and boat and see no need to raise the speed limit . I think by raising the speed limit you will reduce mine,my families and many others enjoyment of this gem of the Black Hills. The Hills area has many other lakes with higher speed limits for those who want to get their destination faster. I for one am against the proposal .

Linda Hager
Hermosa SD
thistleridge@mt-rushmore.net

Comment:

PLEASE keep Deerfield a no wake lake. It is the last vestige of lake serenity in the Black Hills. People and wildlife can co-exist in nature. THE best kayaking/canoeing/shore fishing lake in the Black Hills. Please don't destroy that!!

Eugene Bingham
Rapid City SD
sgaw4@hotmail.com

Comment:

It would ruin one of the best quiet fishing lakes where you can still use a boat. And not have to worry about getting run over at 25mph.

Wade Bingham
Rapid City SD
lopebuster@hotmail.com

Comment:

I use deerfield because it has a wake limit. I dont want to fish among jetskis and skiers. it's a small lake, peacefull, let's keep it that way. the two major likes in the hills are a nightmare, dont ruin this one also.

Adam Newman
Rapid City SD
adampaulnewman@me.com

Comment:

Allowing Boats to go more than 5 miles an hour will allow wake boats to cause giant waves on the lake. Keep it the way it is. A 25 minute drive to get anywhere on the lake is not asking too much.

Vincent Hager
Hermosa SD
thistleridge@mt-rushmore.net

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is the only Pristine Lake Left in the Black Hills Area! I do not use Pactola Lake, Sheridan Lake or Angustora Reservoir in the summer time at all because of all the watercraft and inconsiderate operators on these lakes during June, July and August . If it takes Ken Adel and Don Holsworth a few extra minutes to get to there desired fishing areas, So Be It. I have fished this lake for many years and the no wake rule has never bothered me or the many people I visit with while there. I am an avid Kayaker and boat fisherman and enjoy the lake immensely for it's beauty and peaceful tranquility.

Tom Grissom

Rapid City (Johnson Siding) SD

au43@aol.con

Comment:

Boats designed to produce wake for wake boarding travel at 17 mph. The same boat pulls a boogie board at 22 mph.

I have first hand experience after piloting my neighbor's boat for the last couple of years. This boat has a V8 engine larger than my Ford F150 V8 5.4 liter. It also has 3 ballast tanks that are flooded with water to lower the boat in the water to produce the large wake needed to ride the wave behind the boat without a rope, at 17 mph. The boat is also GPS controled which requires the pilot to only push the throttle full forward, when set.

I do not support raising the speed limit on Deerfield Lake.

Susan Massopust

Rapid City SD

Comment:

No comment text provided.

John Cina

Black Hawk SD

john_t_cina@yahoo.com

Comment:

I oppose the proposal to increase the speed limit at Deerfield lake. The serenity of Deerfield would be greatly affected if boats were allowed to make wake, and the shores would also feel the impact. Please keep Deerfield for the shore fishers, kayakers, and people who enjoy going there to eat and watch a quite peaceful lake. Thank you !

Brett Sterkel

Rapid City SD

Comment:

My husband and I have leased a trailer lot at Angostura Reservoir for 10 years now. We enjoy our boating time there very much. In contrast, we also very much enjoy the quietness and calmness of Deerfield. It is a wonderful place to take the kids fishing and kayaking. Increasing the speed limit on the water would greatly impact the appeal of Deerfield. It is wonderful to have a variety of options in the hills for all types of water activities. I plead that we keep the speed limit low at Deerfield so it continues to be a calm retreat for families to visit in the hills.

Richard Emerson
Rapid City SD
emersric@midco.net

Comment:

I am avid outdoor recreationalist and use Deerfield Lake for paddling, fishing, hiking, biking, and camping - across all seasons. Please leave Deerfield Lake as no-wake and 5 mph speed. It is nice to have a peaceful lake.

Brenda Meier
Rapid City SD
rambam95@yahoo.com

Comment:

I opposed the motion to change the speed limit to 25 on Deerfield.

Clark Ladner
Vermillion SD
c.ladner1969@gmail.com

Comment:

I am not in favor of South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks to eliminate the No-Wake restrictions on Deerfield Lake by increasing the speed limit from 5 mph to 25 mph.

This increase will contribute to shoreline erosion causing a decline in natural trout.

Danielle Quail
Rapid City SD
Daniquail86@gmail.com

Comment:

As a frequent visitor and paddle boarder at Deerfield lake, I think increasing boat speed would detract from the safety and serenity that it currently provides to children and families who seek a quiet lake in which to recreate.

Frances Linn
Hill City SD
Fklinn@gmail.com

Comment:

I support maintaining the current speed limit at Deerfield Lake. Since the BH are utilized by a variety of sports enthusiasts, it is wonderful to have one quiet, speed-free lake. It makes sense to have this be the lake that is one of the farthest from Rapid City. Sheridan and Pactola provide opportunities for water skiing and other speed activities. It is important to have a lake where people can enjoy quiet, or kayak, or fish without wakes. The BH have a long history of being managed exceptionally well for a multitude of uses. Let's continue that tradition.

Maryann Adams Gregson
Keystone SD
Mgregson57751@icloud.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is unique in the type of visitors it attracts. It is the only one of its kind and changing its dynamic would ruin this. It would increase demand on its resources and the increased fishing and camping would make it too congested to sustain its integrity over time. Leave it as is, we have so few peaceful places as it is.

Whitney Van Ommeren
Hill City SD

Comment:

I would love to keep this beautiful lake a no wake lake!

John Wrede
Rapid City SD
dakota225@live.com

Comment:

Adamantly opposed to removing "no wake" zone on any part of Deerfield Lake. Justifications sent via letter to each commissioner as attachment.

Kenneth Anderson
Rapid City SD
Kennand61@yahoo.com

Comment:

There are already too few low wake or no wake zones in the Black Hills. Deerfield is the largest reservoir a kayaker can go to without chop created by other boats. Please keep as is!

Greg Wittenberg

Rapid City SD

wittenberg4@rap.midco.net

Comment:

I strongly oppose the proposal to remove the no-wake restriction on Deerfield Lake. This would be detrimental to both the pristine environment currently at Deerfield Lake, as well as the unique recreational opportunities provided by the current no-wake restrictions.

The removal of this restriction would result in increased bank erosion along the shoreline due to the waves generated by boats and jet skis. This may also result in increased turnover of lake water and lead to murkier water, potentially harming the aquatic species, such as fish and ecologically important insects.

Furthermore, the removal of no-wake restrictions would negatively impact the recreational activities that so many people enjoy at the lake. Deerfield Lake is one of the last relatively larger pristine lakes left in the Black Hills where people can enjoy kayaking, canoeing, paddle boarding, and fishing without having to worry about dodging speed boats and other motorized watercraft. In my opinion, nothing ruins your fishing spot quicker than a boat speeding by and creating a bunch of waves. Another reason people love to go to Deerfield Lake is because it has not been ruined by noise pollution, but with the removal of the no-wake restriction, this would be a thing of the past. In conclusion, I oppose the removal of the no-wake restriction on Deerfield Lake for both environmental and recreational reasons.

Andrea Wood

Lead SD

andriamichele@gmail.com

Comment:

I am a kayaker. I know there are kayaking deaths every year on lakes that allow "wakes".

It scares the heck out of me to kayak on Pactola and Sheridan. As much as I love those lakes, I usually only go there early or late in the season.

Last year, I discovered Deerfield at the end of the season and fell in love. I have been looking forward to kayaking there all summer WITHOUT FEAR OF DEATH.

Boats are already allowed on Deerfield, just not wakes so it creates a lovely and peaceful environment for fisherfolk, kayakers, and swimmers.

Please keep Deerfield as a "no-wake" lake!!

Julie Martin

Rapid City SD

Comment:

I have lived in the Black Hills for 62 years, most of it in the Hill City area. Deerfield has always been the place of peace because of the boating restrictions. To change it to 25 mph so someone can get somewhere faster will ruin the atmosphere of this beautiful place. You say its so more people will use it, so you can empty the garbage more often, clean the toilets more often, patrol the campground more often. All so somebody can get to a spot faster, well maybe they should stop and smell the roses. The quieter you become the more you hear, who wants to hear more motors, NOBODY. I find it ironic that the closest campground owner says NO, and you say it will bring him more people. Please don't ruin what has been for decades with happiness to most.

Glen Lakner

Wall SD

Comment:

Please leave Deerfield lake as is. My best hours and days were spent at North Shore or Whitetail campgrounds, I returned from Korea in 1951 and "discovered" it. What a great place for unwinding! As motorized continuous could be banned. Less shore erosion. In front of every shore fisherman on the lake as quickly as he can.

Jack Duprel

Sturgis SD

Comment:

As our family frequently camp, fish, boat and canoe on Deerfield we prefer it remain a no wake lake. It is a quiet lake for young people to enjoy shore fishing and canoeing without a boat roaring next to you. As we are elderly we enjoy the quietness of the lake. There are plenty of other lakes for speed and water skiing. Please leave as a no wake lake.

Brody Brisk

Rapid City SD

brody.brisk4@gmail.com

Comment:

Increasing the speed limit to 25 mph to allow a single fisherman less time to cross the lake is a slippery slope. As someone who enjoys watersports, 25 mph is more than enough to perform numerous activities such as waterskiing, tubing, wakesurfing, knee-boarding, etc, etc. This will only invite people wanting to do watersports who are trying to get away from more crowded lakes. My other concern is how the speed limit will be enforced. There is no possible way a warden would be able to monitor the speed limit of every boat on the lake. I could see a scenario where a boat could easily go over the 25 mph speed limit and no one would ever know. Increasing the speed limit is just asking for trouble. Please don't let this beautiful, secluded lake be turned into a busy, overcrowded place that would be viewed as a "new" getaway for the high-powered boats.

Heidi Brisk

Rapid City SD

Comment:

If the speed limit is increased at Deerfield Lake for a fisherman to reach his fishing spot quicker, this is equivalent to raising the speed limit on a road just because someone wants to get to their desired destination faster. This just doesn't make sense. Let's leave this lake as is and enjoy the beauty in the peaceful Black Hills.

Brittany Neiles
Rapid City SD
Brittanayneiles@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose changing the wake status of Deerfield Lake. As a occasional paddle boarder (SUP), having a quiet lake is essential. Not only is it much harder to balance when you add wake permissions, it becomes dangerous for those in canoes, kayaks, and on stand up paddle boards.

Anne Britton
Rapid City SD
SOUTHDAKOTACANUCK@HOTMA
IL.COM

Comment:

My family and I live in Rapid City and travel to Deerfield Lake to paddle board and kayak for the sole reason that the lake is a no wake one. My kids have learned paddling and swimming there and it is nice not to have to worry about a boat not seeing us. 25 mph does not seem fast until you're in the water and have a boat bearing on you and your family. There are plenty of regular fishing lakes in the Black Hills.

Charlie Ward
Rapid City SD
dirtdiggerchuck@gmail.com

Comment:

Please don't ruin Deerfield for those of us that enjoy the tranquility of this lake.

Charlie Ward
Rapid City SD
dirtdiggerchuck@gmail.com

Comment:

Please don't ruin Deerfield for those of us that enjoy the tranquility of this lake.

Les Job
Deadwood SD

Comment:

Oppose the change

Steve Hovland

Rapid City SD

stevehovland.sh@gmail.comkoi

Comment:

Leave speed limit ad is.

Wayne Oedekoven

Vale SD

Comment:

Deerfield is a beautiful lake with no-wake. We love fishing on lake with a big boat. We like the fast boats on making large wake. We have grandchildren who like kayak on lake, not to worry about large wake. It nice not have all the lakes fast moving boats. Leave as is NO WAKE!

Wayne Compton

Custer SD

Comment:

Deerfield Lake has been a favorite spot of ours to fish and just enjoy the beauty of the area for over sixty years. We are an elderly couple (in our eighties) and all of our fishing is done from the shore. We especially like Deerfield Lake because it is easily accessible as it gets more difficult for us to get around. We usually go there during the week, when it is less crowded. Once in a while a large boat is on the lake. The wake from it, even at trolling speed, causes a fairly large wake. Boats traveling at a speed of 25 miles per hour would make fishing from the shore with a bobber nearly impossible. We feel twenty - five minutes getting to a desired fishing spot not excessive. It gives one time to relax and enjoy the lake. We urge you not to change the speed limit on Deerfield Lake. Please leave it as it is, and not ruin fishing from the shore.

Kathy Cornelison
Rapid City SD
kac@rushmore.com

Comment:

May 26, 2019

Dear Game, Fish and Parks Commissioners,

I am writing to express my great disappointment upon hearing that you were considering raising the speed limit on Deerfield Lake, one of the most pristine, large, quiet lakes in the Black Hills, a place where you can carry on a conversation without straining to hear over the constant roar of boats. A unique environment to kayak, canoe, take a walk, hear the birds and just be at peace. If you raise the speed limit on the lake, this will all be lost and Deerfield Lake will no longer be the amazing experience it has been for fifty years.

I kayak, canoe, hike, and picnic at Deerfield Lake and cannot imagine what a huge loss it will be to so many who have loved the experience of Deerfield Lake for years if the speed limit is raised. There are so few serene places left in the Hills and the only large lake area, where you can kayak or canoe for hours and not be disturbed by speeding boats and the noise and wakes they leave behind. I strongly urge you to keep the speed limit on Deerfield Lake as it is, please do not raise the speed limit. Thank you.

Respectfully,
Kathy Cornelison
3514 Maple Avenue
Rapid City, SD 57701

Beth Scott-Thomas
Hill City SD
bethscottthomas@gmail.com

Comment:

I use Deerfield lake a lot to kayak and enjoy the fact that it is a no wake lake. There aren't that many no wake lakes in the Black Hills. Let the anglers that want to use a faster speed stick to the other lakes that allow this. I don't use their lakes and I don't want them to use Deerfield! This a a peaceful setting, please don't disrupt the serene beautiful lake by allowing people to come and make huge wakes making it difficult for the rest of us. Thanks for your consideration.

Frank Shobe
Rapid City SD

Comment:

The purpose of this letter is to register STRONG OPPOSITION to the petition to increase boat speed on Deerfield Lake from 5MPH to 25MPH. It seems appropriate to first address the claim of the petitioner that it takes him up to 25 minutes to take his boat where he wants to go fish. While i do not have access to specific details of the dimensions of Deerfield Lake, my topographical maps indicate the extreme distance from the inlet of the lake down to the face of the dam is approximately 1.5 miles. there are two boat launch ramps, each on opposite sides of the lake, roughly midpoint. This means when launching his boat, Mr. Edel should be no more than three-fourths of a mile from his intended fishing location, which would enable him to be on location in approximately 9 minutes at the speed of 5mph - increasing his speed to 25 MPH would reduce the duration of his trip to 2 minutes. - a saving of 7 minutes. Should he decide the fishing is better at the opposite end of the lake, cruising his boat at 5 MPH should require only slightly less than 19 minutes for Mr. Edel to traverse the entire length of the lake - increasing his speed to 25 MPH would reduce the duration of his trip to 4 minutes - a saving of 15 minutes. It is difficult to understand how he is experiencing a hardship - taking a 10 - 15 minute boat ride through some of the most beautiful scenery in the Black Hills hardly sounds like a wasteful expenditure of time, especially for a retiree, who should have learned by now to focus on the journey, not the destination. The consequences of saving Mr. Edel his precious 15 minutes will be to destroy the canoeing, kayaking, fishing, and swimming experience for everyone else at the lake. My wife and I both have kayaks and we enjoy going on long paddles on beautiful Deerfield Lake - a serene peaceful experience in gorgeous scenery, usually with an abundance of wildlife, deer, marmots, elk, fox, etc visible on the shore, ducks & geese on the lake, and osprey & eagles in the sky. This experience is denied to us on either Sheridan or Pactola lakes due to the dangerous conditions created by speeding boats and jet skis. Occasionally, we venture out of those lakes in early spring, or late fall, when the pleasure boater and water skiers are less likely to be out, but even then there are often fishermen charging around at high speed (Mr. Edel?), which means we rarely can simply relax and enjoy the experience. Deerfield lake offers a peaceful and beautiful setting for recreation - it is good for the soul. Please do not take that away from the many users of the lake who go there for quiet relaxation, just because of an impatient man.

Kevin Thom
Rapid City SD
Kevin.Thom@pennco.org

Comment:

I do not support changing the boating speed limits to 25 mph on Deerfield Lake. The current No Wake policy has worked well for many years. Currently, the Sheriff's Office provides year round patrol in areas around all the lakes in Pennington County and boat patrol that operates on Pactola and Sheridan Lake during the summer months. We partner with Game Fish & Parks on training and lake patrol activities. We both have limited resources so we coordinate the dates which agency will be patrolling on which lakes so we can maximize our coverage. I will not speak for Game, Fish & Parks, but I have two concerns with changing the speed limit. My first concern is the ability, or inability, to enforce a speed limit on Deerfield Lake. It would require us to purchase additional radar equipment to monitor the boat speeds. What is in place now is simple to enforce and works just fine. My second concern is that we would be splitting our boat patrol time between 3 lakes instead of 2 lakes. This adds a strain to limited resources. As an avid hunter, hiker and outdoor enthusiast, I would advocate that we have enough lakes that people can operate boats at high speeds on. Why not preserve what we have in terms of the unique character and setting that Deerfield Lake offers to our area. It is not broken, so let's not try to fix it. Thank you for your consideration of this information.

Randolph Rehm
Spearfish SD

Comment:

Ken Edel's proposal to remove the 5 MPH no- wake restriction on Deerfield Lake is a bad plan that disregards the recreational enjoyment of the lake and further, can also cause degradation to the shoreline and other physical aspects of the lake. Mr. Edel's comment that it can take 25 minutes (at 5mph) to get where he wants to fish on Deerfield is ridiculous! He should realize that he is not fishing on Angustura, Belle Fourche Reservoir, Pactola, or any other larger lake. If it does take him 25 minutes to travel from one end of Deerfield Lake to the other end, why does he see a problem with that situation? is he fishing in a tournament that requires him to hit as many hot spots on the lake during a short time period? Deerfield Lake should be maintained as a calm body of water that can be enjoyed by people who cherish a small amount of solitude and relaxation without having to deal with the few boaters who feel that it is necessary to get from one end of the lake to the other in the fastest time possible.

James Wilson
Rapid City SD

Comment:

I am a Pennington County resident and sportsman and writing in support of keeping the Deerfield Lake, no wake/5mph boat speed limit as it is. The lake is only a little over two miles from east dam to the west inlet and that takes only about 30 minutes to traverse at the no wake speed limit. Time and distances from the east landing/ramp are even less. Those who want to go fast have at least three other, bigger lakes in the hills. Let's keep Deerfield calm, serene, and not so noisy. Thanks for hearing my input.

William Lemley
Rapid City SD
wrl.jln.1808@gmail.com

Comment:

Preserve the solitude of this lake where kayakers, paddle boarders, canoers & swimmers can enjoy the lake without engine noise, wake boards, etc. Please do not destroy one of the last vestiges of quiet left in the Black Hills of S.D.

David Allen
Aurora CO
dave1918@comcast.net

Comment:

I grew up In Lead and fished Deerfield a lot over 20 years. Colorado has ruined many great fishing lakes like Deerfield by allowing faster boats. I will be returning next year and I ask You not to ruin Deerfield. I realize many large companies may want this so They can sell more. Please do not succumb to the almighty dollar and Coloradicate Deerfield. Leave it alone for the true Sportsmen. Thank You for considering this.

Ev Hoyt
Rapid City SD

Comment:

We write to express our concern and opposition to a proposed rule change pending before the SD Game, Fish and Parks ("SDGFP") Commission which would eliminate the No Wake and 5 mph speed limit for boats on Deerfield Lake in Pennington County, South Dakota. It is a common misconception that these three lakes in the BHNF are the principal lakes available to recreational users in the Rapid City area - but, in fact, there are two much larger lakes located just outside the boundary of the BHNF and within about one hour's drive from Rapid City which are major recreation venues for Black Hills residents - those lakes being Angostura Reservoir (4,407 surface acres) located near Hot Springs and

Belle Fourche Reservoir/orman Dam (8,063 surface acres) located a few miles east of Belle Fourche. Because these reservoir lakes are not located within the BHNF, SDGFP owns and operates extensive campground facilities and boat docks on these two large lakes. These popular lakes are managed by SDGFP as warmwater fisheries, where walleye are the principal gamefish sought by anglers. Deerfield Lake comprises only 30/o of the surface area of the larger lakes within about an hours drive from Rapid City. Little is to be gained by transforming the nature of Deerfield Lake from a safe, serene alpine lake to a high speed, large boat lake.

Background: As you know, Deerfield Lake is remotely located in the USFS Black Hills National Forest ("BHNF") about 12 miles West of Hills City, SD. Deerfield Lake (414 acres surface area) is one of three of the larger lakes located within the Black Hills National Forest, the others being Sheridan Lake (385 surface acres) and Pactola Lake (785 surface acres). All three lakes are located within an hour drive from Rapid City. All of the lakes within the Black Hills National Forest are operated and maintained by the US Forest Service/Black Hills National Forest. Unlike many lakes outside the boundary of the BHNF, SDGFP does not own or manage any properties, campgrounds or docks on lakes within the BHNF - those facilities and campgrounds are owned and managed by USFS/BHNF and US Bureau of Reclamation

("USBOR"). SDGFP manages the fishery in these three BHNF lakes primarily as coldwater fisheries, primarily for trout, although SDGFP has recently introduced walleye in Sheridan and Stockade Lakes in the BHNF. Background for Deerfield Lake With the exception of Deerfield Lake, all of the lakes discussed above are open to public recreation and use by large boats without speed limits, and the lakes are used for a variety of water activities, including high-speed boating, jet skis, wake boarding boats, water skiing, small non-motorized paddle craft like canoes and kayaks, swimming and fishing. Deerfield Lake, which was developed by USFS/BHNF and USBOR, maintains a "No Wake and 5 mph" speed limit in accordance with a Memorandum of Understanding (see copy attached) between these US agencies dated October 7, 1964, which provides that the USFS will implement the following regulations applicable to use of Deerfield Lake by the public: "5. The following specific regulations shall be adopted by the Service (USFS) a. Motor boats on the reservoir shall be limited to and not exceed a no-wake boat speed which is defined as normal docking or trolling speed. b.

Omitted as not applicable c. Management of the fish and wildlife resources of the area shall be vested in the State of South Dakota. At no time shall the area be closed to fishing or hunting without previous consultation with the South Dakota State Commission of Game, Fish, and Parks." in accordance with that Agreement between USFS and USBOR, Deerfield Lake has been managed for more than 50 years subject to a No-Wake speed limit for boaters on the lake. As a result, Deerfield Lake is a popular fishing lake, and fishermen operate boats at trolling speeds to fish for trout and other fish in Deerfield Lake. Boats may be launched from two boat ramps which are located at the east and west ends of Deerfield Lake. Shore fishermen enjoy the peaceful environment created by the quiet operation of boats using the lake. Users of small craft, such as kayaks and canoes, use the peaceful waters without fear of collision with high speed boats or wakes which might cause them to capsize. Picnickers and shore users enjoy the peaceful environment of the lake. During spring and fall seasons, it is so quiet at Deerfield Lake that you can hear the distinctive calls of the sandhill cranes as they soar high above the lake. Eagles and osprey fish the lake without concern for noisy, high speed motorboats on the lake. In considering the present petition to change the long-standing No Wake regulation for Deerfield Lake, SDGFP is encouraged to accord comity to the federal governmental agencies which have an interest in Deerfield Lake- It is those agencies which constructed Deerfield Dam and operate the reservoir as a water storage facility for the city of Rapid city and downstream irrigation users. It is those agencies which built, operate, and maintain campground and lakeside facilities for Deerfield Lake users. SDGFP has little or no capital investment in the Deerfield Lake facilities; SDGFP manages the fishery in Deerfield Lake. In the interest of intergovernmental

comity, SDGFP should give great weight and deference to the USFS/USBoR agreement regarding the establishment and continuation of a No wake and 5 mph speed limit on Deerfield Lake as it considers the petition for rule change. we strongly encourage the SDGFP commission to reject the petition for rule change and preserve Deerfield Lake as a peaceful and safe environment for lake users. Problem Areas with proposed Rule change: There are a number of problems which will result if the proposed rule to eliminate the "No Wake/5 mph

speed limit; presently applicable to Deerfield Lake is adopted and implemented. Among the problems anticipated if the proposed rule change would be adopted are: (1) The peaceful "environment and character of Deerfield Lake will be irreparably changed, and Deerfield Lake will become "just another noisy Black Hills lake" with the roar of motors on the large fishing boats and the wake board boats, the blare of loud music from the wake board boats, the loud buzz of the jet skis cruising at 25 mph, and other unnamed noise makers; (2) Operation of large boats at speeds up to 25 mph will endanger users of small craft, either by collision or by large wakes which could capsize a small canoe or kayak - just the increased vigilance required to continually be "on the lookout" for motorized boats and jet skis moving at 25 mph will create apprehension in the mind of a person in a canoe or kayak; (3) A 25 mph speed limit will be almost impossible to enforce on Deerfield Lake. It will be very difficult for another boater or shore user to accurately estimate the relatively high speed of a moving boat on the lake in order to substantiate a complaint with law enforcement, which will rarely be present on the lake. With a No Wake regulation in place, a boat operator exceeding the No Wake speed limit is immediately aware that he is creating an unlav'rful wake, as is the observer on the shore or in a small craft. And, the shore user can easily capture a picture of the wake and boat with a digital or iPhone camera; (4) A No Wake requirement is essential in that the newer wakeboard boats move at very slow speeds with a loud engine roar, but wakeboard boats are designed to produce a high wake on which the boarders "ride the wave". (5) A boat moving at 25 mph can create a significant wake. For example, my small 14' fishing boat equipped with a 25 hp motor tops out at 21 mph (per GPS speed measurement), but this little boat creates a significant wake at top speed. The proposed rule is just not needed. In addition to these reasons to reject the proposed rule change to eliminate the No Wake and 5 mph speed limit, an additional reason is that there is just no compelling need to change the No Wake rule on Deerfield Lake. The total lake surface area on the 5 lakes mentioned at the outset is 14,054 acres; and the surface area of Deerfield Lake is 414 acres - just 3% of the total. Very little water "high speed water" would be gained by adding Deerfield Lake to the "wide open" list. Fishermen can fish from boats on Deerfield under the present regulation - trolling is done at very slow speeds, under No Wake conditions. There are 2 boat ramps on Deerfield Lake, so boaters can launch a boat near the area where they plan to fish - there is no need to travel at speeds of 25 mph to over from one trolling spot to another on Deerfield Lake. Fishermen, shoreline users, canoes, kayaks, hikers, campers, and others have enjoyed the serenity of Deerfield Lake for many years - there is no good reason to change the character of Deerfield Lake by permitting "high speed-wake creating" operation of boats on Deerfield Lake. Please reject the Petition to eliminate the No Wake/S mph speed limit on Deerfield Lake! Please - don't make Deerfield Lake just another noisy Black Hills lake! Keep it special!

Mikal Lewis

Hill City SD

Comment:

I'm 75 year old retiree from GE. I moved to the Black Hills after the flood in 1973. I'm here because I run, hike & mountain bike. Over the years I have seen the quiet areas being taken over by jet skies, side by sides & a host of other mechanized vehicles. I hike, bike & snow shoe in the Deerfield & Flag Mt area because of its beauty & especially its natural areas. When I hike the Bald Hills off US 385 I can hear the boats & jet skis, many miles away. This is NOT what we need in the proposed area! Let Sheridan & Pactola have the modern up to date "things", Let Deerfield stay the gem it is. Think about future generations.

Craig Alexander

Rapid City SD

craigalexander1071@gmail.com

Comment:

Dearfield Lake is the only lake of its size that I can kayak without fear of being run over by a speeding boater. If you throw alcohol into the boat operator then the risk multiplies. Please keep Dearfield as a no wake lake. Thank you.

Virgil Hansen
Rapid City SD

Comment:

Deerfield and the surrounding area are pristine, quiet, and most enjoyable. Let's keep it that way. Boaters who want to race around making big waves and lots of noise have many choices. They do not need to spoil Deerfield for the rest of us. I fish from shore and from a small pontoon boat (Hobie) propelled by oars. I can get around Deerfield just fine. The launch ramp from motor boats is well situated and it certainly does not take 25 minutes to get to the inlet, the farthest point from the launch ramp. I also fish from my Hobie in Pactola and Sheridan. I do not appreciate being buzzed by speeding boats and being rocked violently by their big wakes. I have observed very little enforcement of the existing rules on speeding at either of these lakes and doubt that it would exist at Deerfield either. Fishing is supposed to be relaxing and enjoyable. It is not necessary to zip from place to place. Deerfield is a wonder place. DO NOT SPOIL IT!

Dan Wessels
Rapid City SD

Comment:

I would like to request that the no-wake status remain in effect. I say that as a person that has taken my family camping and hiking there many times. We used to camp with several friends that would bring their children, canoes, and kayaks. We have done camping at other reservoirs throughout the hills, each having their own special character. Deerfield is the only reservoir that offers the peace and tranquility we sometimes desire. Boats with engines revved up to get to the speed of 25 MPH would definitely break that tranquility. If speed limit is the only regulating factor who is to say that we won't see any motorized vehicles on the lake such as jet ski's? How will the speed limit be regulated? There has been a history of dangerous behavior at other hills area reservoirs with fast boats in the form of people in the water getting run over by boats. I felt comfortable with my children and pets in the water at Deerfield. Not sure I would feel that way with the no wake restriction gone. My children are grown but I would like for the opportunity if I am lucky enough to be a grandfather someday that my children have the same opportunity to take their children to the lake I had.

Dallas Stewart
Edgemont SD
lois/dal@gwtc.net.

Comment:

This a lake that the grandkids can go & kayak & canoe without fear of being swamped or run over by a wake, it is a good learning lake, keep as is, if it ain't broke don't fix it.

Cynthia Harlan

Lead SD

charlan2013@gmail.com

Comment:

As a kayaker, camper, and frequent visitor to Deerfield Lake, I am shocked and dismayed by the proposal to remove the No-Wake restriction. Please realize that there are so many users -- both locals and visitors -- and more all the time -- that are looking for a quiet and peaceful experience in our beautiful Black Hills. These are the folks that don't require speed and noise but just the opposite to appreciate our amazing area and there are so few lakes left to do so. Surely, their interests need to be represented as well. Please PLEASE keep the No-Restriction on Deerfield Lake.

Thank you for your time and attention

FYI -- I will be mailing a more extensive comment via USPO

Merlene Broer

Hill City SD

busygrma41@gmail.com

Comment:

Raising the speed limit to 25 would encourage more snowmobile traffic during ice fishing season and cause too much interference with fishing and kayaking with increased size of wakes.

Roger Broer

Hill City SD

roger@rogerbroer.com

Comment:

It is a pristine mountain lake, current speed is sufficient for canoers, kayakers, boaters, and snowmobilers (even in the winter). It should be enforced to prevent loud parties and excessive machine noise.

Weyland Anderson

Rapid City SD

WEYLANDRSN@MAC.COM

Comment:

INCREASING SPEED LIMIT IS LIKELY TO ATTRACT MORE MOTORIZED TRAFFIC. PLEASE RESERVE THIS LAKE AS A TRANQUILL RESOURCE.

Quinn Ward

Lead SD

quinn.ward03@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield lake is a quiet, calm, and beautiful lake that is fantastic for fishing due to it's no-wake policy. I, as well as the rest of my family strongly oppose raising the speed limit, as it would make Deerfield just like Pactola and others; too choppy!

Jeff Bradeen

Custer SD

Jandkbradeen@yahoo.com

Comment:

The lake is not big enough. Some one will die.

Robin Powell

Johnson City TN

Comment:

Please keep the current speed limit and wake restriction in effect at Deerfield Lake. Deerfield is an oasis of peace and serenity. Lifting the wake restriction would ruin the serenity that so many enjoy.

Jay Hammerquist

Rapid City SD

Comment:

Please leave the no wake zone in place at Deerfield. It is a pristine lake precisely because of the lack of noise and rough water. We enjoy kayaking the back channels and it is the quietest place to be on the water in the in the Hills. Thanks

Donald Knudsen

Rapid City SD

dknudsen@gpna.com

Comment:

There are few places left in the Black Hills where one can go and enjoy nature without some motorized noise. Deerfield Lake is one of them. Yes, one might hear a generator once in a while but not likely. Yes, one might hear a drone overhead occasionally. But motorboats would be operating from dawn to dusk and beyond. And I live in RC and don't hear people complain that there aren't enough places available to enjoy their motor boats. Draw a line. This far but no farther. Preserve some places for peace and quiet.

Betty Backus

Rapid City SD

backusba@rap.midco.net

Comment:

Deerfield is a beautiful lake offering many recreational opportunities for the public. Increased boat speeds will greatly interfere with the current uses on the lake and the surrounding lands. We have several other nearby lakes where boating anglers can travel at higher speeds. Please leave Deerfield a 'no wake' lake.

Tim Elseman

Custer SD

tselsemangmail.com

Comment:

This is the only lake of any size in the Black Hills where it is safe to kayak or fish from a kayak or float tube without being threatened by power boats traveling at high rates of speed. As a no-wake lake it provides a more solitary outdoor experience than lakes such as Sylvan, Horse Thief, Lakota, and Center, to name a few.

Kari Strong

Rapid City SD

willow13_7@hotmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Craig Johnson

Black Hawk SD

jsc.8572@yahoo.com

Comment:

I have used this lake all my life because of its beauty and peacefulness. There are no beaches and I've never seen anybody swim in it, the lake is very cool. The skiers and jet skis have so many options is it so wrong that people who want the peace and quite have one. Keep it like it has always been.

Ruth Esperance

Rapid City SD

Wyflyfishing21@yahoo.com

Comment:

I strongly oppose the lifting of No Wake at Deerfield Reservoir within the administrative boundary of the Black Hills NF. There are three large reservoirs just West of Rapid City, this reservoir (Deerfield) is highly popular with non-motorized users. I frequently see many people kayaking and boating and fishing and enjoying the serenity of the sounds of nature. Frequently I see kids and young families out enjoying Deerfield. There is just not a large reservoir with no wake to enjoy safely. I struggle to understand why we would change this feature of Deerfield just so fisherman can get to another fishing spot faster? Please keep the no wake in place so we can all enjoy Deerfield.

Zach Dosch

Rapid City SD

zach.dosch@gmail.com

Comment:

Do not change this rule. It is the only nice lake left in the hills that isn't over run by people. It's truly a beautiful, quiet camping location to go to on the weekends. My family only goes to Deerfield to camp because of the no wake rule. We can use our paddleboards and canoe without having to worry about large boats and waves. Please keep it the way it is currently set. As the old saying goes, if it's not broken why fix it.

Justin Taylor

Rapid City SD

Jtaylor83@gmail.com

Comment:

Leave the lake the way it is. We don't need motorboats and jet skis zooming around, making noise and destroying the peaceful environment. They can go to pactola or sheridan lake.

Kyle Kopren

Rapid City SD

kkfishhook_kyle@hotmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Brady Gabel

Rapid City SD

Brady.gabel.1@gmail.com

Comment:

My name is Brady Gabel, and I strongly oppose lifting the wake restrictions at Deerfield Lake. My family loves camping at Deerfield due primarily to the piece and quiet it offers. We can canoe safely and I can fly fish without worry of huge wakes.

This is the only Lake we have like this in the Black Hills. In addition, the lake supports a very healthy spawning run of rainbow trout, which will certainly be impacted by increased turbidity and erosion due to increased wakes.

I have not met one person who supports this measure. Please leave Deerfield Lake as is.

Carter Taylor

Rapid City SD

cartert@dakotabusiness.com

Comment:

Deerfield is unique in that it is a no wake-lake.

There are plenty of larger lakes in and around the hills that appeal to the motor boats, but few places where people can take a small boat and row, sail or troll without the danger and annoyance of a wake. Please keep Deerfield as-is.

David Montz

Rapid City SD

d_montz@hotmail.com

Comment:

I oppose the lifting of the No Wake Zone on Deerfield Reservoir for many of the same valid reasons expressed by the Black Hills Fly Fishers. Degradation of water quality, noise pollution, water safety, etc.. It would be nice to keep one medium sized reservoir free from the effects of increased motor use age. I would be interested to know if the petitioner has any personal commercial interest in seeing this legion past. Deerfield reservoir is not easily accessed as are other reservoirs in the Black Hills. The increase in traffic with larger boats towed on that road create. Even more safety issues. Please keep Deerfield Reservoir a no wake Lake for our future generations to enjoy as we have.

Carolyn Mastin

Hill City SD

300mastin@gmail.com

Comment:

Please do NOT lift the Deerfield Lake no-wake restriction! As a local - it is nice to have one quite lake and area to enjoy without mass tourists, garbage, fast boats, noise & chaos. There are plenty of other lakes in the area for that. Deerfield Lake is the only quite peaceful lake in the Hills. Please - it needs to stay the same, a NO-WAKE zone or there will be NO tranquil places in the Black Hills. Let's preserve this place.

Carolyn Mastin
Hill City SD
300mastin@gmail.com

Comment:

Please do NOT lift the Deerfield Lake no-wake restriction! As a local - it is nice to have one quite lake and area to enjoy without mass tourists, garbage, fast boats, noise & chaos. There are plenty of other lakes in the area for that. Deerfield Lake is the only quite peaceful lake in the Hills. Please - it needs to stay the same, a NO-WAKE zone or there will be NO tranquil places in the Black Hills. Let's preserve this place place.

Levi Bertolotto
Blackhawk SD
levi.bertolotto@gmail.com

Comment:

I'm against the change because Deerfield Reservoir is the last bastion of peace for people who don't like waste, the wasteful ways of the people who enjoy wakeboarding and jetskis will undoubtedly contaminate the lake and it's peace. Let them have pactola and Sheridan and Angostura and Orman and the Missouri River system, but let us have Deerfield. It's a long ways to drive most will have have to drive past more suitable water

Matt Nofziger
Sioux Falls SD
walleye792@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Dallas Abbott
Rapid City SD

Comment:

I and many other citizens of the area DO NOT WANT to increase the speed at Deerfield lake.

David Veilleux
Rapid City SD
mickeyfinn@vastbb.net

Comment:

I am totally against the increase. In fact let alone I don't think there should gas powdered boats on the lake period. First off it's a great lake for canoeing and kayaking
It's a beautiful place to relax and get away from all the noise we deal with every day. There is no need for anyone to be crushing around with a motor on such a small lake .

Matt Schneider
Rapid City SD
matt75schneider@gmail.com

Comment:

Please leave Deerfield Lake no wake!!!

Jack Backer
Monroe SD
Jbackerus@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please, leave the no wake rule as it is for Deerfield Lake

Bill Holec
Rapid City SD
bholec@rapidcityeyecare.com

Comment:

There is no scenerio that I can think of that removing a no wake zone would be beneficial for any part of the watershed, fish, wildlife, or asthetics. Many people have already commented on the effects of wakes on bank erosion, poorer water quality. This is the closest we have to a pristine alpine lake, lets keep it that way.

Ron Koth
Rapid City SD
ron.koth@gmail.com

Comment:

Please leave the existing no wake zone in place. It is good to have one of the larger Hills reservoirs available to those seeking solitude, whether angling or other water based activities.
Thank you
Ron

Samuel Farrar
Rapid City SD
Samuelf@bhigr.com

Comment:

Leave it the way it is. I enjoy the calm water and quiet of Deerfield. He can boat at Sheridan or pactola. It's unsafe to use small boat around fast motor boats.

Joshua Osterbur
Rapid City SD
Osterburj@yahoo.com

Comment:

There is no reason to lift the no wake zone. Deerfield is a small lake ment for fishing recreation... There are plenty of bigger lakes for others to partake in recreation of wave runners, tubing and others sports. This lake is safe for kyakers, standing boarding, and fishing. There aren't many places for people to go with out a wake zone and they are constantly put in danger from those who don't look for others and are drinking while out on the lakes. Take care of those who want to enjoy the lake not ones who want to tear it up constantly.

Dale Peters
Lead SD
bhanglersd@gmail.com

Comment:

Speed increase for boats to 25 mph is not needed and could endanger those on shore--especially those wading. Canoes, kayaks row boats & float tubes may also be in danger. Fishing boats have no speedometer...those monitoring lake can now see if no-wake rule is being followed. Please leave no-wake rule on Deerfield Lake. Preserve the peace & quiet on this SD jewel. Please keep it a safe lake for all to enjoy.

Joe Doerges
Spearfish SD
jdoerges@me.com

Comment:

Please keep the no wake zone in place for Deerfield Reservoir.

William Busse
Rapid City SD
william@busseproperties.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is a critical habitat for eagle nesting. I am opposed to the new wake proposal.

Josh Daiss
Hill City SD
jcdaiss@gmail.com

Comment:

Please leave the 5-mph (no wake) boating restriction in place. I believe the speed restriction has very little impact on the ability for fisherman to enjoy the lake. This would however have a large impact on the kayakers and canoeists who currently enjoy the peaceful "no wake" aspect of the lake.

Dean Rose
Newcastle WY

Comment:

oppose

Christine McCart
Spearfish SD
cdmccart@gmail.com

Comment:

Please leave the no wake zone rule in place in Deerfield Reservoir. Reasons: RC water supply (increased sediment in water from bank erosion), there are already lakes that allow motor boats in the Black Hills, fly angler and paddle sport concerns, and the need for quiet recreation - not loud motors.

Marcus Warnke
Rapid City SD
mwar86@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield is the best lake for canoeing/kayaking because of it's size and the tranquility with the no-wake restriction. It is perfect the way it is.

Eric Mack
Rapid City SD
erichunter1234567@hotmail.com

Comment:

Leave the lake alone, its peaceful the way it is, there are plenty of other lakes for higher speeds!

Kevin Eilbeck
Rapid City SD
kevin@kevineilbeck.com

Comment:

oppose

Marc Ohms
Custer SD
Marcohms@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please leave the no wake on Deerfield! One of the few places in the hills you can enjoy being on the water without worrying about being ran over or swamped by boats.

Not to mention bank erosion will greatly increase and as well as siltation.

Big boaters are not the only users of our waters!

Brett Johnson
Rapid City SD
Brett_mjohnson@yahoo.com

Comment:

Keep the it a no wake lake, no to the 25mph.

Amy Dirienzo
Rapid City SD
adirienz@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield is the only large reservoir in the Hills I can canoe without worrying about being capsized by other boats' wakes. It has been my favorite canoe and fishing location for years because of its peaceful atmosphere thanks to the no wake regulation and 5 mph speed limit. Increasing the speed limit would completely alter the atmosphere and would be a huge loss for recreation in the Hills. Plenty of options are available for jet skis, surf boats, and other wake boats! I strongly oppose the change to the speed limit increase.

Mark Raderschadt
Hill City SD
mraderschadt@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please do not increase the speed limit on Deerfield Lake. Plenty of Motorhead lakes around. leave this one a tranquil place to be.

Chuck Henris
Rapid City SD
c_rphoto@yahoo.com

Comment:

The lake is not that big. The rule should stay the same.

James Muhlbeier
Rapid City Sd SD
jamesmuhlbeier2@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Dennis Landguth
Rapid Coty SD
dlandguth@aol.com

Comment:

oppose

Kris Weinberger
Piedmont SD

Comment:

Leave it the way it is.

Joshua Kusser
Rapid City SD
Joshuakusser@hotmail.com

Comment:

Why not keep one lake pristine and untouched by Recreation Boaters

Jamee Allgier
Rapid City SD
Griffymom@gmail.com

Comment:

Leave one decent lake for those of us who like to enjoy the water without fear of being run over by some drunk partygoer in a ski boat. They have enough lakes to choose from.

Gary Miles
Hartford SD
MilesRüfus@aol.com

Comment:

oppose

Marcia Pischke

Custer SD

snickersam@goldenwest.net

Comment:

25 mph is way too fast and was proposed by Mr. Edel because he feels it takes too long to travel across the lake to a new fishing spot. Perhaps a compromise of 10 mph could be considered. It would be a bit of a decrease in Mr. Edel's travel time while still protecting the enjoyment of other lake users such as canoers, kayakers and bank fishermen.

Carl Mathews

Rapid City SD

Comment:

The lake is a nice size for paddling. Changing the rule would make the lake unsafe for those who use it currently.

Kelly Abraham

Black Hawk SD

fxsbkelly@hotmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Brad Clocksene

Rapid City SD

Comment:

Please leave the speed limit at 5mph as it is now. There are plenty other "recreational " lakes for jet skis, wake boats and the like. Removing the speed limit not only will ruin the lake and it's atmosphere, but also the SDGF&P reputation on everything and you know this...

Matthew Seney

Hill City SD

Skeletongelatinstudios@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield lake is one of the few lakes in the hills you can enjoy fishing, kayaking, and camping, with out constant boat motor noise and boat wake. There are plenty of other lakes for that. Keep Deerfield as it is. It's the only lake in the hills I enjoy.

Bryant Reinert
Rapid City SD

Comment:

The people that make the drive, do it for a reason. It's one of the most peaceful places around. Please don't ruin that area like you have Sheridan.

Marcia Finck
Rapid City SD
tmfunck@live.com

Comment:

This is a lake we travel more than an hour to in order to avoid large speeding boats.

Lorna Richey
Spearfish SD
Landmriche@gmail.com

Comment:

Please do not replace Deerfield Lake's no-wake restriction. My family has been enjoying this lake for more than 50 years. We enjoy the peace and quiet and no wake fishing. Don't mess with perfection, please.

Mike Richey
Spearfish SD
sdricheys@gmail.com

Comment:

Please do not allow boats with wakes on Deerfield. There are not enough lakes in the hills for peaceful and quiet swimming and fishing. Jet skis, water skiers, and motor boats with tubes are loud and disruptive. Do not replace this restriction!

Jack Edwards
Rapid City SD
jackedwards1@hotmail.com

Comment:

It is not a lake for water skiing, jet boats, or motor boats. Kayaking, float tubes, fishing from shore (both fly fishing and regular) and should be kept for kids, slow moving traffic, canoes, etc. There are four lakes (pactola, Angostura, Sheridan, Orman) for these activities. Deerfield does not fit that description. If a fisherman out of a boat can not take 15 minutes out of his time with a trolling motor for a low wake, then he doesn't need to fish Deerfield. Keep Deerfield the peaceful and quiet area it has been for many years and enjoyed by families and others.

Austen Erickson

Spearfish SD

austenerickson@gmail.com

Comment:

In an ever increasing noise enhanced world, SD has held on to a ruling that becomes more valuable with time. But why change that ruling now? It is in the visitors & locals of the black hills best interest to have Deerfield as a no wake zone as the noise & activity involved would degrade the quality to that of a common MN lake. A lake held in the past is more valuable in the future. Further, it is my opinion the small lake would reach capacity often which could mean 1) degraded quality of each public persons recreation and 2) greater enforcement. I do not believe there is any economic merit to this decision and the desire to navigate this small lake faster is unreasonable.

Rick White

Rapid City SD

jdavis1@rap.midco.net

Comment:

Deerfield is the only place not in Custer Stae Park that you can go in the summer with a kayak, float tube, canoe, or just waders and not have to worry about getting swamped by the wake of a boat.

Charles Rounds

Rapid City SD

cwskrounds@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose changing Deerfield from a no wake lake to allowing a 25 MPH speed. We need a lake that is quiet!

Roger Herman

Custer SD

cann99@yahoo.com

Comment:

I have fished Deerfield Lake for about twenty years. Have taken wife, grandchildren and friends for a day of usually good fishing. Seen eagles and osprey circling. Saw a deer swim across. Have never had the urge to dash from end to end. Have caught fish trolling from one end to the other. We enjoy the lake as it has been and I see no pressing need to up the boat speed.

Brad Humbracht
Hot Springs SD
bah00@hotmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield is a peaceful and out of the way place that needs protection. There is already Pactola, Sheridan, Angostura, Orman and many other places that people can speed and tear around in boats. Deerfield provides quiet water for kayaks and canoes to use and recreate without fear of getting ran over by a boat or dealing with their wake. Boats are already allowed, but can only slowly go about. Speeding to a fishing spot isn't needed, slow and steady provides a peaceful place for all. If you need to rush and speed, go to another lake.

Sawyer Corr
Hermosa SD
soysauce876@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Wyatt Kammerer
Philip SD
Wyatt_kammerer@yahoo.com

Comment:

oppose

Joe Hawthorne
Hill City SD

Comment:

There are two lakes nearby you can go as fast as you want to leave Deerfield as it is.

Jeremy Stover
Austin MN
jeremyjstover@gmail.com

Comment:

My vote is to not increase the speed of boats on Deerfield Lake!!!

Alfred Vanderwarka
Custer SD

Comment:

People that want to go faster have several other lakes they can use. Leave Deerfield as it is for the rest of us to enjoy.

C Erik Larson
Rapid City SD
ceriklarson@yahoo.com

Comment:

I am against any change to the current rule prohibiting watercraft from operating at wake- creating speeds in excess of 5 mph on Deerfield Reservoir. Allowing such use would fundamentally alter the current use of the lake, creating noise and environmental disruption. There are other nearby locations where powerboat and jet-ski users can find entertainment.

Tom Troxel
Rapid City SD
t_troxel@hills.net

Comment:

The proposed change would adversely affect the character and atmosphere at Deerfield Reservoir. I recommend leaving the speed limit as is.

Michaelle Laird
Hill City SD
mlaird7691@gmail.com

Comment:

I do NOT want the increase of 25 mph. There are kayaks, canoes, small fishing boats that would suffer.

Blane Cuny
Wasta SD
cunybka@aol.com

Comment:

I speak on behalf of our family. We use a small Jon boat to fish this lake. We enjoy this lake for this reason. The rules as they are now are perfect. This allows us to keep an eye on all of the young fishermen we have. This is our family get away for that reason. Thank You.

Kenette Carlson

Lead SD

rkenettecarlson@gmail.com

Comment:

We strongly oppose changing the no wake zone on our beloved Deerfield Lake! Please leave it alone. You will forever ruin the solitude of a majestic place. Leave the speed to Pactola and Sheridan!

Ashley Kurtenbach

Spearfish SD

ashleykurtenbach@hotmail.com

Comment:

There are plenty of lake options in the area for wakes and larger motor boats to use. Why disturb the tranquility that Deerfield Lake has to offer, one of the unique lakes that make the Black Hills area attractive. Additionally, there are a number of deep concerns that need to be addressed. Who is actually going to patrol it, to my knowledge we are short on staff to patrol all the areas that already need to be overseen. Environmental concerns, include large wakes causing bank erosion, just how will you ensure to keep the water clean for those who depend on it for a source of drinking water?

I have yet to hear a good argument as to why raising the speed limit is a good idea.

Please take these concerns for the future of the land and water into consideration, let's not make another problem we have to fix down the road by making a large mistake today.

Jerry Densmore

Rapid City SD

densmorejerry@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield is somewhat off the path for water skiers and Jet skies. It is the one reservoir where it is quiet and the only waves are created by nature. It is a nice place to relax without a lot of motorized noise. Please keep things as they are. Sheridan and Pactola have been turned into fast boating playgrounds, leave us one large slow/quiet boating area in the hills.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jerry Densmore

Rapid City SD

densmorejerry@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield is somewhat off the path for water skiers and Jet skies. It is the one reservoir where it is quiet and the only waves are created by nature. It is a nice place to relax without a lot of motorized noise. Please keep things as they are. Sheridan and Pactola have been turned into fast boating playgrounds, leave us one large slow/quiet boating area in the hills.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bryan Schnell
Rapid City SD
pir@rap.midco.net

Comment:

I am in opposition to changing the no wake policy at Deerfield Lake. As an 50 year+ Black Hills active hunter, fisherman & outdoor rec enthusiast I believe there are enough other options on other BH water bodies for watercraft to be driven and create wakes upon. Please protect the solitude and serenity of this important and unique Hills treasure. Thank you.

David Carpenter
Rapid City SD
dak.carpenter@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose lifting the no wake restriction on Deerfield Reservoir. The abundance of loud marine engines and loud music systems ruins the outdoor experience at all the other major lakes in the Black Hills area. Let's keep it peaceful at Deerfield.

Phil Kahnke
Salem SD
Pkahnke@yahoo.com

Comment:

I sure hope this isn't get actual consideration. We have thousands of lakes that are open to regular boating and then there's Deerfield Lake that is beautiful and quiet and someone wants to ruin that. I can't understand the reasoning behind it...besides laziness and the fact that some fisherman can't spend an extra few minutes to get across the lake.

Whitney Driscoll
Spearfish SD
wdriscoll@me.com

Comment:

I am strongly opposed to changing the speed limit on Deerfield to 25mph and believe it should be left at 5mph. The petition put forth says an increased speed limit will "allow the public to better utilize this resource". Changing the speed limit has nothing to do with the number of people using the lake only how they will use the lake. I am familiar with "surf boats" and they only need to travel at a speed of 8-10 mph to create a large enough wave to surf on. It would be detrimental to the shoreline, fisheries and overall quiet experience of a mountain lake to allow such activities. There are plenty of other opportunities for this type of activity in the Black Hills. I have fished with an 18' boat on Deerfield and there is absolutely no reason to increase the speed limit other than to get someplace faster or partake in other water sports. This lake has been managed for fisheries and quiet enjoyment for years and should remain as such.

Steve Hirtzel
Rapid City SD

Comment:

The Black Hills National Forest opposes the public petition to remove the no wake zone restriction on Deerfield Reservoir and increase the motorized watercraft speed limit to 25 miles per hour.

Historically, federal management on Deerfield Reservoir has always emphasized providing a unique opportunity for recreationists seeking a non-motorized experience rather than higher-speed motorized watercraft use that is available on other larger reservoirs, such as Pactola or Sheridan. Deerfield Dam and Reservoir are part of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's (USBR) Rapid Valley Project. As such, the water rights (US509-2) to Deerfield Reservoir are held by the USBR. The Black Hills National Forest manages the National Forest System lands, including the recreation facilities, around the lake.

Interagency management of Deerfield Reservoir between the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and the USBR is described via Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The initial 1948 MOU between the parties' outlines general Agency roles, including "the Bureau . . . has primary jurisdiction over the water surfaces of the reservoirs . . .". This MOU also provides the first mention of watercraft restriction under article 5.d.:

"No boats longer than 16 feet or boat motors greater than 5 horsepower will be permitted on Deerfield Reservoir".

This initial restriction was likely in response to the heavy use when the lake was first opened to fishing in May 1948. The USBR's 1948 Annual Project History Report states "Boats with large motors were used on the reservoir and became a menace to the smaller boats."

The still valid 1964 Deerfield Reservoir MOU, which superseded the 1948 MOU, has an updated section under Article 5 that reads:

5. The following specific regulations shall be adopted by the [Forest] Service.

a. "Motor boats on the reservoir shall be limited to and not exceed a no-wake boat speed which is defined as normal docking or trolling speed".

We are aware that South Dakota Administrative Rule 41:04:02:51 designates all waters of Deerfield Reservoir as a "no wake zone". It is our understanding that this rule was put in place to assist the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks (SDGFP or Department) with law enforcement regarding watercraft speed on the reservoir, given the limited staffing and availability of Forest Service law enforcement personnel.

This no wake restriction helped with law enforcement, but it also kept the recreation use much more manageable and significantly reduced user conflicts. Deerfield Reservoir is a long, narrow waterbody which has the potential to increase the negative interaction between boaters going 25 mph with those creating no wake, such as kayakers or canoeists. This was the justification for the original 1948 MOU between USFS and USBR. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this proposed change for Deerfield Reservoir and we recommend that the current no-wake restrictions remain in place for the reasons mentioned above. Please feel free to contact me at (605) 673-9203 if you have questions or need additional information.

Bryan Schnell
Rapid City SD
pir@rap.midco.net

Comment:

I am in opposition to changing the no wake policy at Deerfield Lake. As an 50 year+ Black Hills active hunter, fisherman & outdoor rec enthusiast I believe there are enough other options on other BH water bodies for watercraft to be driven and create wakes upon. Please protect the solitude and serenity of this important and unique Hills treasure. Thank you.

Robert Donaldson
Sturgis SD
Stretch@rushmore.com

Comment:

I have been enjoying the lake for almost 70 years. (I am 73). The last 20 years or so I even just use an electric motor early morning so as to not disturb the tranquility. The no-wake rule has worked for most of us so please leave it.

Beatrice Begley
Rapid City SD

Comment:

Please keep Deerfield Lake a quiet peaceful lake. It does not need the noise & stench the higher wake would cause. It is bad enough we have to listen to the roar of 4 wheelers about everywhere.

Jan Rippel
Rapid City SD

Comment:

I'm writing to let you know I would like the no wake rule to remain in effect for Deerfield Lake in the Black Hills. My husband and I have canoed on the three large lakes in the Black Hills. We are always careful when going across Sheridan or Pactola, but we feel safe when at Deerfield. Once, several years ago, we were canoeing at Pactola, and we were staying close to the shoreline because of power boats. We were headed to the west end of the lake and had gone past a slow speed buoy. As we get to the far end of that area a power boat came speeding by and then turned and roared away. On the way out of the slow speed area we saw the buoy had been blasted to pieces by that boat. A no wake rule give a sense of security.

Cameron Miller
Hermosa SD

Comment:

In regards to removing the no wake zone on Deerfield Lake I strongly oppose this. Every other large lake in the Hills currently have speed boats & jet skies on them. This is the only large lake that is peaceful & serene because of the no wake zone. So many people enjoy the lake with canoes, kayaks & paddle boards. Sportsman without the "need for speed" also deserve a place to quietly & calmly enjoy the outdoors as much as the other type do & they have "their lakes Angustora, Sheridan,& Pactola" Please leave us one lake, leave it alone.

Laurie Miller
Hermosa SD

Comment:

I am writing in regards to removing the no-wake restriction on Deerfield Lake. Currently Angustora, Pactola & Sheridan Lakes don't have no wake zones & very rarely do we use those lakes because of the speed boats that consistently fly by our fishing boat while we are trying to relax and fish. The constant rocking of our boat, from their waves diminishing our experience, so we prefer Deerfield Lake, the only lake in the Hills that people like us can enjoy. We see other young people on paddle boards canoes & kayaks enjoying the serenity of the lake. I do not understand how one impatient angler can change the only tranquil lake we have. He has other choices of "fast fishing" if this is removed we won't have any. This doesn't seem fair to me. Please don't remove the no wake zone.

Lynn Taylor Rick
Rapid City SD
ltaylorrick@midco.net

Comment:

Please leave the NO WAKE zone rule in place. This lake is the only in the Black Hills where you can take your canoe and/or kayak and enjoy a safe and quiet paddle without fear of being struck by a boat.

George Larson
Rapid City SD
glarson2@gmail.com

Comment:

I want to be able to have Deerfield remain a safe place for self-powered boats (kayaks etc). The erosion and safety concerns of waked recreation boats outweigh the need for speedy transit of the lake for fishing or recreation.
Keep Deerfield wake free .

Jason Sanderson
Rapid City SD
jtsander@gmail.com

Comment:

We would prefer to keep Deerfield a no-wake lake as it's one of the few in the area that offers these opportunities for kayaking, canoeing, etc.

Sheri Ketelsen

Rapid City SD

angelsk@rushmore.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is a very special place to go. It promotes serenity and peace. It is somewhere you can go just to get away from all of the hustle and bustle and noise of the world around us. Please maintain the no wake restriction.

Cheryl Bridwell

Hill City SD

cheryl.culver@yahoo.com

Comment:

We live 1 mile from Deerfield Lake, and we love the quietness, solitude, and no wake law this beautiful lake provides. There are plenty of other lakes that provide people with no wake options. There are nesting eagles and many other wildlife, that live on or near the lake. I do not want theirs, or our, enjoyment of this peaceful, quiet spot to become just one of many. It's a very special place, and thats how it should remain.

Michael Bridwell

Hill City SD

bridwelltransport@yahoo.com

Comment:

We live 1 mile from Deerfield Lake, and we love the quietness, solitude, and no wake law this beautiful lake provides. There are plenty of other lakes that provide people with no wake options. There are nesting eagles and many other wildlife, that live on or near the lake. I do not want theirs, or our, enjoyment of this peaceful, quiet spot to become just one of many. It's a very special place, and thats how it should remain.

Kelly Vorachek

Rapid City SD

k.vorachek@yahoo.com

Comment:

I float and kayak fish on Deerfield Lake and would pretty much be out of luck if the law were to change. There are plenty of other lakes for fast boating, not many for my type of recreation. Please, do not allow this change. Thank you for considering my opinion.

Matt Larson
Hill City SD
kix4six@aol.com

Comment:

I'm opposed to removing the no wake zone from Deerfield lake. Deerfield lake is my family's favorite spot to enjoy the black hills, and escape the busy tourist season. I don't understand wanting to rush fishing. To my, that is the opposite of why I go to Deerfield.

Renee Mckinley
Rapid City SD
reneemckinley@juno.com

Comment:

As a camper and kayakers, I appreciate a lake with no wake! Deerfield offers an opportunity for the disabled, like myself, and children to kayak without fear of being capsized by a passing motor boat. Deerfield is a small lake which is easily crossed paddling a kayak in a matter of 15 or 20 minutes. There is no need for an increase in the speed limit for boats.

Gary Witt
Lead SD
gswitt@vastbb.net

Comment:

this is one of very few lakes that have a no wake restriction. there are plenty of other lakes to use. Please keep this restriction. this lake is used by many for peaceful purposes.

Stephen Bailey
Rapid City SD
Spbailey22@gmail.com

Comment:

There are precious few places to escape the noise makers that have seriously degraded the Black Hills. It would be another blow to those of us who seek solitude and renewal at Deerfield. I am a SD native recent for 37 years.

Brenda Hofer
Rapid City SD
beachlhofer@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please leave some lakes in the Hills where a person can simply sit and enjoy quiet and nature. Some of us like simpler recreation, let us have a place too.

Chris Brandriet

Sioux Falls SD

chris.brandriet@gmail.com

Comment:

This location is a hidden gem for people wanting to get away from the speed and recklessness of other lakes. Please leave Deerfield the way it is.

Marg Battista

Black Hawk SD

margaret.a.battista@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Mary Garrigan

Rapid City SD

marygarrigan@rushmore.com

Comment:

Please keep Deerfield Lake free of speedboats and other watercraft that create a wake. It is beautiful for kayaks and kids

Kevin Stumpff

Sterling CO

Comment:

It's quiet for now. If this goes through it will not be quiet at all. Where are you to go with out the noise?

Bryan Nelson

Rapid City SD

bryan6772@gmail.com

Comment:

Oppose

Lisa Haslip
Sturgis SD
haslip@spe.midco.net

Comment:

Please keep Deer Field Lake the way it is. We enjoy going to this lake of quiet solitude. I enjoy boats and jet skis look like fun, but somewhere else. We all need to leave quiet lakes alone. We camp here and love to fish from shore.

Linda Cartwright
Hill City SD
lkcartwright@comcast.net

Comment:

I spend my summers at Deerfield Lake and thoroughly enjoy the quiet and peaceful surroundings that Deerfield Lake offers. The lake provides great fishing, canoeing and bird watching. Increasing the speed on the lake will detract from the peacefulness of Deerfield Lake. There are other lakes that anglers can access with the larger boats. Leave Deerfield Lake alone. Thanks

Mike Sliper
Rapid City SD

Comment:

Leave Deerfield NO wake.

Mike Schortzmann
Rapid City SD
mjsdas@rap.midco.net

Comment:

This is regarding the request to remove the no wake law on Deerfield Lake. Changing it would ruin the peace, quiet, solitude, and tranquil experience there. I am an avid fisherman and have never heard any other fisherman, myself included, complain about the 5 MPH limit on Deerfield Lake. Please keep it at 5 MPH.

Steven Thimas
Deadwood SD
miksteve@outlook.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Shanda Channer

Hill City SD

Shandachanner@yahoo.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Michele Thomas

Deadwood SD

miksteve@outlook.com

Comment:

Please keep Deerfield Lake AS IS — a no wake area!

Marcia Diagostine

Hill City SD

mdiagostine@gmail.com

Comment:

I kayak a couple of days a week in the central black hills & truly appreciate Deerfield Lake as a no wake lake. I live close to Sheridan, but do not visit it much due to the fast boats & my safety. When I take friends to kayak, they are timid & afraid if we are on a lake with motorized boats. This occurs at Jenny Gulch, quite frequently, even though they go at a slower pace. It is still not as nice as Deerfield Lake without the boats.

Rodger Dooley

Sioux Falls SD

RodgerDooley@hotmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Scott Diagostine

Hill City SD

sadiagostine@gmail.com

Comment:

Very much enjoy the quiet, peaceful atmosphere at Deerfield Lake now. If it is not broken, don't fix it, please.

Amy White
Rapid City SD
Sdsightseer@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose increasing the speed of water craft on Deerfield Reservoir to 25 mph. Please do not increase the speed limit. Keep Deerfield peaceful.
Thank-you

Elizabeth Kleffner
Custer SD
lizkleff@goldenwest.net

Comment:

Please DO NOT change the no-wake rule at Deerfield Lake. As one who enjoys shore fishing, Deerfield is a very special, peaceful place that needs to stay as it is.

Geoffrey Sheehy
Rapid City SD
Geoffrey.Sheehy@gmail.com

Comment:

My family camps every summer in the Deerfield Lake area. Our favorite spot is Ditch Creek, and my wife has been camping at Ditch Creek for 40 years. But I would never want to camp at Sheridan Lake. What is the difference? Distance from Rapid City is part of it, but a bigger part is the partying lake crowd doesn't come to Deerfield Lake. The campers at Ditch Creek, White Tail, and Dutchman are quieter crowds—people looking to get further out and in quieter places. If the speed limit at Deerfield Lake is changed, it won't only change the mood of the lake itself, it is likely to change the mood of the entire area around it. The ATV traffic in the area has already changed the area significantly, but to draw the partying/boating crowd will seriously alter the vibe in that part of the Hills, leaving very few options for those of us who cherish quiet in the forest.

Dave Vaughn
Rapid City SD
dvaughn@hughes.net

Comment:

I enjoy a quiet paddle in my canoe without having to compete with the power boats common to other area lakes. I support keeping the no wake limit on Deerfield.

Kay Knudson
Lexington NE
frkay@q.com

Comment:

My family camped and fished at Deerfield. The environment is quiet and peaceful without boats racing around.

Justin Whitehead

Mitchell SD

jstnwhitehead@yahoo.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Barry Houdyshell

Rapid City SD

bhoud3@gmail.com

Comment:

I have been fishing on Deerfield Lake for over 50 years. It is the perfect place to go and get away from the daily grind. Quite and peaceful as it should be. We don't need another lake with speeding boats and jet skies.

Ken Wesche

Rapid City SD

hockeynut@rap.midco.net

Comment:

I strongly oppose allowing high speed boat traffic on Deerfield Reservoir. Deerfield is the last sizable piece of water left in the Black Hills that has not been taken over by the speed-and-party crowd, and they have plenty of other places to party. Keep Deerfield Reservoir pristine and wake-free.

Kelly Kistner

Mccook Lake SD

iwlasdpresident@outlook.com

Comment:

May 31, 2019

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

Dear Commissioners,

The South Dakota Division of the Izaak Walton League of America (Division) appreciates this opportunity to comment on the proposal to change speed restrictions on Deerfield Reservoir.

The proposal would establish a 25 mile per hour maximum speed restriction for watercraft operating on Deerfield Reservoir in Pennington County in place of the current "no wake zone".

SUPPORTIVE INFORMATION

The Division urges the Commission to reject this proposal.

Many people enjoy camping and fishing at Deerfield because of the peace and quiet the current no wake zone provides. Deerfield, at only 435 surface acres, is a very small reservoir. With that limited size the Division believes there is simply no reason to make this change.

Many other waters in the area and across the state are available for people that want to recreate in other ways. We believe having some waters, including Deerfield, that still offer a peaceful, quiet and tranquil environment is needed today more than ever.

With that we respectfully ask you to please reject this proposal and keep the no wake zone in place on Deerfield Reservoir.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

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

Maurice Hurd

Pierre SD

Comment:

Growing up in the Black Hills I spent many a day fishing from a boat with my Dad. We used a 3.6HP which was more than adequate. Keep no wake. 5 M. P. H. Deerfield lake is a wonder place. Please do not ruin it.

Dale Peters

Lead SD

Comment:

We are writing in response to the proposed change to Deerfield Lake. As life-long residents of South Dakota, we feel the no-wake status should remain unchanged. Fishing boats are not equipped with a speedometer. How would a fisherman know when he is going "25 m.p.h."? No wake is obvious to those monitoring and checking for rule breakers. The 25 m.p.h. speed increase is not necessary. If it "takes too long" to get to a favorite fishing spot, that fisherman should allow more time or take his boat to Pactola Lake or Sheridan Lake. We feel that shore fisherman, those in float tubes, those in canoes and row boats will be adversely affected if the speed limit is increased. We also feel it will be a danger to those who fish in chest waders. Deerfield has always been a lake that offers a peaceful, calm experience for those who wish to avoid those requiring more speed. Let's not destroy that!

Logan Schaeffer

Hermosa SD

Comment:

I'm writing this to oppose changing the no wake zone at Deerfield Lake. Currently Deerfield Lake is the only large lake that can be enjoyed by the "slower" angler. Families with small children often do not have the resources or perhaps the desire for speed boats & just want to enjoy the peacefulness of Deerfield on paddle boats, canoes or shore fishing. Let us have one lake in the Hills where people can slow down & enjoy the beautiful atmosphere.

Jo Nelson

Rapid City SD

Comment:

Quiet afternoons sitting on the shore fishing with my dad - we didn't have a boat, but we enjoyed the time we spent together watching bobbers bobble on the surface of the lake. I strongly oppose increasing the speed limit for boats on Deerfield Lake and support keeping the current no-wake restriction in place. Deerfield is a lake where you can watch families fishing from shore and they don't have to worry about being knocked about by the wake of a boat speeding by. Deerfield is a place you can go for a hike, paddle a canoe or kayak, picnic, or go swimming and not be disturbed by the sound of loud outboard engines racing by. Deerfield is one of the only lakes where you can paddle a canoe or kayak and not have to worry about being bashed about by the wake of a power boat or worry about capsizing. Deerfield is a place where children can learn to enjoy the quiet of nature and discover that motors are not necessary to get from one place to another. It is pleasant to sit on a hillside overlooking the lake and watch fishermen slowly move across the water. Deerfield is a place where kids can hunt for frogs or chase dragonflies. Deerfield is a unique lake in a magical setting that should be maintained by present and future generations. As we know too well, if you are driving your car through a neighborhood with a 25 mph speed limit, most drivers are actually going 35 to 40 mph. If the speed limit on Deerfield is increased to 25 mph, the same will happen. Law enforcement personnel will be needed to patrol the lake and enforce the speed limit, which is an expense we do not incur at this time. Unfortunately, when the speed of boats goes up, so does the consumption of alcohol. We have had several tragic accidents on other lakes in the Black Hills that have involved alcohol and speed, resulting in death or life altering injuries. On Deerfield, with a 5 mph speed limit, we do not have those types of issues. Because Deerfield Lake is located in the Black Hills and the people who use Deerfield and who might be most affected by the proposed change also live in the Black Hills, it would have been nice if the public hearing could have been held in Rapid City rather than Pierre so there could have been more opportunity for public participation and comments.

Bruce Uhrig
Rapid City SD

Comment:

Please, do not change the speed limit on Deerfield Lake. I grew up in Lead, SD, I have many memories of going to Deerfield Lake during my grade school and high school years. Later moving to Rapid City in the mid 1970's and still to this day, 55 years later, go to Deerfield Lake. My daughter lives 1.5 miles from Pactola Lake, but in the summer, we still pack up and go to Deerfield Lake to get away from all the hustle and bustle of speed boats, jet skis and other fast-moving watercraft. If someone complains just because it takes 25 minutes to boat to their favorite fishing spot, just slow down and enjoy the 25 minute ride. Trolling to the spot would most likely lead to catching fish before getting to the "favorite spot". Deerfield is, and has always been one of those special places where a person can get away from the all hustle and bustle of daily living and working, and really relax for a change.

Gary Seidel
Lead SD

Comment:

We want to comment on the proposal to raise the speed limit on Deerfield Lake. We are both life-long residents of the Black Hills and are now retired. We really enjoy fishing as a relaxing hobby. We go to Deerfield lake because of the no wake policy. We have a small pontoon boat and it is so nice to Deerfield with no waves constantly rocking the boat. The shoreline on the lake is nice now but will soon erode with waves. There are plenty of lakes in the Hills to go to if you need to go fast! Please do not raise the speed limit on Deerfield Lake.

Beth McIntyre
Hill City SD

Comment:

I'm writing in response to the Deerfield Lake petition for rule change which proposes an increase in boat speed for 5 to 25 mph. I oppose this change. Deerfield lake's current no-wake restrictions allows a calm body of water for different water activities; fishing, canoeing, kayaking, swimming, floating on air mattresses, etc. Speed in getting from one fishing location to another is not mandatory and therefore allows all participants to enjoy the lake. The maximum distance from the east end of the lake to the west end is 2.3 miles and the average width of the lake is .25 miles. Therefore, it requires less than 30 minutes to go anywhere on the lake at 5 mph. It is getting harder and harder to enjoy the serenity of the Black Hills. Whether hiking, biking or kayaking in the hills, it seems the noise pollution from ATV's, dirt motorbikes, motorboats, jet skis and other motorized vehicles increases yearly on forest roads, lakes and even Centennial Trail. (The damage caused to our forest roads and trails will be around for generations and the cost to the taxpayers is far greater than the tax revenue generated from these permits). It's extremely difficult to enjoy kayaking on Pactola or Sheridan lake where the speed boats and jet skis with the consequential wakes and traffic make for dangerous kayaking. Keeping the lakes at different speed restrictions is a good compromise for all users. Please keep Deerfield lake at 5 mph speed restriction is a good compromise for all users. Please keep Deerfield lake at 5 mph speed restriction. It is the best utilization of this resource by allowing all users the right to a serene water activity in the Black Hills. Thank you.

Kathy Kling
St. Onge SD
kakling@vastbb.net

Comment:

I have many concerns regarding a 25 mph speed limit vs. the current "no wake zone" at Deerfield Reservoir. My concerns include the GF&P cost to manage the definite increase in boaters (particularly those towing water skiers); the safety issues regarding higher speeds (more deadly accidents); the effect on water quality (more fuel and trash in the water); the disturbance of fish by high noise and increased water surface activity; the boat noise effect on people and wildlife in the surrounding areas; and, perhaps mostly, the disturbance of calm water now cherished by kayak, canoe, float tube and low speed boat anglers, passive watercraft users, and shore swimmers.

I hope that you will thoughtfully consider each of these concerns, and that the result will be your opposition and rejection of this petition.

Thank you.

Kathy Kling
Concerned Citizen
Local Property Owner (Family has owned property on Ditch Creek Road since the late 1940s)

Dowell Caselli-Smith
Rapid City SD
dowell1007@gmail.com

Comment:

My wife and I often enjoy kayaking at Deerfield lake. We see lots of fishermen as it is. The change would basically ruin our fun to save a few fishermen a few minutes. We definitely think the change would be very wrong.

Nicole Kruske
Lead SD
nickruske@gmail.com

Comment:

I love fishing that lake, I prefer it over the other lakes in the area because you don't have the wakes there that you do at Pactola or Sheridan.

Karen Leichtnam
Silver Spring MD
kleicht@verizon.net

Comment:

No comment text provided.

James W Speirs

Rapid City SD

jameswspeirs@icloud.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake wake restriction should remain. A quiet lake is needed for quiet activities such as fishing and canoeing. I oppose changing the current no wake regulation.

Thomas Tyson

Rapid City SD

thomastyson@lycos.com

Comment:

I am 72 years old and was transferred to Ellsworth AFB SD in 1977 and have lived in Rapid City since then except between 1984 and 1991. I have been a hunter and fisherman all my life. I fish Deerfield Lake all year long. I have used a small 12 foot boat and a 14 foot kayak. For me, the ambience and safety of the no wake policy at Deerfield is as important as the fishing. Over the past 4 years, the number of people using canoes, kayaks and stand-up-paddle boards has been increasing and I believe that this is because of the no wake policy. It is not as enjoyable and safe with larger faster watercraft causing the wake and noise. Pactola and Sheridan are available for those uses and it is less enjoyable for the smaller watercraft when sharing those lakes. The small watercraft users are not the only ones who benefit from the no wake rule. The people on the shore and picnic area and the wildlife would loose the quiet if the rule changes to 25 mph. The wildlife may be adversely affected and not use the area. During the ice fishing season, motor craft do use the lake and although they do not make waves the noise does detract from the outdoor experience of the ice fishermen that venture out on foot. I strongly feel that this change will adversely affect the experience of the locals and the tourist.

We have rules on motorized land vehicles on public lands but they are not adequately enforced. How well would this 25 mph rule be enforced?

Susan Johnson

Nemo SD

susanj@blackhillsvacations.com

Comment:

We do not need the noise. We have plenty of boating at Pactola, Sheridan, Angostura, Rocky Point and the Mighty Mo. Please leave this pristine lake alone.

Katherine Kinsman

Rapid City SD

kkinsman@aol.com

Comment:

There are plenty of motorized bodies of water in the Black Hills. Deerfield Lake should remain a place for non motorized recreation.

Skip Tillisch

Hill City SD

skiptillisch@wildblue.net

Comment:

There are four large lakes in or adjacent to the Black Hills where people can operate their boats at high speeds. There is only one where I can go with my kayak, or my canoe, and not fight the waves created by fast moving boats. If you have to raise the speed limit raise it to 10 mph, or prohibit recreational towing (wake boards, water skis, and tubes). Wake boards typically travel at 13 to 25 mph, and because of the ballast tanks in the boats, create huge wakes. Please leave one decent size lake for those of us that want to paddle or fish in peace and quiet.

Dwaine Tollefsrud

Rapid City SD

dntollefsrud@gmail.com

Comment:

I have a canoe, float tube & kayak & enjoy the current no wake limit on Deerfield Lake. Please leave the the 5 mph speed limit & no-wake restriction in place.

Mary Braley

Hill City SD

bravedaley@gmail.com

Comment:

I'm writing in response to the Deerfield Lake petition for rule change. This proposal would increase the water craft speed from 5 mph to 25 mph. I oppose the change. I have kayaked in multiple South Dakota lakes. In the Sioux Falls vicinity there is a stark contrast in recreational use between Lake Alvin (no wake) and Wall Lake (wakes not restricted). Lake Alvin is used by fisherman, kayaker and canoeists. Wall Lake is frequented by skiing and jet ski. Each group has a nearby lake geared to meet their needs, either solitude or recreational thrill seeking. As quoted by the petition's author in the Rapid City Journal in a March 19, 2019 article regarding Deerfield: "Pactola and Sheridan have become such popular destinations for water skiing, jet skiing and tubing that the water gets too rough for his fishing boat by about 11 a.m. most summer weekends". Unfortunately the 25 mph speed limit will allow skiing, tubing and jet ski use at Deerfield Lake, thus creating rough waters that interfere with fishing, canoeing, paddle board and kayaking. (average speeds: combo ski=25 mph, slalom ski=19-36 mph, wakeboard=16-19 mph, trick ski 11-21 mph, tubing 8-25 mph, jet ski beginner 10-15 mph) Unfortunately people do not always follow the law. Despite ATV trail closure Memorial weekend due to wet trails I still saw ATV on these trails. While hiking I see motorcycles and ATV in areas restricted from motorized vehicles. I fear the difficulty in monitoring speeds on Deerfield Lake will result in abuse. Shore fisherman, non-motorized water craft, birdwatchers, hikers on trail 40L, and people simply relaxing along the shore enjoy the serenity a no-wake lake provides. Deerfield Lake is the one remaining sizable lake in the Black Hills that retains the quiet and tranquility of this unique area of our state. It is a peaceful haven for kayak, canoe, fisherman, hikers, birdwatchers and other outdoor enthusiasts. Please do not approve the proposed Deerfield Lake boat speed limit when voting on July 6, 2019.

Gregory English

Rapid City SD

gregaenglish@hotmail.com

Comment:

I have a cabin in deerfield and bought the cabin because of the tranquility of that area including deerfield lake. I enjoy kayaking to catch fish and the quiet setting I can do that in on the lake. It would be a terrible idea to ruin the uniqueness of deerfield with the sound and wake of loud boat engines and their large wakes. Thanks

Jocelyn Aker

Rapid SD

osprey@midco.net

Comment:

I strongly oppose the change to a 25 mph speed limit. The no-wake restriction helps prevent erosion of the shoreline and mud-flats. Mudflats are important feeding areas for migrating shorebirds both in the spring and fall. Migrating birds such as Common Loons and grebes, both of which feed at deep water lakes such as Deerfield Lake during migration, prefer calm waters. Additionally, there are two-known occupied Osprey nests in the area of the lake and a Bald Eagle nest located very near the shoreline. Both of these species feed on fish and could be disturbed in their fishing efforts by boats moving at a faster rate of speed or causing a wake.

If the speed becomes 25 mph, I can image water skiers pressuring the G&P to allow water skiing on the lake. To do that, skiers would need a speed of 35 mph and "Barefoot" skiers a speed of 45 mph. Once increased speeds are allowed, no end will be in sight. Next will be Jet Skis. Please keep the "No wake" and 5 mph policy in place - we need a serene place in the hills and a place that provides ideal nesting conditions for two raptors.

Lucy Ganje

Hill City SD

lucyganje@gmail.com

Comment:

My family and I utilize Deerfield Lake because we appreciate the no wake restriction currently in place. We feel it provides a quiet and safe environment for canoeing, kayaking and swimming--especially for youth activities. We DO NOT want the wake limit changed. There are many other lakes in the Black Hills where motorized water vehicles have access. But few, if any, like Deerfield Lake where so many of us go because of the current wake restriction. Thank you.

Barbara Wilson
Hill City SD
barjw1234@gmail.com

Comment:

I am a full time resident and live 1 mile from Deerfield Lake. We fish on our pontoon boat and ice fish here. I love the peacefulness of this lake. It would be so disturbing to change the no wake limit for one person (Edel) so he can travel on his fishing boat faster to get to better fishing across the lake, how silly. There would be no peacefulness present at the Lake in the future, if this no wake limit would change. It would be a shame to let speed boats, jet skis pollute our good fishing, kayak, canoe and swimming lake. Deerfield Lake is NOT big enough to allow the speed to change. It would be a nightmare and a hazzard to each person on the lake not to mention the noise the new speed would bring to our now peaceful lake. Please keep our Deerfield Lake at the 5 mph no wake limit. Preserve our peaceful lake, it just makes good sense for all.

Jon Wilson
Hill City SD
jonw6159@gmail.com

Comment:

Thankyou for the opportunity to share my thoughts on this proposal. Being a resident of Deerfield for the last 18 years it has been an absolute joy. Especially using the lake for fishing both in the winter and summer. One of the many enjoyable aspects of the lake is the manner in which it is used during the summer. Floaters for fly fishing, paddle boarders, and kyackers. We use our Pontoon boat to "float" the lake to enjoy an afternoon or evening, while fishing for the great Trout that call Deerfield Lake home. The current "No Wake " restriction poses no constraints to or ability to use the lake how it was intended. Fishing by it's nature is not a speed sport unless of course you are on the Pro Fishing Circuit. We also enjoy the Eagle population that calls Deerfield lake home. And in fact, you will remember a few years ago the DNR came out and created a restricted zone as to not disturb the nesting eagles with even a 5 MPH restriction. There are few enough lakes in the Black Hills and fewer still where we can enjoy the serenity, Eagles and the wild life on shore without, being disturbed by engines being cranked up to enable a bit more speed for the sake of speeding up the catch. I totally oppose the proposal and would encourage the Commission to stay the course regarding keeping Deerfield Lake a "No Wake Lake."

Dan Mahoney
Rapid City SD
daniel.mahoney@k12.sd.us

Comment:

We camp and fish up there a lot. It is a small lake and increasing the boat speed on it would not only make it dangerous, but ruin the quiet surrounding.

Scott Harris
Black Hawk SD
Boonersdh@rap.midco.net

Comment:

This is a beautiful quiet lake. We don't need jet skis and jet boats on every lake. Please leave it as a no wake zone

James And Carol Cummings

Rapid City SD

jnc67caddy@aol.com

Comment:

Deerfield is now a pristine fishing lake and we would like to keep it that way. We support the no wake lake as it is now. it is so peaceful and quiet up there it is wonderful. plus we think it is too small for the speed boats etc. please don't take our lake away from us. thank you.

Roberta Nowlan

Hot Springs SD

rlmeiners@hotmail.com

Comment:

This the lake my mom taught all her grandkids to fish on with out worries of wakes and speed boats. I have wonderful memories of my elderly mother Kiyaking on in peace.

Todd Tobin

Silver City SD

toddtobinsd@gmail.com

Comment:

Please Deerfield Lake a "no wake lake", free from walleye and northern pike, and keep it as a trout lake as it was from its beginning.

1. Please keep the tradition of a "no-wake-lake" in place on Deerfield Reservoir.
2. The Black Hills original lake and stream fishing history is rooted in trout, NOT walleye or northern pike. Please keep the Deerfield Lake experience for the past fifty-five (55) years intact.
3. Rainbow trout are naturally reproducing in Deerfield Lake from the Ditch Creek and Castle Creek tributaries, why would the State of South Dakota willingly destroy this cycle of life created through the introduction of walleye and northern pike?
4. Deerfield Lake has become a refuge for non-motorized lake goers, why would the State of South Dakota want to take that away from those taxpayers and outdoor enthusiasts?
5. As a long-time firefighter and emergency responder to Pactola Reservoir, the number of 911 response calls to that water recreation area is predominately based from watercraft that can exceed twenty-five (25) miles per hour. The location of Deerfield Lake is more than thirty (30) minutes away from the nearest fire department and ambulance service (Hill City). Emergency Medical Services (EMS) agencies train to reach incident call(s) location(s) within twenty (20) minutes from the time they are paged to the arrival time on-scene.
6. If larger, faster boats are allowed on Deerfield Reservoir, that lake will experience an increased 911 incident call volume as experienced at Pactola and Sheridan Lakes currently do; with a substantially longer EMS response time the public safety concerns will be an unwelcomed consequence from the States actions.

Jerome Harvey

Rapid City SD

savedeerfieldlake@gmail.com

Comment:

To:
Kelly Hepler
Secretary GAME FISH & PARKS

523 E CAPITOL AVE
PIERRE SD 57501-3181

Ref:

South Dakota Game Fish and Parks Petition # 70 to change 41:04:02:51. Pennington County public water safety zones are as follows:

? From: (1) All waters of Deerfield Reservoir are a "no wake zone";

? To: all waters on Deerfield Reservoir be modified to 25-mph.

On Thursday, June 6, 2019, the South Dakota Game Fish and Parks Commission will be holding a hearing to raise the speed limit on Deerfield Lake from no wake to 25mph.

I'm born and raised in South Dakota and a very frequent user of and visitor to Deerfield Lake since I can remember and I'm opposed to this petition.

- Deerfield Reservoir is the largest lake in the Black Hills where people can enjoy recreational opportunities, without fear of boat wakes and without the noise of loud boat motors and subsequent pollution. There are plenty of other lakes in the region, Pactola Reservoir, Sheridan Lake, Angostura Reservoir, Stockade Lake, and Orman Dam, that are large enough for motorized water sports enthusiasts and fast boat fisherman to enjoy their recreational opportunities.

- Comparing winter activities with spring, summer and fall activities are like comparing apples to oranges, their simply is no comparison and therefore is not a valid argument.

- Increasing the speed, creates a lake wide wake zone, on a lake where this has never been allowed. The Father, Son/Daughter opportunities with a low budget, low speed fishing boat will forever be lost as it will simple, no longer be safe to go on to the lake, unless one has at a minimum, a high dollar, fast going, bass style fishing boat. An entire generation of youth being introduced to low cost sporting and outdoor pursuits on the lake will be lost.

- Fast boat fishing opportunities currently exist for the petitioner Mr Edel at both Sheridan Lake, 39 minutes from his residence and Pactola, 37 minutes from his residence.

- The current no wake regulation is more than just a "nice gesture", it's very practical and needed for safe recreating applications on the lake. Currently the only fully qualified and equipped Dive and Water Rescue team is based at the Rapid City Fire Department, Station 3, 102 Federal AV in Rapid City SD. This service is currently 30 minutes from Pactola, 39 minutes from Sheridan Lake and a 1 hour, 11 minute drive under perfect condition's to Deerfield Lake, these time frames do not include additional delays caused by zero cellular phone coverage at Deerfield, and the time to notify assembly and scramble a team. With the introduction of fast boat fishing and similar activities competing with the paddle boaters (Canoes, Kayaks et-al) and low speed, low budget fishing boats will inevitably lead to accidents, drownings and other calamities requiring the response of these emergency resources.

- Changing Deerfield to an "all wake lake" will increase cost to the South Dakota Game Fish and Parks Department as there will be a need to install and maintain appropriate signage, increase patrols, dedication of a Game Wardens Time to patrol, monitor and enforce applicable rules and regulations. This will include additionally fleet acquisitions and maintenance for vehicles, communications equipment, training, a boat and all the ancillary equipment. As this equipment is currently dedicated for like purposes on the current "wake lakes". These are expenses that are not needed and a waste of resources.

- Petition #70, references old "data" from 2016, contrary to the petitioners opinion of Deerfield Lake being "underutilized" It is ok and acceptable for Deerfield to remain as is, a no wake lake and not join the other lakes and fisheries to be over used and over fished.

- All wake lakes suffer from increased damage to shore line, habitat, and sedimentation. All undesirable effects.

I ask you to please oppose petition number #70 on June, 6th, 2019

Tanya Westbrook

Rapid City SD

Comment:

I oppose increasing the wake restriction on Deerfield Lake. It should remain 5 mph. There are plenty of other lakes in the hills with a higher mph limit. Deerfield is treasured for its peace and tranquility for fishing as well as increased safety for kayaking and paddle boarding.

Rich Detry

Albuquerque NM

Rdetry@yahoo.com

Comment:

I visit the Black Hills every summer. Deerfield is one of my favorite places to spend time. I love the peace and quiet. If the boat speed maximum is increased I will stop visiting Deerfield and the Black Hills. I visit the Hills to get away from noise and activity.

Genevieve Newell

Rapid City SD

jackienewell@rushmore.com

Comment:

Please keep Deerfield Lake wake free. There are so few quiet places, and this is one valued by so many. It's great for shore fishing, kayaks, canoes, paddle boards and row boats. Please keep it wake free.

Halley Legge

Rapid City SD

hal7272@hotmail.com

Comment:

Take into consideration the major amounts of erosion on the shorelines of Sheridan Lake. "Surf boats" or boats that hold water in order to create a large wake in their path, have ruined Sheridan Lake's exterior infrastructure. Walk-in area trails have moved up the shoreline considerably. Alternatively, Pactola has enough rock on its exterior that it has not been affected like Sheridan has by these boats. As a fisherwoman, I enjoy a place of solitude. Deerfield serves that need no matter the time of year. If this proposal goes through, there is no way to enforce a 25 mph speed. Budgets are already low and law enforcement officers are not equipped with Radar guns to enforce such measures. Your officers are there to protect the resource and the habitat. Please continue to protect Deerfield, its peaceful demeanor, and our valuable resource.

Joseph Loe
Hermosa SD
jkloe2@hotmail.com

Comment:

Enjoy the solitude and absence of noise while fishing. If it takes awhile to get to your spot, at least you can count on no boat wake interrupting once you get there.

Jerry Duba
Rapid City SD
jduba@rushmore.com

Comment:

I think canoes and kayaks should be entitled to one lake to enjoy without fear of being run over or swamped by motor boats.

William Chamberlain
Custer SD
itzdigger@yahoo.com

Comment:

there are plenty of other lakes for boating please leave one calm piece of solitude in the black hills thank you

Susan Goodman
Custer SD
sdgrn23@yahoo.com

Comment:

please leave deerfield as is, there are plenty of other lakes that people can ride wave runners and motor boats. this change will certainly ruin the peacefulness, serenity, and beauty of this lake.

Curtis Groote
Rapid City SD
cgroote1@yahoo.com

Comment:

We have camped for 39 years near Deerfield Lake.
With the invasion of ATV's the forest is no longer one of solitude and quiet, along with their off-trail erosion. (We would rather see ATV's banned).
To remove the no-wake provision would be a travesty. Please keep it the way it is.
Thanks.

Steve Pischke

Custer SD

pischke@goldenwest.net

Comment:

With this proposal, has anyone taken into consideration the pair of Bald Eagles that nest adjacent to the lake on the west side? How would instituting a 25 MPH speed limit affect them.? I was on Angostura reservoir last week and heading into shore I asked my fishing buddy to crank the speed up in his walleye boat to 25 MPH and we do not need this on Deerfield Lake. Let's keep it the "family friendly" lake that is it. Thank you.

Lynn Kading

Rapid City SD

lskading@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose increasing the speed limit on Deerfield Lake. This is the only lake in the Black Hills where fishing and slow water sports can be enjoyed without competing with water craft that create wakes. Keep this lake available for this segment to enjoy. There are plenty of lakes available for water craft that need to go faster.

Mark Gibbes

Rapid City SD

mandtgibb@vastbb.net

Comment:

Strongly oppose removing the no-wake/5 mph restriction on Deerfield Reservoir. I very much enjoy taking my grandchildren fishing in my canoe and Deerfield is the lone spot in the Black Hills where I can do so without danger of being capsized by the wakes of speeding boats; furthermore, the peace and quiet we enjoy at Deerfield is not available on other Black Hills lakes. Thank you.

Bobbi Cramer

Rapid City SD

booberryracing@gmail.com

Comment:

This a beautiful lake, I enjoy the serenity and beauty and most of all the quietness of the lake just hearing nature. I love kayaking there and it's so nice no worrying g if a boat or jet ski is going to run me over. Pactola is out of control I don't what this to happen to one of the Black Hills gem's.

Julia Davis

Rapid City SD

freakyga1985@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield needs to stay a no-wake zone. Most of us that use it on the water are kayaks, canoes, small fishing boats with just a troll motor, and fishing tubes. There is a lot of walking access to fish off shore and those in the boats listed are respectful to those fishermen. We have plenty of other lakes for other boating activities. Deerfield experience fishing is priceless, leave it alone and continue sustaining it as a true fishing jewel. Keep a lake for the tranquil experience, for the on shore fisherman, for kayaks and canoes.

Allen Puetz

Black Hawk SD

timinginvestments@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Cindee Bittner

Black Hawk SD

timinginvestments@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jeanne Foss

Custer SD

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Clifford Meyer

Sturgis SD

cwm0728@gmail.com

Comment:

please keep Deerfield lake a no wake lake. it is the only lake where you can use a boat to fish without skiers

Judith Meyer

Sturgis SD

meyyerjudy623@gmail.com

Comment:

please keep Deerfield lake a no wake lake

Robert Roush

Sturgis SD

Comment:

please keep Deerfield lake a no wake lake

Sharon Roush

Sturgis SD

Comment:

please keep it a no wake lake

Delbert Meyer

Sturgis SD

Comment:

keep it a no wake lake

Lisa Meyer

Sturgis SD

Comment:

keep it a no wake lake

Edward Hofkamp
Rapid City SD
ehofkamp@rushmore.com

Comment:

Do not allow the change for boaters to violate the no wake rule at Deerfield Lake. Boaters have many other lakes in the area for recreational activities. Leave Deerfield for shore fisherman with families.

Donald Askew
Hill City SD
donaskew46@gmail.com

Comment:

My wife and I live within 5 miles of Deerfield Lake. We use the lake for camping, hiking, fishing, swimming and boating. We enjoy the quietness of the lake and adhere to the no wake rules on the lake. We feel that an increase in speed on the lake will damage its peaceful and serene qualities and infringe on the fishing, canoeing and swimming. There are many other lakes that can be used for skiing, power boating and the next thing we'll see are the jet skis. Please listen to the neighborhoods, campers, visitors to the Black Hills and keep this lake the way it is.

Mark Johnson
Rapid City SD
Markbiggreentree@gmail.com

Comment:

Please leave the only large lake we have a no wake peacefull place

Stanley Blaylock
Rapid City SD
stanleyblaylock50@gmail.com

Comment:

If the no-wake restriction is removed from Deer Field Reservoir it will ruin lake for people like me. I am a Grandfather who loves to take my Grandsons to Deerfield to camp, kayak, bank fish, and swim. It would no longer be a safe haven for people like me wanting to escape the perils of jet skis, boat skiing and party boats. Please don't allow this to happen.

Charlotte Stender

Box Elder SD

C_bear36@hotmail.com

Comment:

Do not remove the no wake restrictions or increase the speed limit at Deerfield Reservoir! This is one of the few serene, peaceful lakes we have left to enjoy kayaking, canoeing, and fishing without the constant drone of powerful boats and all the pollution and trash that those type of recreationalists bring with them. If the no wake restriction is removed and the speed limit is raised, the serenity that Deerfield is known for will be destroyed. Boaters that wish to go faster already have Lake Sheridan, Lake Pactola, Orman Dam, Angostura, and several other options to rip around on. Leave Deerfield as is!!

Kinsley Groote

Rapid City SD

kfp22powers@hotmail.com

Comment:

I oppose the Deerfield lake speed limit increase on the lake. please keep the solitude of the lake. I wouldn't mind a speed increased to maybe something like 10 mph but 25 mph is way too high.

Sarah Nelson

Sturgis SD

sarahnelson02@yahoo.com

Comment:

I oppose changing the no wake restriction. Deerfield Lake is the only lake where muscle powered boats like kayaks and canoes don't have to worry about fast boats and jet-ski traffic.

Karen A Moore

Sturgis SD

onemoorebass@outlook.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake deserves to remain as peaceful, quiet, restful, beautiful, tranquil and lovely as the conditions of weather and considerate human use can allow it to be. If it were up to me, I'd change regulations to allow ONLY muscle-powered water craft and swimming. Fishing, too, of course. Fishing can inspire patience and discovery of wonder, if given half a chance.

Joseph Harrison

Rapid City SD

Comment:

No wake on Deerfield Lake please

Ranelle Clow
Rapid City SD
ranelleclow@gmail.com

Comment:

I am an older woman who enjoys kayaking and camping. I am able to do both at Deerfield because of the No Wake. Please keep it that way. There are many lakes where boats can speed. Please, please keep Deerfield No Wake. Thank you.

David Bass
Rapid City SD
drdavidlbass@aol.com

Comment:

Please don't destroy the treasure of solitude and quiet.

Ron Bunnell
Rapid City SD
ronbunnell2013@gmail.com

Comment:

Please Consider Deerfield Very Carefully

The three most beautiful lakes in South Dakota are undoubtedly Canyon Lake in western Rapid City, Sylvan Lake in Custer State Park where we go each year for our wedding anniversary and Deerfield Lake where we go just to get away for a few days.

These lakes are the sole reason for ever buying an annual fishing license. The fishing poles only come out for our annual visits and down-time at one of these beautiful places.

These lakes have two things in common. They are peaceful and quiet. At Deerfield and Sylvan, the peace and quiet is amplified because there is no reliable cellular service. People can go there and be with their others without distractions. You do a little fishing, take a nice walk, sit by the fire or just watch the wildlife.

The only beneficiaries from having these lakes open to speed boats is the person speeding along on a wave runner or perched behind the steering wheel of the boat racing back and forth on the lake with no interest in the peace and quiet that made the place beautiful and attractive in the first place.

Finally, if the decision is made to move ahead with allowing higher powered boats onto Deerfield Lake, at the very least, the Game, Fish and Parks Commission should ease into this by allowing boats on the lake only for a select few holidays during the next, let's say, five years. Then do a really good job of gathering feedback on how that works for everyone involved. How much new infrastructure is required such as boat ramps and trailer parking, etc. Five year time period is mainly due to weather considerations which can be very different than other parts of the Hills.

Thank you Ron and Donna Bunnell
3208 Kirkwood Drive
Rapid City, SD 57702
Cell 605-415-8239

Scott Hettinger
Rapid City SD

Comment:

The Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) maintains an interest in proposed changes at Deerfield Dam and Reservoir that is part of the Rapid Valley Project. Reclamation opposes the public petition to remove the no wake zone at Deerfield Reservoir and replace it with a 25 miles per hour restriction. Reclamation is the Federal agency with jurisdiction for the operation and maintenance of Deerfield Dam and Reservoir. Deerfield Dam and Reservoir are located on Castle Creek, an upstream tributary to Rapid Creek. Deerfield Dam and Reservoir's authorized purpose is to provide supplemental municipal water for the Rapid Valley Water Conservancy District. As Reclamation's managing partner, the City of Rapid City operates and maintains Deerfield Dam and associated features. Deerfield Reservoir also provides recreation, and fish and wildlife benefits. Reclamation and the United States Forest Service (Forest Service) operate under agreements outlining administration and recreation responsibilities for Deerfield Reservoir. In a 1964 Memorandum of Understanding between Reclamation and the Forest Service, it specifies that "motor boats on the Reservoir area shall be limited to and not exceed a no-wake boat speed which is defined as normal docking or trolling speed." Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the subject proposal for Deerfield Reservoir. Reclamation recommends that the current "No Wake Zone" restriction at Deerfield Reservoir remain in place. If you have any questions related to this comment, please contact Cindy Larom directly at 605-519-5459.

Ranelle Clow
Rapid City SD

Comment:

This note is in regards to the Deerfield Lake proposal. I am an older woman who has discovered kayaking. And Deerfield Lake is where my friends and I can gather to enjoy calm water and kayak the whole lake. Please do not increase the speed on Deerfield, there are enough other lakes for motorized water craft. Vote No no speed increase is needed. Keep Deerfield at 5 MPH.

Gary Ladner
Rapid City SD
gjladner@rushmore.com

Comment:

I am writing to voice my opposition to change the Deerfield Lake No-Wake restriction by increasing the speed for water craft from 5 to 25 MPH. Whether one is fishing, canoeing, kayaking, paddle boarding, swimming, hiking or just enjoying nature, Deerfield Lake is one of nature's treasures, not destroying them. Please keep Deerfield lake a No-Wake lake by maintaining the 5 MPH restriction.

Robert Paul
Hot Springs SD

Comment:

I am tendering these comments in regard to proposal regulation changes concerning boating on Deerfield Lake in the Western Black Hills. Deerfield lake, by virtue of it's location, is a unique gem for the State of South Dakota. It is in a very secluded, pristine area of the Hills and is the only large lake in the Black Hills where tourists and residents alike can experience the solitude without the noise, congestion, and interference with increased boating pressure. Allowing increased speed limits at Deerfield lake will also increase the risk of accidents injuries, and complaints in an area of very poor phone reception. Be able to contact emergency personnel will be very difficult for most people. I would strongly urge the commission to deny the proposed change. I feel the change would lead to more problems than any we currently may have. There are adequate locations already exist with better access, communication and availability now.

James Grebner
Rapid City SD

Comment:

I've enjoyed fishing in the Black Hills for nearly 60 years. My friends and I have always loved the peace & serenity to be found at Deerfield Lake. It's the only place we can get away from the noise, rough water & congestion cause by speeding boaters. Please don't ruin this last piece of paradise. Keep the no wake rule in effect.

Clayton Renner
Deadwood SD

Comment:

Eliminating the no wake zone on Deerfield lake is a very bad idea. Deerfield is the only large body of water where people can get away from high, noisy activity. Why spoil a wonderful, quiet area just so someone can speed to his favorite spot a few minutes faster. Also, if the wake ban is lifted, there will be tubers, wake boarders, and yes Skiers!

Lyndon Smith
Rapid City SD

Comment:

Could you please include this letter in your public record, to be considered by Game, Fish, & Parks commission. My son in law takes me up to ice fish at Deerfield lake each winter. This is all I have to look forward to in the winter. We both marvel at the peace and beauty of it. The fish are plentyfull and taste so pure it is amazing. Huge eagles land and come with in ten food of our fish shack. We can no let this spot of beauty be soiled with hydro-planes and jet skies with nitro. One lake in all of South Dakota, come on One! Left for us that are not enamored in high horsepower. Please don't make this into a cesspool like so many of the other lakes. Please leave Deerfield alone, so I can enjoy it in my last few years.

Jerome Harvey

Rapid City SD

savedeerfieldlake@gmail.com

Comment:

On Thursday, June 6th, 2019, the South Dakota Game Fish and Parks Commission will be holding a hearing to raise the speed limit on Deerfield Lake from no wake to 25 MPH. I'm Born and raised in South Dakota and a very frequent user of and visitor to Deerfield Lake since I can remember and I'm opposed to this petition. Deerfield Reservoir is the largest lake in the Black Hills where people can enjoy recreational opportunities, without fear of boat wakes and without the noise of loud boat motors and subsequent pollution. There are plenty of other lakes in the region, Pactola Reservoir, Sheridan Lake, and Orman Dam, that are large enough for motorized water sports enthusiasts and fast boat fisherman to enjoy their recreational opportunities. Comparing winter activities with spring, summer and fall activities are like comparing apples to oranges, their simply is no comparison and therefore is not a valid argument. Increasing the speed, creates a lake wide wake zone, on a lake where this has never been allowed. The father, son/daughter opportunities with a low budget, low speed fishing boat will forever be lost as it will simple, no longer be safe to go on the lake, unless one has at a minimum a high dollar, fast going, bass style fishing boat. An entire generation of young being introduced to lost cost sporting and outdoor pursuits on the lake will be lost. Fast boat fishing opportunities currently exist for the petitioner Mr Edel at both Sheridan Lake, 39 minutes form his resident and Pactola, 37 minutes from his residence. The current no wake regulation is more than just a "nice gesture", it's very practical and needed for safe recreating applications on the lake. Currently the only fully qualified and equipped Dive and Water Rescue team is based at the Rapid City Fire Department, Station 3, 102 Federal Av in Rapid City, SD. This service is currently 30 minutes from Pactola, 39 minutes from Sheridan Lake and a 1 hour, 11 minute drive under perfect condition's to Deerfield Lake, these time frames do not include additional delays caused by zero cellular phone coverage at Deerfield, and the time to notify assembly and scramble a team. with the introduction of fast boat fishing and similar activities competing with the paddle boaters (canoes, kayaks et-al) and low speed, low budget fishing boats will inevitably lead to accidents, drownings and other calamities requiring the respond of the emergency resources. Changing Deerfield to an "all wake lake" will increase cost to the South Dakota Game Fish and Parks Department as there will be a need to install and maintain appropriate signage, increase patrols, dedication of a Game Wardens time to patrol monitor and enforce applicable rules and regulations. This will include additionally fleet acquisitions and maintenance for vehicles, communications equipment, training, a boat and all the ancillary lakes" These are expenses that are not needed and a wast of resources. Petition #70, references old "data" from 2016, contrary to the petitioners opinion of Deerfield Lake being "underutilized" it is OK to acceptable for Deerfield to remain as is, a no wake lake and not join the other lakes and fisheries to be over used and over fished. All wake lakes suffer from increase damage to shore line, habitat, and sedimentation. All undesirable effects. I ask you to please oppose petition number #70 on June,6th, 2019.

Genine Mace

Belle Fourche SD

gkmace@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please leave Deerfield lake alone. If boaters want to go faster they can go to Pactola, Sheridan, Angostura, or Orman Damn. Deerfield should be left for the casual fishermen, people in float tubes, small boats and shore fishermen. Deerfield is a family friendly environment where the people can fish in the above mentioned ways safely. If the boats are allowed to create wakes these activities will not longer be safe at Deerfield. Please leave Deerfield lake alone.

James Good
Rapid City SD
gulo40@hotmail.com

Comment:

I have lived in South Dakota for 20 years and have continually enjoyed camping and visiting at the Forest Service campground at Deerfield Lake almost every summer/fall. My wife and I enjoy the tranquility of the area, particularly the Lake, with its speed limit on boat use. The limited speed and resulting noise control of the boats on the Lake add to the enjoyment of this beautiful area.

I am a retired Refuge Manager with the US Fish & Wildlife Service(USFWS) having served for 30 years on refuges in most western states. I was the Refuge Mgr. at Havasu Refuge(CA-AZ), along the Colorado River from 1984-1996. One of my primary tasks was the management of the Topock Gorge Unit of the Refuge which goes for 15 miles from the north end of Lake Havasu to the Interstate Highway 40 Bridge. During summer, early fall months, the refuge receives some of the heaviest recreational boat use in the US. Our Refuge Officers, including myself, patrolled the Colorado River enforcing refuge regulations, particularly dealing with boating and jet skis. We had constant dealings with excessive speeds and disturbances to visitors, swimmers and operators of boats in backwaters off the main river channel which was under the jurisdiction of the USFWS. I battled constantly, over 10 years, with fishermen, recreational boat and jet ski operators violating no-wake zone regulations. Many citations were issued for these violations. Finally at the end of this period the Refuge got regulations in place to have no-wake regulations put in place for the back waters off the main Colorado River channel which is a navigable waterway under the jurisdiction of the US Coast Guard.

The no wake speed limit was very well accepted where established on the refuge and is still in place. Boating speed control regulations are needed in most areas where there is public use.

I am against the proposal to increase the boat speed limit at Deerfield Lake to 25 mph and encourage the Commission not to put this regulation change in place. We do not need to have the increase boat speed with associated increased noise in the beautiful and tranquil Deerfield Lake setting. I see no reason to allow this so fishermen can go faster. There is already enough of this type of disturbance on other lakes in the Black Hills.

Thank you for your time.

Jan Vandarwarka
Custer SD
jan1947sd@gmail.com

Comment:

Let those of us who love the peace, quiet, and calm of this no wake lake have one major Hills lake to safely navigate with our float tubes, canoes and kayaks. Protect this beautiful place. There is enough speed and noise on the rest of our lakes!

Rhea Kontos
Sioux Falls SD
rmkontos952@gmail.com

Comment:

In the age of speed, we need to slow it down and it has been a privilege to enjoy any lake that has a no wake or slow speed so those with paddle crafts and beach goers can enjoy the pleasures of a cleaner and quieter lake. I imagine the wildlife appreciated it as well. Seems like plenty of lakes in the surrounding area are available for boaters that need to accelerate.

Patricia Braun
Rapid City SD
plbraun@rushmore.com

Comment:

please do NOT change boating speeds at Deerfield. Please continue with this pristine, beautiful spot that is a rare treasure. The fisherman who stated he wanted to 'get to his favorite fishing spot' faster needs to take a deep breath and understand he is there not because he NEEDS to catch a fish for survival, he is there because he is a privileged human with a boat and equipment for the FUN of it. thank you.

Patrick Britton
Rapid City SD
patrickgw64@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose raising the boat speed limit on Deerfield Lake. It is a peaceful lake used by several people for fishing, kayaking, canoeing and paddle boarding. The people in favor of raising the speed limit should slow down, enjoy the beauty of the lake, or go to a different lake. Thank you!

Gary Ladner
Rapid City SD
gjladner@rushmore.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake remains one of nature's pristine treasures where one can enjoy solitude as nature intended. Please do remove the No-Wake restrictions, instead work to set aside more natural resources. Tranquility can not be found in noise and restlessness.

John Rehorst
Rapid City SD
JREHORST@RAP.MIDCO.NET

Comment:

I am opposed to changing Deerfield from 5mph to 25 mph for boats. There are many larger lakes allowing faster, noisy boats. Deerfield is the only larger lake that has maintained its quiet, serene atmosphere. Increasing the speed might adversely impact the safety of the non-motorized users of the lake. Please do not change this as it is increasingly difficult to find and enjoy tranquil areas in the hills. We need to preserve this lake's unique peacefulness. Thank you.

Jenny Rehorst

Rapid City SD

JREHORST@RAP.MIDCO.NET

Comment:

I am opposed to changing Deerfield Lake from 5mph to 25 mph boat speed. I have spent time with my family camping and fishing at Deerfield lake throughout the past 40 years. It has been possible for us to enjoy fly fishing from float tubes, as well as canoeing and kayaking, without having to worry about speeding boats going by. There are already many larger lakes in the area which allow for 25 mph boat speeds. Increasing the speed at Deerfield will increase the boat traffic, decrease the safety for non-motorized users, and take away from the wonderful and unique peace and quiet that this area provides. Please do not change Deerfield Lake. Thank you!

Janice Weisser

Hot Springs SD

jweisser@gwtc.net

Comment:

Please, please don't change Deerfield Lake. We love it the way is it, we need more solitude for everyone but mostly for the older citizens who have been going there for years and years. Our young people also need to learn about the quiet part of life. thank you for your consideration.

Robert Weisser

Hot Springs SD

jweisser@gwtc.net

Comment:

DON'T change Deer Field Dam. I have been going there for 80 years and love the quiet life.

Thanks

Dolores Nelson

Rapid City SD

Comment:

Please leave the no-wake restriction in place so we can all enjoy the peace and quiet of this wonderful place and not have to listen to power boats and jet skis

Kenneth Nelson

Rapid City SD

Comment:

This is one of the few no-wake lakes left in the Black Hills and it should stay that way. It is nice to be able to shore fish and not have power boats roaring by.

Susan Hey
Rapid City SD
butterflysue@midco.net

Comment:

The no wake designation and 5 mph speed limit is appropriate for Deerfield Lake. The citizens need to have a lake where kayakers and canoeists can enjoy no wake water. We all need a lake of quiet and peace in the Black Hills .

David Thom
Custer SD
dthom@gwtc.net

Comment:

I do not support lifting the "no-wake" restriction for boat traffic on Deerfield Reservoir for the following reasons:

- This is the only large reservoir/lake in the Black Hills that has a no-wake restriction to retain the quiet solitude for those recreationist seeking such settings. Sheridan, Pactola and Angustora all have unlimited motor/boat size that provide those types of experiences. Speed, waves and nosie is expected and anticipated on those lakes so those seeking a quieter experience can go to Deerfield Reservoir.
- Deerfield Reservoir has nesting bald eagles near the shore that should have some degree of quiet for reproduction and growth.
- Campers in the campgrounds adjacent to the lake enjoy the quiet the current setting allows.

Please retain the peace and quiet of this beautiful high elevation lake by voting against this proposal to increase boat speed.
Thank you. Dave Thom, Custer, SD

Anton Schwarz
Hill City SD
tschwarz1018@gmail.com

Comment:

Deerfield Lake is the only lake a person can float tube , kayak, or canoe witjout be swamped by jet skis or boats. Fishing while float tubing etc. would be hazardous. It wasn't so long ago that a young man drowned while kayaking on Deerfield. Could you imagine if one had to deal with speed boats and jet skis? We have no problem with getting across the lake while maintaining a maximum 5 mph!
Thank you!

Mylee Puetz
Black Hawk SD
Myleepuetz@excite.com

Comment:

There are three boat ramps around Deerfield Lake. If fishermen are in a hurry to get to a particular fishing hole, they can put it closer to it. To my knowledge there aren't bass tournaments on Deerfield Lake so why the rush to get around. We have been camping at this lake for several years specifically because it's peaceful and there is no concern of getting run over by a speeding boat while out kayaking. Please let us keep some peace, calm and quiet in this crazy, fast-paced world we all live in.

Tyler Nachtweih
Summerset SD
Nachtweih.tyler@gmail.com

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Robert Kayl
Bellaire TX
kaylcpa@sbcglobal.net

Comment:

Re: Deerfield Lake No-Wake Restriction

As an owner of property near Deerfield Lake and a concerned citizen, I strongly oppose the lifting of the no-wake restriction currently being considered by the GF&P Commission. My opposition is due to three key factors; 1) disturbing the existing tranquility of the lake, 2) public safety, and 3) the presence of other boating alternatives in the Black Hills region.

My wife and I recently purchased a property near Deerfield Lake. The lake, with its current no-wake restrictions and tranquil beauty, was a key factor in choosing the Black Hills. The lake is a quiet treasure in the Black Hills and should continue as it stands today. We are visiting the Hills this week and plan to hike around the lake. We are expecting to enjoy the quiet, peacefulness of the lake, without the disturbance of high speed boating. We also hope to kayak or canoe on the lake; two activities that could be jeopardized in the future, if the no-wake restriction is removed.

There is also a public safety concern with lifting the no-wake restriction. Currently, there is very limited, if any, cellular reception at or near Deerfield Lake. If an accident would occur, which may be more likely due to boats speeding across the lake, emergency response time is extended. The presence of more boats, traveling at faster speeds, greatly increase the chance of an accident occurring. Having to travel several miles to get cellular reception or hoping that the Mt. Meadow store is open to use their telephone is a risk that supports keeping the no-wake restriction on Deerfield Lake intact.

Finally, there are several other boating opportunities in the Black Hills region. Pactola Reservoir, Sheridan Lake and Angostura Reservoir all offer alternatives to boaters without a wake restriction. Keeping the Deerfield Lake no-wake restriction is really the only practical option for kayakers, canoers or others, who want a relaxing, wake-free environment in Black Hills.

As a South Dakota native, landowner and part-time resident, I appreciate the traditions of the state. The tradition of Deerfield Lake, as it stands today, with the no-wake restriction, should be honored and celebrated. I strongly oppose lifting the no-wake ban of Deerfield Lake and urge the Commission to keep the lake as our parents and grandparents intended.

Thank you.
Robert Kayl
Anne Kayl

Sylvia Lambert

Interior SD

smldancer@hotmail.com

Comment:

It seems that people, who know the importance of quiet places for physical and emotional health, get discriminated against by the dominant culture of speed. Though they may be a minority of the population, they deserve their right to have a place for their way of being.

Please let Deerfield Lake continue to be the one Black Hills lake for the people who want solitude.

Thank you.

Patrice Lynch

Rapid City SD

Takodasnana@gmail.com

Comment:

We are Totally against this petition!!!My family has tried to canoe on lakes that allow high speed vehicles. Several times, many boats purposely try to capsize a canoe with no concern for kids under 10 in the boat. I have rarely observed SDGFP out regulating the speed and drinking on these lakes. It is difficult to determine a speed of boat and Deerfield is too remote for administration/law enforcement. No wake is much simpler to administer. No wake should continue on Deerfield Reservoir to provide recreation users a more serene experience. Increasing wake will erode the shores. Thus will impact the rare Lake Chub. There have been no studies that have determined the reasons why this fish population is in decline. It is the only lake in the Black Hills with two bald eagle nests. There are many shorebirds, including loons. The SDGFP is responsible for maintaining habitat and populations for ALL species. Not just for the species that can be hunted, trapped, or fished. They also need to be good neighbors to land management agencies and do more to accomodate their management objectives, not make this stupid petition from some guy that doesn't like to take 30 min. across the lake. What's his hurry???He should go fish and dodge speed boats on lakes that are managed actively to provide superior angling experience. We need this lake for the serenity and peaceful experience and the ability to safely canoe with kids.. My family and friends respectfully ask the commission to not go forward on this petition. It is a waste of resources and money that their budgets cannot afford. Put your priorities on lakes that need more overcite than this one.

Patrice Lynch
Rapid City SD
Takodasnana@gmail.com

Comment:

We are Totally against this petition!!!My family has tried to canoe on lakes that allow high speed vehicles. Several times, many boats purposely try to capsize a canoe with no concern for kids under 10 in the boat. I have rarely observed SDGFP out regulating the speed and drinking on these lakes. It is difficult to determine a speed of boat and Deerfield is too remote for administration/law enforcement. No wake is much simpler to administer. No wake should continue on Deerfield Reservoir to provide recreation users a more serene experience. Increasing wake will erode the shores. Thus will impact the rare Lake Chub. There have been no studies that have determined the reasons why this fish population is in decline. It is the only lake in the Black Hills with two bald eagle nests. There are many shorebirds, including loons. The SDGFP is responsible for maintaining habitat and populations for ALL species. Not just for the species that can be hunted, trapped, or fished. They also need to be good neighbors to land management agencies and do more to accomodate their management objectives, not make this stupid petition from some guy that doesn't like to take 30 min. across the lake. What's his hurry???He should go fish and dodge speed boats on lakes that are managed actively to provide superior angling experience. We need this lake for the serenity and peaceful experience and the ability to safely canoe with kids.. My family and friends respectfully ask the commission to not go forward on this petition. It is a waste of resources and money that their budgets cannot afford. Put your priorities on lakes that need more overcite than this one.

Lennie Symes
Rapid City SD
Isinrc@gmail.com

Comment:

I implore the GFP not to change the no-wake restrictions at Deerfield Lake. My family has been active in utilizing many state park areas and lakes in the Black Hills: Angostura, Pactola, Deerfield, Sheridan, Center, and Horsethief. Often Angostura, Pactola, and Sheridan become almost unusable for stand-up paddleboards (SUP) because of the wakes and traffic (and noise) generated from boats and jet skis, particularly weekends, and these are larger lakes than Deerfield. Center and Horsethief are too small, as you can cross to the other side in 5-10 minutes. The lone retreat from the boat traffic is Deerfield. The problem with Deerfield is that it is narrow, so wakes will reverberate from shore to shore long after the boats move on. If you SUP or kayak in the Jenny Gulch area of Pactola or between North Ramp/Ski Beach of Angostura on busy days (or even nearly all of Sheridan), you know exactly how disturbed the water can get in narrow areas, even after the boats move on. Currently, Deerfield lake is active, but removing the no-wake restriction is a disaster to it's greatest attribute—a peaceful retreat in the Hills. Please do not change the no-wake restrictions!

Lennie Symes

David Huizenga

Hot Springs SD

dshuiz73@goldenwest.net

Comment:

Please retain the current no wake status at Deerfield Lake. As a camper, kayaker, and canoeist at Deerfield I believe it should retain its status as a premier destination for users to experience the natural serenity, beauty, and solitude without the noise and wake caused by higher boat speeds. There are sufficient boating opportunities at several lakes in the area to accommodate those wishing higher speeds as well as fishing opportunities. Please leave the current restrictions in place at Deerfield to preserve its natural unspoiled legacy for many years to come. Thank You

Firarm, Crossboaws and Bow Restrictions in State Park and Rec Areas

Wayne Huebert

Sioux Falls SD

waynewhitetail@gmail.com

Comment:

In respect to allowing crossbows as a legal weapon in State Parks. The way I read it means one does not have to be handicap. This is wrong in my opinion because not only does this take away from our deep tradition of compound and traditional archery, it is dangerous due to the speed of crossbows to people riding horse, walking or hiking. This may have been an issue when compounds started as well. Maybe we just have to adjust to it like hunters did before. Thank you for your consideration and the jobs you do.

James Elsing

Lemmon SD

elsing@sdplains.com

Comment:

I support the proposal to expand the period when hunting is allowed in the Shadehill Lake park and recreation areas to September 1 to May 31 from the current October 1 to April 30. If you look at the map of Shadehill Lake you will see the several park and recreation areas are intermixed with and between game production areas, and there is no apparent indication on the ground marking and identifying the many boundaries between them, such that one does not know with accuracy which area one is positioned. This affects grouse and partridge hunting in the Fall and turkey hunting in the Spring. Changing the dates as proposed to allowing hunting Shadehill Lake park and recreation areas from September 1 to May 31 would fix these problems, provide more hunting recreation, and save the expense of marking and maintaining boundary signs. Thank you. James Elsing

Other

Justin Murphy

Lyons SD

justintmurphy@outlook.com

Comment:

South Dakota should consider drawing elk licenses earlier in the year. It is difficult to properly plan for fall hunts not knowing if an individual has drawn a South Dakota elk tag. By the time results have posted most other states have already had second draws. It would also assist with getting leave requests approved with employers if an applicant is successful. Thank you for your time.

Justin Murphy
Lyons, SD

Lamoyne Darnall

Rapid City SD

lamoynedarnall@yahoo.com

Comment:

Due to bass being very inquisitive, they are an easy target for spear fishers, therefor there are very few Bass in Pactola to repopulate the species. Please give them a chance by stopping the spearing of bass in pactola.

Cody Warren

Rapid City SD

Clwarren94@yahoo.com

Comment:

As an avid angler I have seen a decrease of the bass population and an increase of spearfishing. The bass are a pretty easy target in the clear water Pactola has to offer. When people say spearfishermen cant get them all that's correct, but they have put a good dent in it.

Tass Thacker

Rapid City SD

Brucetassiow@hotmail.com

Comment:

This program is ridiculous. The pheasant population has declined due to the distraction of their habitat. The pheasant is an exotic species not native. Teaching children to kill animals for fun is wrong.

Rusty Schmidt
Rapid City SD
foxhound6126@hotmail.com

Comment:

I am completely opposed to limiting the access permits to the Custer National Forest.

Diane Lang
Seattle WA
lang_diane@hotmail.com

Comment:

Please protect our wildlife.

Steve Toepfer
Oacoma SD
stevetoepfer@icloud.com

Comment:

I was unable to leave a public comment at the assigned location as for the May 23 rd meeting so I am sending it here. I have read the proposed changes and I agree with them. I believe these are good changes.

Deborah Kitzul
Grand Blanc MI
warriorhawkwolf@yahoo.com

Comment:

We are destroying everything on the planet. Over 60% of the animals in the last 40 years. We are quickly coming to our own demise.

Beverly Alba
Winthrop MA
beverlyalba@aol.com

Comment:

No extension past May 1. The public overwhelmingly opposes any wildlife trapping. The lands are public and belong to all in US. Trapping is inherently cruel, ethically wrong, and ecologically unsound.

C. Marie Hlushtchyk

Carteret NJ

yogagirl0201@yahoo.com

Comment:

Animals aren't the problem its people who are the problem. Humans are no better & no higher than animals, they need to share the land. The selfishness & greed must end & maybe the world will be a better place. If humans cant respect animals than they are just plain evil.

Virginia Derasmi

Carteret NJ

ginjon@aol.com

Comment:

Maybe if you'd stop building so much the people wouldnt be taking the animals land. Get rid of the people not the animals! The animals ask you for NOTHING - LEAVE THEM ALONE!

Cody Traweek

Olympia WA

Cody.Traweek.PharmD@gmail.com

Comment:

I urge the commission not to extend the use of traps on public lands. The current May 1 deadline should be maintained because it enhances public safety, promotes tourism, and reduces the suffering of orphaned wildlife on public lands preventing the unethical trapping of mothers with young. Expanding archaic trapping of our public wildlife is promoting a barbaric and cruel process that needs to be stopped. There are better ways to expand pheasant populations and we should not indiscriminately kill wildlife to improve hunting odds, as this shows an ignorance for the delicate balance of local ecosystems.

James Elsing
Lemmon SD
elsing@sdplains.com

Comment:

I clicked on the link below Flying a Drone in State Parks and reviewed the resulting page, that included the following: "The following statute applies to drone use regardless of what property you are on:
• You cannot use a drone to hunt, kill, take, concentrate, drive, rally, stir up, spot, or locate game birds, or animals. SDCL 41-8-39." Your comments state the language is in fact SDCL 41-8-39. I assume nearly everyone reading this page assumes what you have stated to be true. I had my suspicions, so I checked it out. You have not stated the statute, nor have you stated an accurate summarization of the statute. You are not only misleading the public by your claim to the statute, you are destroying any credibility of the GF&P by your inaccurate claim. Of course I now wonder how many other statements from the GF&P on any subject are worth reading or believing. Had your preliminary statement read to the effect "The following is a summary interpretation of the statute cited that should be read for correct understanding." I could live with that. Or you could have printed the full statute as your introductory declaration denotes. Your inaccurate claim is definitely not the professional competence and accuracy I expect from the GF&P. I didn't see the point in further checking the prior claims on this web page referring to SDCL and ARSD. Are they too inaccurate summaries? I find it unacceptable that the GF&P can make careless and false claims of the law regarding your own affairs, but if I were to do the same I would be arrested and charged in court for failure to properly follow the law.

Vicki Honerkamp
Piedmont SD
vickihonerkamp@gmail.com

Comment:

Yesterday,5/12/19, we took advantage of the free fishing day and my husband took me fishing to Sheridan Lake. I am disabled and have a hard time walking even with a cane. I was so pleased with the metal walkways with rails that led on to the floating docks in the area just off the highway! I was able to get on to the dock with no assistance! It was simply a beautiful day and we had been there fishing for about an hour when a very nice young man approached us from your department and said he was taking surveys. We had only had one nibble at the time and he said he would check on us later. Another hour and a half passed and he returned. We had only had one more nibble so he decided to survey us and asked us several questions. We were happy to comply.

Well,we were there a couple of more hours and finally fish were starting to bite for several fishermen around us when my husband caught a nice sized trout! This was a pretty and fat Rainbow trout just the size for my Mother's Day supper! But it was an unusual fish as it had a unique deformity! I am sending some pictures with this email and was wondering if there is a possibility of getting them to that nice young man? I think he would get a chuckle that not only was this fish unusual but also the fact that the fish did not bite until after he left! He was a tall thin young man with dark curly hair. By the way, the fish was delicious and the spine was fused in to the unusual shape. I have no idea how it could swim!

Gary Lindner
Clear Lake SD
gklin@itctel.com

Comment:

just a short comment on the live trap give away and bounty program. I have used live trap to do this for sometime around my crp with pretty good success. when this program came out I thought what a super idea, and still think it's a great idea. but since I am getting older and grumpier I have to complain about something. GFP does such a good treating land owners the way they should be treated since we do feed wild life all year,that is why in my opinion I think the the trap give away should have been given to landowners first chance. still waiting for mine. so my grades for the above would be. bounty program= A+—giving traps away free A +—treating land owners with respect A+—who received the traps to begin with D . thank you for your time for reading this.

Judith Wegner
Pierre SD
judith.wegner1313@icloud.com

Comment:

I'm writing to express my feelings and concerns about the Bounty Program. I am under the impression that there will be another meeting on Monday, May 6th. The Argus Leader has the first months count on how many were trapped. It was jaw dropping to see how many were killed. I'm reading an article in South Dakota Outdoors all about this. According to the article we have lost over 1/2 a million acres in the CRP Program and farming practices are cleaner too. Because of this pheasants have fewer places to nest and hide from the cold. These statements are taken from our state pheasant biologists. Also to be pointed out is the same 4 species to be trapped are the ones that keep our rodent populations down. They actually stated that these species are not the reason for a decline in pheasant numbers.

I can ask you why not put falcons,hawks, etc. on that list? Please don't. My point being any species that feeds off pheasants should be killed??? Whenever man makes a decision at this level the repercussions are felt long after. As a matter of fact your agency doesn't know how this will impact other things or species.

Yes, pheasants are important to the economy of South Dakota. That being said we have a great deal of pheasants raised in protection at Lodges and farms. Pheasants aren't native to South Dakota but all of the bounty species are. I'm asking you to reconsider this drastic decision of a bounty on these species. Mother Nature doesn't always need man to interfere.

Thank you for your time. By the way I live on 17 acres east of Pierre. I feed the pheasants. I wait for fox to have their babies so my kids can see nature and wildlife. We don't kill anything on our property.

Melody Dennis

Deadwood SD

mdennis@rushmore.com

Comment:

I am a 30+ year resident of South Dakota. I am mortified by this ridiculous bounty program. We are teaching our children to abuse and kill innocent animals for \$10? What happened to kindness and compassion for living beings? This is disgusting. And to use children in your ads is offensive.

On one of your posts you said that if we run across a nests of babies to leave them alone. Mom will be back. No she won't. She's been senseless murdered for her tail. And her carcass thrown away to rot. There is absolutely no basis for this program. If Miss Noem is having trouble attracting pheasant hunters to her property maybe it's poorly managed. The photos you are posting are horrible. Stop it. Seriously. This program is costing money that could be used to improve wild life habitat. Game Fish and Parks is supposed to protect and defend our wild life. If any of your employees are so heartless to think this is ok, resign. You are in the wrong line of work. Don't be afraid to stand up for the wild life you are meant to protect STOP this thing Now!

Jeri Fosheim

Midland SD

fosheim@gwtc.net

Comment:

To whom it may concern,

I have a young, petite daughter who is hunting this Spring under the new guidelines of no rifle, only shotgun. We did try to have her shoot small game loads and the try a turkey load to see if she could handle it. She hasn't shot shotgun before as we knew it would be hard for her to handle at this age and want her to have a good experience.

We were affirmed and found shooting shotgun is WAY too much for her. It is considerably unsafe due to her inability to hold the gun steady and manage that size of load. We tried different methods to support her and pad it but to no avail. It just doesn't work.

She is also going to have to be considerably closer to her game and consider all her surroundings in a shorter amount of time prior to her shooting. Which we understand that making that assessment is part of hunting but just wish she'd have the time back a rifle on a bipod affords her in a safely supported shot.

She successfully harvested a turkey two years ago under a mentor tag with a .223. It wasn't super close, she had time to put her sights on the turkey, and it's now mounted in her room as it's still one of her best memories with her dad. I truly hope this year is successful in that they see some and she'll try again.

Our hunting group includes between 3-6 pairs of dads and kids, depending on weather and schedules. These kids are in their influential years of 8-15 and all enjoy hunting. A few aren't old enough and will be starting in the next year or two. We'd like to ensure their success of being future turkey hunters and would like to ask you to reconsider allowing rifles to be used in harvesting turkeys as it was in the past.

Angie Dolan
Sioux Falls SD
adolan@q.com

Comment:

I'm writing you as someone who has always been a proud South Dakotan, but your predator program has changed that. I am ashamed to be associated with the "family hunting" program that's been devised to eliminate animals seen by some to deplete the pheasant population. Two of the dogs we've adopted have come to the door with pheasants hanging from their mouths, so perhaps dogs will soon be caged, killed and their tails chopped for the same predator bounty you're offering. Let's work on climate control and conservation programs, the real reasons we're having issues. Teaching children the thrill of trapping, watching animals killed, and having tails chopped off doesn't begin to compare to the fostering, loving, and caring for animals who need help, as we have done repeatedly. Compassion, caring, and kindness? Not with your program! Work for POSITIVE effects, and please help our state create a better image than it now has.

Shannon Caperton
Rapid City SD
shanny2920@gmail.com

Comment:

I am writing in opposition to the Nest Predator Bounty Program. I am completely opposed to teaching children that killing small animals for money is okay. What is wrong with you? I believe the majority of South Dakotans do not agree with this program and would like to see it end.

Mary Tautkus
Deadwood SD
jtct@rushmore.com

Comment:

I am a law abiding, SD business owner who is so shocked and appalled at the predator program. What are you doing to stop it?
It is inhumane and is not teaching kids the background and purpose of hunting. I have heard you did not even get notified until afterwards. I am a voter and want my voice to be heard. We are supposed to be a democracy. So many people are against it but no one is answering us. I use to be so proud to live in SD and now I am ashamed. My business is very good and I put in thousands of dollars into the state system. So why did the public not get to voice their concerns? I am seriously thinking of moving and taking my tax dollars to another state that supports the dignity and lives of our animals and what they give back by having an ecosystem that works. And what about all the babies that will die slowly and miserably from starvation. I am not anti hunting at all if done right, and for the right reasons. This is not how it should be taught.

Wolfgang Schmidt

Nemo SD

elkcabin@msn.com

Comment:

We strongly urge you to NOT extend the Nest Predator Bounty Program until Aug. 31. This is a cruel program that will throw our ecosystem entirely out of balance. It is orphaning many small animals after killing their mothers, not to mention the cruelty of using traps. Also, what kind of message is this sending to our children and grandchildren? That killing is good? What do children know about trapping? Not to even mention the taxpayer expense involved. The residents of South Dakota should have a voice on this issue and it should not be decided by a "panel" of few. It is a one-sided program instituted by GF&P who should be PROTECTING our animals, not mass killing them. The rodent population will skyrocket as a result of this misguided idea. In this age of mass shootings in our schools, there should be no programs that promote violence in nature in order to boost the pheasant population. This was a very bad idea from the beginning and should be stopped immediately. We urge you to absolutely not extend this program until August 31. Please do your job and care about all of the animals in our world.

Muriel Anderson

Rapid City SD

mur mama60@gamil.com

Comment:

This is during the time animals raise their young and I feel that 8 months is long enough for trapping.

Deborah Harrowa

Rapid City SD

Dharrowa@icloud.com

Comment:

Trapping through the heat of the summer can be a very cruel death for the animals caught in traps, when not consistently checked. In addition, being on public lands, someone's pet or animals not on "kill list" could easily be caught in a trap and also die in the excruciating heat! Please don't extend this season.... in fact get rid of it altogether or only kill the animals areas where there is an actual nuisance!

Devin Miller

Smithfield SD

Devinmdurga@yahoo.com

Comment:

This kind of nonsense only promotes a lack of respect for wildlife and teaches killing is fun and profitable. It's barbaric and inhumane and thousands of offspring die horrible deaths as their sole providers are killed off for kicks. This brutal activity needs to stop. In this day and age people no longer support this barbarity.... and it's time South Dakota caught up with newer science and a less ignorant world view.

Carol Haley
Sandwich MA
Haleycarol@gmail.com

Comment:

I am in sting disagreement with any plan to extend trapping season on public land. There are several other humane methods to protect chickens and other livestock which don't involve this brutality. Trapping causes immense suffering.

Catherine Efraimson
New York NY
Mmutts@yahoo.com

Comment:

Game, Fish and Wildlife need protections not eradication. Using traps is cruel, painfully and inhumane, alienate methods must be available and considered rather than allowing this barbaric practice to continue.

Michael Delgado
San Diego CA
mpdelg33@gmail.com

Comment:

I urge the Commission to end trapping on public land.

Jillian Anawaty
Rapid City SD
Herbenlegends@gmail.com

Comment:

Please do not extend the trapping season.

Doug Dobesh
Spearfish SD
caldo5691@hotmail.com

Comment:

I guess the only way to get you people to listen to us is to hit you in the only place that it hurts-your pocketbook. I am encouraging everyone that I see to not purchase hunting and fishing licenses until intelligent, common sense comes into play. Every year we read that the GF&P is wringing their hands because the number of resident hunters keeps declining. We all know that the only reason this causes concern is due to lost revenue. The GF&P is supposed to be stewards of all wildlife in this state, not just the ones that bring in revenue. You at the GF&P, the GF&P commission, and the governor should be really proud of yourselves.

Kathryn Larsen

Spearfish SD

larsengirls@rushmore.com

Comment:

Well, I guess the Governor pays you and the general public apparently doesn't because you sure bend your rules to cater to her wants !!!!

Delwyn Newman

Lemmon SD

lindelnewman@gmail.com

Comment:

I want to comment on the recent trap giveaway and bounty program. I first heard of the program by e-mail AFTER the GFP decided the response for free traps was so high that the number went from 5 to 3 free traps. When I read THAT e-mail I then learned the program was closed (where is the fairness in that?). Then I read about the \$10.00 bounty. My question then became where did the money come from and why the sudden war on skunks, racoons, red fox (I know they like eggs, they have always liked eggs). Who will benefit the most (the average hunter or a private hunting preserve?) To me this is some kind of political game being played out with my sportsman dollars. My this never be! Thank you. Delwyn Newman, Lemmon SD

Mark Moreen

Montague MI

Redwingsmark@gmail.com

Comment:

Changing the date only confuses the application process. Making changes just for the sake of change is never a good thing, the simpler you can keep a process the apt people are to try hunting in South Dakota

Palisades

Andrew Sorenson

Garretson SD

asorenson.precisionag@gmail.com

Comment:

Leave it where it is. We want people to drive by the golf course and through the town of Garretson.

Restrict Spearing of Bass on Pactola Reservoir

Douglas Mitchell

Pierre SD

lilymitchell447@gmail.com

Comment:

I think it is a very good idea to prohibit the spearing of bass at Pactola Reservoir year round and also to take the no wake limit off of Deerfield Reservoir and enhance the use of that lake.



Everett E. Hoyt

4422 Carriage Hills Drive
Rapid City, South Dakota 57702
Home: 605-343-2707; Cell 605-430-2150
Email: evhoyt@rap.midco.net

May 29, 2019

Ms. Rachel Comes
Admin Asst to SDGFP Secretary
523 E. Capitol Avenue
Pierre, SD 57501

Re: Proposed Rule Change re Deerfield Lake

Dear Rachel,

Enclosed are originally signed Petitions Opposing the Proposed Rule Change re Deerfield Lake, in the format which you had suggested as appropriate for Comment on the Proposal. You will note that the enclosed Petitions are signed by 41 individuals, with name and address shown.

Please include the signatures on the enclosed Petitions as **Comments to the Commission on the Proposed Rule Change re Deerfield Lake which is to be heard by the Commission on June 6, 2019.**

Should there be any questions regarding the Petitions, please contact me.

Sincerely yours,

Encl.

Keep Deerfield Lake Beautiful and Safe

Petition to SDGFP Commission to Reject Rule Change on Deerfield Lake

We, the undersigned Concerned Users of Deerfield Lake request that the SD Game, Fish and Parks Commission reject the "Petition to increase the speed limit on from 5 mph to 25 mph and eliminate the No Wake restriction on Deerfield Lake" and keep Deerfield Lake beautiful and safe for all lake users. High speed boaters and jet skis already use the large Black Hills area lakes Sheridan Lake, Pactola Lake, Angostura Lake and Orman Dam/Belle Fourche Reservoir – there is no need to permit high speed boat operation on Deerfield Lake to endanger small craft users and annoy shoreline users.

By signing this petition in opposition to the proposed rule change, we give authorization and request that our names in opposition be provided to the Commission for their consideration during the hearing on the Petition for Rule Change for Deerfield Lake to be held on June 6, 2019 and any continued action.

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>CITY AND STATE</u>	<u>DATE</u>
Mark Vickers	609 81st	RC, S.D.	5/17/19
Kyle Drakunoff	28883 Wynnes Rd	edge mont SD	5/18/19
Grant M. Senborn	2102 Rio Dr.	Rapid City	5/18/19
Lawrence Kortaneshki	3040 W. Main #211	Rapid City, SD	5/18/19
LEE BRAND	2515 DOMING DRIVE	BISMARCK ND	5-18-19
JOHN KRUGER	1527 Remore Av	Baton Rouge LA	5/19/19
Nicholas Hilarides	1612 Rolling Green Dr.	Racine, WI	5/19/19
Joe Black	1200 Southwest Rd	Platteville WI	5/19/19
GEORGE KREBER	4472 CROOKED OAKS Rd.	Piedmont, SD	5-20-19.
Jerry Newman	2023 W Flormann,	RCSD	5-20-19
Helen Ladner	4418 Bellewood Dr.	RCSD	5-21-19
Gary Ladner	4418 Bellewood Dr.	Rapid city, SD	5-21-19
M. Ice Lees	509 AITA Lake Dr	Rgt. C.R., SD 57201	5/21/19
DAVID GAMET	2108 Cruz Dr	Rapid city, SD 57701	5/21/19
Jason King	2402 5 th St	Rapid city, SD 57701	5/21/19
RS Pence	11630 College Ln Apt 31	Spearfish, SD 57783	5/22/19

Keep Deerfield Lake Beautiful and Safe

Petition to SDGFP Commission to Reject Rule Change on Deerfield Lake

We, the undersigned Concerned Users of Deerfield Lake request that the SD Game, Fish and Parks Commission reject the "Petition to increase the speed limit on from 5 mph to 25 mph and eliminate the No Wake restriction on Deerfield Lake" and keep Deerfield Lake beautiful and safe for all lake users. High speed boaters and jet skis already use the large Black Hills area lakes Sheridan Lake, Pactola Lake, Angostura Lake and Orman Dam/Belle Fourche Reservoir – there is no need to permit high speed boat operation on Deerfield Lake to endanger small craft users and annoy shoreline users.

By signing this petition in opposition to the proposed rule change, we give authorization and request that our names in opposition be provided to the Commission for their consideration during the hearing on the Petition for Rule Change for Deerfield Lake to be held on June 6, 2019 and any continued action.

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>CITY AND STATE</u>	<u>DATE</u>
Karl Stephenson	202 Flormann St	Rapid City, SD 57701	5/11/19
Shaun LeZotte	2703 Maple Ave	Rapid City SD 57701	5/11/19
Jacob DeGroot	5153 Pine Tree Dr.	Rapid City, SD 57702	5/11/19
Mike DeMoss	1805 Skyline Ranch	Rapid City, SD 57701	5/11/19
HAROLD FENHANS	4237 CANYON LAKE DR	Rapid City 57702	5/11/19
Brady Gabel	1705 Coppendale Drive	Rapid City 57703	5/11/19
JOHN R. HOLMGREN	203 PINEDALE DR.	RAPID CITY, SD 57702	5/11/19
Hans Stephenson	1114 South St	Rapid City SD 57701	5/11/19
Ryan Gabert	1048 E Tallent St	Rapid City SD 57701	5/12/19
Dallas Abbott	5115 Autumn Place	Rapid City SD 57702	5/12/19
David Hanna	10120 Pioneer Ave	Rapid City SD 57702	5/13/19
David Moutz	4678 Avenue A	Rapid City, SD 57703	5/13/19
Cory Grace	318 National St #7	Rapid City SD 57702	5/13/19
Scott Malon	P.O. Box 785	Lead, SD 57754	5/15/19
Kristin Stephenson	202 Flormann St.	Rapid City SD 57701	5/15/19
Lyle DeCook	2714 Oak Ave	Rapid City 57701	5-16-19

May 28, 2019

**South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks Commission
Department of Game, Fish and Parks
523 East Capitol Avenue
Pierre, South Dakota 57501**

Secretary Hepler, Members of the Commission;

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments in opposition to the proposal to change public water safety zoning on Deerfield Reservoir.

I wish to first address the Petition to alter the "Public Water Safety Zone regulation on Deerfield Lake in Western Pennington County. The petition seeks to modify the zoning regulation by rescinding what it refers to as "the 5 Mile Per Hour restriction" on Deerfield Reservoir and insert, in its stead, a 25 mile per hour speed limit for water craft on that reservoir. The petition states, without collateral reference, that there is no underlying reason for the existing regulation and further states that the requested change is warranted to improve on an alleged under-utilized resource. How can one arrive at a conclusion like that without daily use trend statistics for all lake users? A loose review of creel surveys is hardly a viable indicator of the broader recreational use and capacity of Deerfield Lake. While Deerfield Lake is certainly most often used for fishing, it remains an outdoor destination of a wide variety of users from canoers, kayakers, float tube fishermen, to campers and shoreline landscape artists; during seasons of open water. It remains the last body of water

in western SD to survive the invasions of water based recreational technology. I have difficulty understanding how mention of winter snowmobiling, ice racing, and ice fishing have any bearing on increasing the boating speed limit during warmer months of the year.

There are abundant reasons why Deerfield Lake is and should remain a quiet, peaceful and safe "No Wake" lake.

Allow me to provide what might be referred to as several of the underlying reasons for the present public water safety zone rules that were adopted, largely in 1996, after considerable discussion and input from the US Forest Service, historical users of Black Hills reservoirs, boaters, fishermen, concession operators, and even the Pennington County judiciary.

In a nutshell; prior to those rules being promulgated, the US Forest Service was the defacto overseer of the three primary reservoirs in the Black Hills but their management and law enforcement effort dwindled, largely due to budget cuts, organizational changes, and staffing cuts. Additionally, the US Forest Service had no specific regulations in the Code of Federal Regulations that related to regulation of boating or public water safety zones on any Black Hills Reservoir. Forest Service law enforcement rarely used a "catch all" regulation to cite people for violations of swim zones, and no wake zones that had been arbitrarily installed by seasonal enforcement employees without the benefit of any formal rule in support of those designations. In short, boating traffic regulation and enforcement was haphazard, inconsistent and increasingly unsafe for most lake users.

With increases in recreational usage, user conflicts also increased and Game, Fish and Parks became the target for most complaints because by that time, Department Enforcement Officers were exercising their statutory responsibilities for boating safety and enforcement on Black Hills reservoirs without the benefit of formal boat traffic rules in ARSD. As a practical matter, the issue has become; and is entirely one of "user carrying capacity" on Black Hills lakes rather than one of an under-utilized resource. In this life long Black Hills outdoor enthusiast and professional's opinion; both Pactola and Sheridan Lakes have reached an unacceptable and unsafe level of recreational boating traffic on summer weekends and we do not need to attempt to redistribute that boating traffic to Deerfield Lake and create another congestion problem for the Department and users to deal with. Improved and intensified oversight and management is a more preferred alternative.

As a result of growing user conflicts, on all three lakes, (Pactola, Sheridan and Deerfield) since the early 1990's, and the near complete absence of visible and legally supported, consistent boating regulatory devices positioned on the lakes prior to that time; Game, Fish and Parks consulted with the aforementioned sources and proposed rules for Commission adoption. Those rules were predicated on the expertise and desires of the aforementioned sources of input and professional judgement on how best to keep the user conflicts to a minimum while insuring the comfort and safety of all. That is the primary goal of any boating safety regulatory effort. Department boating enforcement needed rules for these lakes no differently than any other body of water in the State to fulfill their statutory obligations in conformity with SDCL 42-8-1 and other provisions

under that title.

Deerfield Lake was proposed to be a "No Wake" zone for several reasons; not the least of which was "enforceability." During discussions with users of many persuasions, it became clear that establishing some mile per hour limit on that lake, or any other, was not enforceable without expenditure of considerable budget money for radar equipment. Additional money would have been required to "buoy" the lake in conspicuous locations to notify boaters of the speed limit, train officers, and subsequently provide consistent, fair and timely enforcement. The obvious reality of any "speed limit" restriction is that it can't be adequately enforced without specialized equipment. A "no wake" regulation, however, requires no special equipment. It requires only an observation followed up with careful judgement and complaint response. The Department nor the US Forest Service had enough budget money to accomplish all of the zoning needed and it was felt that a general "No Wake" designation on Deerfield Lake would preserve the high quality, low impact, passive recreational environment that the wide variety of users historically enjoyed. The No Wake designation was also consistent with language in an agreement between the US Forest Service and the Bureau of Reclamation wherein the Forest Service acknowledged BOR's criteria for managing lake use with a No Wake policy. A formal regulation was never adopted however.

Secondly, apart from enforceability, the principle goal of public water safety zoning is to ensure the safety and enjoyment of all users by minimizing, as much as possible, user conflicts generated by loose or absent boating traffic management. The probability that imposing a 25 Mile Per Hour zoning regulation on Deerfield

Lake will continue to minimize user conflict is not likely. It is important to point out that there are few, if any lakes in South Dakota with such regulations. Certainly, none of the lakes and reservoirs in the Black Hills sustain those types of regulations. What they do sustain, however, is abundant "no wake" zones that provide a much safer and more relaxing experience on the water. If we don't increase speed limits on roads and highways for reasons of under-utilization, why would we do it on our lakes that have been over-utilized on high traffic days throughout the summer for at least 20 years or more.

I think we can agree, at least in principle, that increasing the allowable speed of boats on the water to a level that encourages such things as personal water craft, wake boats, and overly loud, V8 powered jet boats, isn't in the best interests of either the lake or it's traditional users. The petition recommends that the Commission adopt a 25 MPH zone limitation. I'd like to point out that optimum speed for wake boarding as an example, (which is now very popular in the Black Hills) is 14 to 18 MPH. Imagine, if you will, a leisurely fishing trip in a small john boat, canoe or even a float tube on Deerfield, being disrupted and imperiled by jet skiers or power boaters operating at a speed that can't be easily monitored or recognized by either the operator or people tasked with enforcing it. Those conditions exist now on Pactola and Sheridan Lakes and it puzzles me why anyone would want to invite those same conditions on a lake that has been a source of quiet relaxation and more or less passive recreation for decades.

Thirdly, in consultation with the US Forest Service and other resource professionals at the time, there was concern for increased shoreline resource damage from boat wakes. There still

is. Even a casual review of Pactola Reservoir and Sheridan Lake demonstrate substantial shoreline damage due to increased boating and wake activity. Shoreline degradation not only shortens the life of a body of water but does no good service to a fisheries littoral zone or water quality. Thus far, in the life of Deerfield Reservoir, the slow boating traffic and recreational use have minimized resource damage while preserving the quality of the water and landscape that the majority of people enjoy. It is one of the primary reasons they frequent the lake versus others in the region. If this petition had abundant signatures demanding change, I would have to believe that a majority of users of Deerfield Lake share a different value than I do about its use and ambience. Has this Commission or anyone entertained any complaints about the No Wake zone or how it has inconvenienced them? Does operation of a boat at an increased speed actually do anything to increase public utilization of lake resources?

Lastly; the renovation of the South Rochford Road from Rochford to Deerfield will increase the vehicle traffic and likely the recreational load on Deerfield Reservoir. It is my opinion that we must do everything possible to lessen the impacts on the water and land resources surrounding Deerfield. At some juncture, I think it highly relevant and important to understand the need to preserve places and space, in this otherwise high velocity world, where we can escape the belief that we need to get somewhere in a hurry and outdoor recreation is measured in time saving utility. I believe the human spirit needs places where nature has not been overly re-arranged by the hand of man.

I wish to thank the Commission for their time and consideration of

this testimony. I once again urge this distinguished body not to support change in boating or public water safety zoning on Deerfield Reservoir.

Sincerely:



John Wrede

SD Wildlife Conservation Officer, Regional Wildlife Manager Ret.

2802 Westgate Drive

Rapid City, SD 57702

dakota225@live.com

(605) 718-0762