

# Public Comments

## Nonresident Waterfowl

---

**Alan Thomas**

**Huron SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

GF&P COMMISSION MEMBERS: am not sure if my first message was sent so I am sending another.

Please do not increase the Nonresident Waterfowl Licenses by 5% or any percent.

Thank you,  
Alan Thomas  
Huron

---

**Jon Olson**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I strongly urge the commission to vote no on increasing NR waterfowl licenses. The reason fewer residents duck hunt is due to the overwhelming influence NR have on the sport. The land-leasing, the guiding and outfitting leaves nothing for the blue-collar resident. And when the public ground, which now is mostly dry, we just give up. Your bad decisions in policy is destroying the very culture you love to promote to the high rollers.

---

**Jake Sheffield**

**Brandon SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

As a resident Waterfowl hunter I oppose this proposition. After calling and speaking to several Commissioners, their main argument for this proposal is that they are allowed to increase it by 5% and haven't done so in a while so they should now. Just because you can, doesn't mean you should, especially if the majority of the resident waterfowl community is against it. By his own admission, the commissioner who put forward this proposal doesn't waterfowl hunt and doesn't plan on starting. There are more than enough opportunities for non-residents as it is and efforts towards habitat improvement and hunter recruitment would be far more justified. Just to be clear if this is passed, the Commission will be doing so based on nothing other than previous legislation that allows them to do so and it will be in direct contradiction of what their fellow sportsman and constituents want.

---

**Paul Lepisto**

**Pierre SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Tye Kjeldgaard**

**Wagner SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Marc Hamiel**

**Aberdeen SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

It's hard enough getting on land to hunt. With more non resident tags that would only make it harder for us residents. Land owners would start leasing more land than they already do for paid hunting.

---

**Tim Smith**

**Bowdle SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

My name is Tim Smith and I have been a resident of South Dakota for over 20 years.

I am heavily invested in resident waterfowl hunting in the state of South Dakota. I am opposed to increasing the numbers of nonresident waterfowl licenses.

Primary concern is increased hunting pressure will have a significant impact on the well-being of the flyway for the state of South Dakota. I have observed the negative impact of non-resident hunters in the state of North Dakota. Nonresident, hunters, create conflict situations with local landowners owners And decrease the quality of hunting opportunities for our youth programs.

The increase of non-resident hunters will be a vital blow to the youth mentorship opportunities that we offer to Young hunters in our area.

We have experienced significant hunting pressure and reduced participation of locals pheasant hunting due to the popular industry of pheasant and deer hunting.

Waterfowl hunting is a natural right for South Dakota citizens that should be defended.

I will actively oppose any lawmaker and committee member that advocates for the increase of nonresident hunting permits.

---

**Adam Spies**

**Watertown SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Tom Viet**

**Renner SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**James Kirk**

**Springfield SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Tom Curran**

**Yankton SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Please oppose any increase in nonresident waterfowl permits for the sake of quality hunts for our residents, nonresidents, and our youth. As the number of nonresident permits increase, overall pressure on the resources increase which decreases the quality for all. I have witnessed this first hand on the South Dakota waters I hunt. Waterfowl gets so pressured that nothing stays around. Another outcome of increased nonresident licenses is that the number of guides increases and subsequently puts more pressure on the limited availability of hunting and diminishing the quality. It is also unfortunate for our residents that guides are able to purchase and tie up access to private property further decreasing opportunity for residents and other nonresidents that then must find new private or public areas to hunt. This increases pressure on what's left of the private resource (often less desirable) and limited public resources. I respectfully request that you respect and do what's best for your South Dakota resident hunters that you represent. Please vote to oppose any increase in nonresident licenses. Thank you for the great job you do in managing our state's resources.

---

**Michael Moe**

**Brandon SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose this Proposal. There are already left over licenses after the first draw which tells me that not all the licenses are sold.

Why add more? On another note, I feel like adding additional licenses is a step towards the commercialization of waterfowl hunting just like deer and pheasant hunting in this state.

---

**Justin Allen**

**Pierre SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Dear Commission,

Please oppose the increase to NR waterfowl licenses and hunting opportunities in South Dakota. Resident waterfowl hunters numbers have not decreased over the last several years. GFP likes to use data ranges to prove a point. Over 25 years yes waterfowl hunters have decreased but certainly they haven't over the last 5-7 years, GFP numbers show a steady number of SD resident waterfowl hunters. The vast majority of the sportsman the commission are supposed to represent do not suppose increased NR hunters hunting opportunities in SD. Waterfowl hunting is no different. Between leasing of land, guides/outfitters, NR hunters, social media there has not been a time over the last few decades that it is harder to have quality waterfowl hunting in SD. Pouring gas on the fire is irresponsible to the resource and the residents of SD. Please vote no on increasing non-resident waterfowl licenses in SD.

Thank you for your time,

Justin Allen  
Pierre, SD

---

**Ed Spies**

**Watertown SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

we need more roost lakes like Reed Lake in Clark County.

---

**Jim Mose**

**Brandon SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I have already been rejected by out of state leased land I would like to have hunted

---

**Joshua Gabbert**

**Brandon SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I don't see a need. Currently, I travel more than an hour to get to a location with water. If I do find a location that isn't already occupied by several groups, it is only a matter of time before they overrun me. Hunting ethics are fading as fast as the habitat. I think time would be spent more effectively preserving what South Dakota has.

---

**Peter Koupal**

**Rapid Citu SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Nick Suss**

**Brandon SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Jeremy South**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Kathy Ford**

**Denver CO**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Samuel Sheffield**

**Huron SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Boyd Schulz**

**Brookings SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I have been hunting waterfowl for 40 years as a SD resident. There has been a marked reduction in waterfowl habitat over time. Access to private land for hunting is ever more challenging. Commercialization of waterfowl hunting for non-resident hunters is having a major impact on access to private land. Please do not increase non-resident waterfowl licenses.

---

**John Cooper**

**Pierre SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I firmly oppose this proposal. If passed, the Commission will just continue to add to the hunting pressure on waterfowl and increase the places where waterfowl hunting is leased by commercial outfitters.

---

**Monte Vande Kop**

**No SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Austin Fritz**

**Hartford SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Ducks are not an "unlimited resource"

## Other

---

**Steve Cherkas**

**Edgemont SD**

**Position:** other

**Comment:**

I listened into the bobcat management action plan 3/7. The plan is primarily based on juvenile harvest. IMO this is not accurate data to base the plan on. I (common among cat trappers) release all juvenile (if foot not frozen) bobcats along with any stained (from feeding kittens) adult females. This thereby makes your statistics flawed. The primary factor on cat numbers is rabbit population. I saw nothing in plan relating to rabbit population. We recently (last 10 years) went thru a major wipeout of rabbits (hemorrhagic I believe) but they are now on the comeback the last 2-3 years. And cat numbers are also coming back with them. Lots of kitten sign last 2 seasons. I also do not believe your black hills bobcat population estimates (have been told by biologist twice as many lions as bobcats in black hills). I have caught 20+ black hills bobcats each of last 2 seasons myself which would be over 15% (per season) myself in just a small portion of the hills. Females and kittens also have a small territory (1-2 sq miles) compared to the males. When I see kitten tracks in snow I try to avoid those areas. I am strongly opposed to a per trapper limit in black hills and west river. BTW ... where is the 2022 furbearer harvest? Usually online by Sept and still not on website.

---

**John Wrede**

**Rapid City SD**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Cameron Lahndorf**

**Fort Pierre SD**

**Position:** support

**Comment:**

I strongly support the lining up of the grouse and pheasant season for closing on Jan 31.

The chance of actually taking a few more grouse at the end of the season is slim, but would be nice to have the opportunity if it does present itself in the rare opportunity.

---

**Travis Neebling**

**Casper WY**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I am a non-resident, but I hunt in South Dakota every couple of years. I do not support extending the quail, partridge, and grouse seasons through the end of January. The extension amounts to an ~25% increase in days. On the limited public areas to hunt, I am not sure the populations can sustain 25% more harvest. Thank you for your consideration

---

**Jodie Provost**

**Valley City ND**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

Topic – lengthening the grouse season – I oppose it due to lack of monitoring data to show it is feasible without negatively, impacting the population in the long run. The desire to boost hunting and tourism in the state cannot come at the cost of the very wildlife populations that help support it, or they will both tank in the long run. Let's not be shortsighted. Let's be good stewards and get the data we need to make solid management decisions. In the larger picture, prairie chicken and sharp-tailed grouse are in decline due to habitat loss and other factors. South Dakota lies in the heart of their range and thus has an extraordinary stewardship responsibility and opportunity to maintain and increase their populations.

---

**Josh Tatman**

**Sheridan WY**

**Position:** oppose

**Comment:**

I oppose lengthening the grouse season through January. Hunters can't trust SDGFP's management of the public wildlife trust if they greenlight significant increases in harvest, without even having meaningful population monitoring. Increasing take and pressure through the depths of winter should only take place if SD can demonstrate that it will not adversely impact native grouse populations. These species deserve competent management.