

Public Comments

Hunt for Habitat Licenses

Robert Eddy

Spearfish SD

reddy@rushmore.com

Comment:

I encourage the commission to approve the Hunt for Habitat proposal with a few exceptions. I would encourage these tags to be a Deer/Antelope/Turkey/Waterfowl/Small Game licence or Buffalo only. Elk, Sheep and Goat should be off the table. Those tags should be for SD residents drawn in the competitive process. Keep South Dakotas wildlife, it is not for sale!

Charles Courtney

Humboldt SD

cwc.tex@gmail.com

Comment:

awesome

John Fanning

Norfolk NE

johan869@live.com

Comment:

I would like the opportunity to be able to draw any sex tags for deer, elk and antelope.

Ryan Leimkuhl

Aberdeen SD

ryan.leimkuhl@abbusiness.com

Comment:

If we are going to allow out of state then the fee should be a lot higher ,I hunt a lot of out of state the fees are not the big issues ,access and game are

Chuck Clayton

Huron SD

clayton@hur.midco.net

Comment:

I have no problem with the concept, except that it will be the first time non-residents are able to hunt elk in SD, when you have overwhelming demand for those tags from residents. If you check the regulations for most other states, there is a non-refundable application fee of some type, plus you still have to pay for the tags. I would think a tag for 3 big game animals, including an elk, should bring at least what other states are paying, and that would be well over \$1,000. I would say that if this is open to non-residents, it should be higher. Residents are not going to pay the money for the tags. The high rolling non-residents are happy to pay the \$20, and that would be where we would get the most income.

Mark Smedsrud

Sioux Falls SD

Maksmedsrud

Comment:

Commission

I strongly oppose the idea of selling raffle tickets to support habitat. I don't believe raffling a coveted tag is the best choice option in helping habitat. I would much rather see a habitat stamp introduced like other states. It will be applicable to any license including trapping. Raffles are not a consistent source of income and a habitat stamp would be more consistent tied to all hunting and trapping licenses. I believe it could be tied to fishing as it would allow more access to ramps and better stocking opportunities.

Gary French

Cavour SD

garyfrench56@yahoo.com

Comment:

There should be no non resident super tags allowed for a non resident when there are several resident hunters that have been trying for years to draw a elk tag either rifle or archery this would be a slap in the face to your resident hunters that have supported hunting in this state for years why does the GFP want to keep trying to change the way of our state hunting it seems like they want out of state hunters more than the resident hunters

Jarred Burleson

Lead SD

Jburleson13@gmail.com

Comment:

I have always thought this would be good way to raise money for gfp without having to raise resident license fees.

Arlan Smedsrud

Chancellor SD

smedsrudarlan@yahoo.com

Comment:

As residents of this state we are privileged to have enough elk, sheep, Mt goat, bison and deer to allow the resident hunter a opportunity to harvest one of these big game animals. I'm TOTALLY opposed to more nonresident hunters. They already over run our state every year with pheasant season. I'm tired of a Winnebago full of hunters and dogs helping me hunt a 80 acre piece of land. They ruined that hunting, they will do the same with the super tag. Just call it the super rich.

Kent Siemonsma

Humboldt SD

ksiemonsma@goldenwest.net

Comment:

Another way to take more of our money for just a chance. If you want habitat for wildlife you need to start with the farmer, no more drain tile, no more breaking up pasture or sodded ground, tearing out shelterbelts and so on

Scott Gamo

Cheyenne WY

gamowolk@yahoo.com

Comment:

Solid idea on the SuperTag hunts. We do that here in Wyoming and they are well received. Provides an opportunity (albeit small) for non-residents and adds revenue for the department.

Larry Menning

Chamberlain SD

lmenning@midstatesd.net

Comment:

An elk license for a South Dakota hunter is highly desirable but very difficult to obtain. Even the loss of a chance at one of these opportunities to a non-resident is unacceptable to me.

Larry Nemec

Pierre SD

Comment:

Encourage young people to apply by making the licenses equally affordable to everyone, not just the wealthy person. Limit the number of chances to ten per applicant. Also, make the application available by sending payment to or stopping at the game & fish office, and not only online. A lot of hunters don't have computer knowledge.

Nest Predator Bounty

Spencer Poel

Aberdeen SD

tracker-13@hotmail.com

Comment:

I fully support a bounty on pheasant predators and extending the trapping season on public grounds

Kevin Sirovy

Valley Springs SD

ksirovy@alliancecom.net

Comment:

Have no problem with trapping, have a real problem in hunting areas using dogs that have snares without notification.

Sandy Pederson

Vermillion SD

sandypederson@yahoo.com

Comment:

We need more habitat for nesting species. not fewer predator species. I also "own" public lands, and I am against this. I am for more CRP land and buffer strips and other ways to augment the habitat for our state's wildlife...all wildlife.

Tim Lund

Madison SD

tlundlabs@gmail.com

Comment:

Bounty is a good start

Kyle Dietz

Sioux Falls SD

Kylemdietz@aol.com

Comment:

I am a hunter and outdoorsman. As an outdoorsman, I understand that healthy ecosystems are balanced ecosystems. I urge the decision makers base their decision on sound research and the advice of experts in this field of study. You will be more convincing to the public and gain better understanding if the support from such research and experts is visible. Here is a link on information specifically on this topic from pheasants forever. <https://www.pheasantsforever.org/Habitat/Pheasant-Facts/Effects-of-Predators.aspx>
Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment. I hope I get a reply that is specific to my concerns.

Pat Nogelmeier
Florence SD
deepatn@itctel.com

Comment:

Excellent idea. Will state and federal lands be open? Walk-in areas with landowner permission? Skunk Tails need to be vacuum sealed? :-)

Jon Sorensen
Sioux Falls SD
sorensen5000@gmail.com

Comment:

As a SD trapper i see alot of small animals that i release because it does me no good to harvest them because of the low cost and high grading of the pelts. And so the animals get released with very little harm and head back out to destroy more nest and what ever else they can chew on. Giving me a reason to help harvest more of the smaller animals as well as the adults will only help improve the nesting grounds as well as diseases caused by these animals in our off season. Nobody wants to see them destroyed all together. But with prices for fur and the large amount of animal activist against us, our trapper numbers have shrunk considerably and will continue to shrink as the population of fur like raccoons ,skunks etc bloom even more. I have many Farmers begging me to trap there property year around but with nothing to counter the cost of gas and other supplies i cant. Thanks

Stephen Craycroft
Gettysburg SD
huntfish2010@yahoo.com

Comment:

Given the reduction of CRP program participation in the state, pheasant and duck nesting habitat is being significantly reduced throughout the state. The immediate result of reduced nesting habitat is that nest predators become much more efficient at finding and destroying eggs/nests. While increasing available nesting habitat would be far superior to this program, trapping nest predators can be a valuable part of reducing nest predation, and to increase public involvement and awareness of this issue.

Recommend adding feral cats to the list of species eligible for the bounty!

Tacy Paul
Spearfish SD
tacykaraganpaul@gmail.com

Comment:

To kill an animal that is using it's natural instincts to survive so hunters can kill their prey instead is morally wrong and unethical. I wish S.D. would catch up to the 21st century and try to conserve our precious wildlife. So sad that is always boils down to financial gain.

Brad Cox
Lennox SD
brad-1961@live.com

Comment:

oppose

Suzanne Hodges
Sacramento CA
antiguasue@hotmail.com

Comment:

This is war on wildlife and throwing the ecological balance of nature off. Is there not a better use of South Dakota's Time and money rather than attacking the environment???

Sue Hayes
Deadwood SD
Shayespeaches@yahoo.com

Comment:

Trapping is a barbaric activity. I hate having to worry about my dogs getting accidently trapped when I'm taking them out in the woods to hike. Let nature take its course. The birds will continue to survive. This all boils down to money only.

Jim Stephens
Pierre SD
ashlee.commpharm@mncomm.com
m

Comment:

Having grown up in the Day-Clark County area in the prime years 50s and 60s of pheasant I am very much in favor of a bounty system and it certainly did work then, and contributed to the large pheasant population-coupled with great habitat from the Soil Bank Program. My father was a fox and mink trapper as well as being a fur buyer. In the spring we would dig out fox dens, and it was simply amazing the number of pheasant carcasses you would find in a fox den. Interestingly-8 of 10 pheasants found would be hens, as they tend to sit tighter and are more easily caught by predators, such as fox, raccoon and skunks. The bounty was \$4.00-which was a lot of money in 1955, and I can remember many trips to the County Treasures Office, to collect the bounty. As far as the concern that people would collect a road killed skunk, and turn it in for a bounty-I do not see that as an issue. Someone would do that once, and decide it was a very unpleasant experience, and certainly not worth \$10.00. I realize there is an element of society that is against taking a life of any animal. I appreciate Governor Noem's understanding of the predator issue, and think it is a great plan.

Jim Stephens
1013 West Second
Pierre, SD 57501

John Lems

Canton SD

johnl@johnsonfeedinc.com

Comment:

strongly oppose because of date i would strongly support if started in november when furs are prime

Kerry Bowers

Pierre SD

kerrypierr@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose this legislation as there is no legitimate wildlife control issue here. Weather is #1 in the causes of annual fluctuations in pheasant and grouse numbers with habitat loss running a close second. This program is only about one thing... money.

There is little to no justification for the State promoted trapping and killing of these other animals in order to protect these birds.

Terri Jepsen

Pierrepierre SD

terjepsen@gmail.com

Comment:

How could you have a program like this? It is so selfish and disgusting! These animals have the right to live too! What I see is that it's all about money and killing! You have guns and want to heartlessly kill something! I know what your motive is in having this program and that is because some of these animals eat pheasant eggs. Do we have a lack of pheasants in this state? The answer is No! You make enough money each year during pheasant hunting season so why are you looking to wipe out a whole population of raccoons, skunks, opossums, badgers and red foxes? The answer is : greed and it's all about killing! Heartlessly taking animals lives for money and sport!

Bob Hepp

Hartford SD

Bobhepp@ yahoo.com

Comment:

This is such a bunch of BS, what biologist would think of damaging the eco system for a game bird, spending money on traps is not the answer. instead SDGFP should be increasing habitat..

Renee Leftlethand
Freeman SD
rollykoal@yahoo.com

Comment:

Unnecessary to do year round and trapping is cruel and dangerous to other animals and people .. totally disagree and I live on a small farm

Nicky Busutil
Milbank SD
pishnsapph@aim.com

Comment:

This is a senseless proposal, with no regard for the welfare of South Dakota's natural ecosystem. If you want pheasants to flourish so badly, lower the limit for hunters and implement higher fines for poachers and those who hunt over the limit. Enough raccoons, skunks, etc. are killed by vehicles every year; we do not need to increase their deaths.

Patricia Jenkins
Brandon SD
dpjenkins@alliancecom.net

Comment:

LEAVE OUR WILD LIFE ALONE. EVERY TIME WE TURN AROUND SOMEONE IS DESTROYING OUR WORLD! ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! Set up Pheasant Farms with the \$400,000, raise the birds for hunters if its such a big money maker! Dogs and other animals will end up in these traps!

Darcy Bracken-Marxen
Hermosa SD
Darcy@whitetailridgesd.com

Comment:

There are other ways. This bill is barbaric and continues to erode South Dakota's reputation. In terms of animal cruelty, we are one of the worst, if perhaps THE worst. I work hard for a living and oppose any use of my tax contributions to a program that disrespects life.

Lorri May
Madison SD
Lynnyts@iw.net

Comment:

All animals are put on Earth for a purpose. I don't believe in killing skunks, red foxes, opossums, etc. because they may be pests. Find ways to work around them rather than murdering them.

Thank you.

Leah Kelly

Sioux Falls SD

Leahkellylmt@gmail.com

Comment:

Animal cruelty and barbaric torture methods don't belong in a civilized society. Ban trapping altogether and let nature prosper rather than your wallets.

Suzanne Hodges

Sacramento CA

Comment:

oppose

Peggy Mann

Aberdeen SD

mann_5m@yahoo.com

Comment:

Trapping is inhumane, disgusting and barbaric. Trapping should be banned. Anybody with a soul cannot enjoy knowing that a animal is suffering and succumbing to a slow horrible death in a trap. Pure greed. Continually disrupting and destroying the ecosystem will eventually have dire consequences for all.

Larry Menning

Chamberlain SD

lmenning@midstatesd.net

Comment:

Numerous wildlife biologists I respect tell me that bounty programs simply do not work. I believe them. They are costly, like the trap give away was, and are ineffective.

Barry Betts

Oacoma SD

Comment:

Science (even your own GFP research in the 1970's) proves that bountys do not work! Use the money to support habitat including planting food plots on all Game Production Areas in the state!!

Robert Stapelberg
Rapid City SD
rdstapel@rap.midco.net

Comment:

Why do you feel that it's necessary to kill off all the animals except for pheasants, deer and elk just so the hunters have more of them to kill? If that's the only way for South Dakota to raise funds them maybe we should raise taxes and stop killing the other occupants on this planet.

Louise Mcgannon
Mitchell SD
l.mcgannon@ymail.com

Comment:

This is wrong every way you look at it. Number 1, pheasants are not native to South Dakota but you want to kill native animals for hunters.

Number 2. All animals serve a purpose as part of the ecosystem, of all organizations you should understand this.

David Hagen
Aberdeen SD
davehagen1@hotmail.com

Comment:

To whom it may concern,

I'm writing to inform you that I am opposed to the Bounty Program that Gov. Noem has mandated.

Here are a few reasons I am opposed:

1. Financial Loss

Gov. Daugaard's South Dakota Habitat Work Group from 2014 stated that bounties had limited positive effect with high financial costs. page 20 Please read the full report, you could learn a thing or two.

The state will spend over \$900,000 just on traps, 5,500 X 3 X\$55 as well as the dollars that will go toward the bounty of each predator. I find this a very ineffective way of using sportsman's money and you should as well.

2. Unsportsmanlike

Trapping animals that are about to give birth or have already done so, leaving their young to fend for themselves. Unsportsman

Cutting just the tail off and leaving the animal, we have a wanton waste law that all sportsman are to abide by. Unsportsman

This is how the state wants to introduce our next generation to trapping? Our Heritage and Tradition of trapping deserves better than this, wouldn't you agree?

Please don't get me wrong, I have no problem trapping or killing animals, to be honest, I enjoy it.

3. Bounties don't work

If bounties worked, we would have continued the bounties that had been implemented in the past.

If bounties worked, every state would have them. States that have had bounties in the past have eliminated them, just like South Dakota.

There are 3 predators that weren't on Gov. Noem's list: mink, coyote, and feral cats

Mink are related to the skunk, they eat eggs and birds.

Coyotes are related to the fox, they eat eggs and birds.

Feral cats, South Dakota's most damaging predator. Please read the article by Tim Ray GFP Wildlife Damage Specialist. Aberdeen American News Sept. 7, 2018

I've had the privilege of hunting, fishing, and trapping in this great state for over 40 years. I will hunt from the early Canadian goose season to the end of spring goose season. In between these seasons, I hunt ducks, geese, pheasants, archery and rifle deer and raccoons with hounds. The one constant to seeing large amounts of wildlife is HABITAT. When HABITAT is good, hunting opportunities increase. In the future, please put our money towards HABITAT and not waste it on bounties.

Don't forget, Gov. Noem works for the state. She is an elected official, that means she works for me, you, and the personal that work for the GFP. The GFP officials and others that oppose the bounty program should be allowed to share their expertise without backlash from the Governor.

Will I take part in the Bounty Program? Yes I will. However, I will not start until the latter part of the summer, this will at least give the young a fighting chance to survive.

If the state is stupid enough to pay me to do this, I will take part. Maybe we should have a bounty on stupidity, something to think about.

Dave Hagen
918 Ash Lane
Aberdeen, SD
605 216 3363

Annette Hof

Crooks SD

annette_hof@hotmail.com

Comment:

I don't think it's right to go out and just kill these innocent animals and make money off them.

They deserve a better life than this, they haven't done anything to us, so why go and just kill them.

Is someone planning to make a fur coat out of the animals' fur, the fur belongs and looks better on the animals, not on humans, fur coats and all should be banned anyways.

Please don't kill innocent helpless animals they haven't done anything to us, let them have a life that they deserve.

You know something, with all the animals being killed, they all going to be extinct very soon and that's very sad, this world is so full of hate for the animals????

Please have a heart and don't kill the animals, especially for money.

Life means more than money

Thank you for your time

Randee Huber
Sioux Falls SD
cat490@hotmail.com

Comment:

Killing indigenous animals in their own environment in order to protect pheasants, a non-native species, is cruel and short sighted. Even GFP says it won't affect pheasant numbers. It really is not necessary to kill everything in sight all the time. This idea is the worst thing I've ever heard. Does anyone in SD have an respect whatsoever for anything other than money?

David Jenkins
Brandon SD
djenkins@alliancecom.net

Comment:

Take the money and set up State operated Pheasant Farms to increase the Pheasant Population. I Don't want my dogs in the traps!

Julie Hansen
Freeman SD
juliehh1956@gmail.com

Comment:

Pls do NOT go through with this cruel new program. There are ALREADY plenty of pheasants in S. Dak. The small predators are few enough in number; and spread so thinly in the state that this plan is NOT WORTH the butchery and devastation that it will cause. These animals have a use in the ecosystem; and a God-given right to exist too. Thank you.

Beth Millard
Hot Springs SD
Sunydaze@live.com

Comment:

Bounty kill is a horrible idea!!! Set up pheasant hatcheries.. natural nest predators can be safe you make money with pheasant hatcheries.. hunters happy, money made, predators safe and doing what they naturally are made to do..

Gwen Erickson
Watertown SD

Comment:

People will over kill. They will not stop. Better idea is have more conservation work for Pheasant. Many animals and young died with this snowstorm. Not the amount of predators figured out. Much less.

Jan Shevik
Charlotte NC
jshevik@carolina.rr.com

Comment:

NO BOUNTY ON WILDLIFE.What barbaric and dangerous practice. It's arcaic barbarism, South Dakota can do better than murder for money>

Bonita Radtke
Redfield SD
bonita.radtke@gmail.com

Comment:

I strongly oppose the proposed year-round bounty on our native predators, especially based their (perceived) effect on the nesting of an exotic, introduced species, the pheasant. We have quite a few pheasant hunters in the family, but cannot see any sense to decimating native wildlife species over NON-NATIVE birds. Either the pheasants can survive the South Dakota ecosystem--including native wildlife--or we as a state have no business protecting and regulating them. Frankly, the biggest problem for pheasants is diminishing habitat. This bounty is an attempt to blame wildlife for the fact humans want pheasants without providing enough shelter belts and grasslands to support a healthy population of the birds. Provide enough habitat and the predation of our native species will not be a factor in the survival of pheasant hunting in South Dakota.

Florence Duran
Box Elder SD
tduran01@yahoo.com

Comment:

Stop the "Nest Predator Bounty Program.

John Marxen
Hermosa SD
john@whitetailridgesd.com

Comment:

I own/operate a B&B in the Black Hills. A majority of my guests visit this state for the wildlife. As for myself, I do not agree with the killing of animals for profit or sport. This may help boost hunters into our state for the purpose of hunting pheasant but, will it also hurt in the fact that other wildlife is being decimated. Thank you.

Christine Muse

Custer SD

c21chris@gwtc.net

Comment:

This is a ridiculous proposal that will have detrimental consequences on the wildlife in this state. I am totally opposed to this.

Dave Braun

Pierre SD

trackertarga2002@yahoo.com

Comment:

I am adamantly opposed to the proposed bounty program. Each of these creatures were placed on this earth for a specific purpose and deserve to be treated better than merely having someone kill them for their \$10 tail. This is inhumane and ridiculous.

Bob Thielen

Volga SD

vthie@itctel.com

Comment:

The pheasants population needs the help, with the little cover left. During severe weather I have fed pheasants on my long driveway. 5/6 years ago there would be 80 to 90 birds, now 2 or 3. Just no cover any more with all of the CRP being plowed up. Thank you for trying to help them!

Heather Spaich

Lehigh KS

heathercletis22477@gmail.com

Comment:

Why can't people just leave poor animals alone. People make the choice to kill and endanger animals. Animals are just trying to survive. While we keep pushing and shoving them out of their habitats. Killing them for vanity and greed. It's things like thua that make me sad to be a part of the human race. We need to start caring more and quit being so greedy and vane.

Jo Kephart

Vermillion SD

jkephart412@yahoo.com

Comment:

This is a cruel and misguided plan, which I vehemently oppose. Please protect our wildlife. They are one of the things that make our state great.

Teresa Gunst
Sioux Falls SD
teresalg@midco.net

Comment:

The initiative is cruel and should not be allowed.

Yvonne Lange
Groton SD
martha51986@yahoo.com

Comment:

oppose

Jane Eagle
Graton CA
sedna101@aol.com

Comment:

PLEASE stop this egregiously cruel and misguided plan! A "Nest Predator Bounty Program," in which state residents will receive \$10 for turning in a tail of a raccoon, striped skunk, opossum, badger or red fox that they have killed. IS PURE EVIL, ANTI-SCIENCE AND ANTI-GOD. The state already launched a related scheme in which they are providing free cage traps to South Dakota residents to trap and kill those wildlife species. THIS IS OBSCENE.

It's all part of Governor Kristi Noem's "Second Century Initiative," which purports to encourage the killing of those "nest predator" species to increase numbers of game birds like pheasants for hunters. But GFP has admitted that this program has little chance of increasing pheasant numbers, and is really intended to recruit new people to hunting, fishing, and trapping in the state. THIS IS EVIL ON EVERY LEVEL.

Eden Slate
Armour SD
Edenslate@gmail.com

Comment:

I am against "Nest Predator Bounty Program"

It's all part of Governor Kristi Noem's "Second Century Initiative," which purports to encourage the killing of those "nest predator" species to increase numbers of game birds like pheasants for hunters. Even GFP has admitted that this program has little chance of increasing pheasant numbers, and is really intended to recruit new people to hunting, fishing, and trapping in the state.

Stop this egregiously cruel and misguided plan!

Richard Getting

Sioux Falls SD

Richardgetting@sio.midco.net

Comment:

Stop killing indigenous animals to protect the pheasant.

Larry Fredrickson

Chamberlain SD

larryjan@midstatesd.net

Comment:

I was a former pheasant/furbearer Research biologist for Game, Fish and Parks. And the study I did on organized landowner sportsmen harvest by trapping and it's effect on pheasant population (1970-1975) did not reveal a significant increase in the pheasant population and was quoted incorrectly by Keith Fisk (March 5, the Dailey Republic) as a positive result. Since the difference was not significant it could have been a random result. No scientific data I know of shows that predator bounties ever resulted in a benefit to game birds. Besides the harvest time was in the fall for fur value in my study (a different situation).

All the predator prey study results from Carl Trautman and myself showed that you needed a very intense control effort using all means including poison (banned in 1972) and had to reduce fox, raccoon, badger and skunk population by 80 to 90 percent to get the pheasant increase. The remaining predators under a bounty removal system could still do great damage to the pheasant population.

There is no way enough predators could be taken by live trapping alone to reduce them enough to increase pheasants. You would only be taking off the reproductive surplus. Therefore this is a waste of sportsmen's money (mine included).

Instead I mentioned in several newspaper article the money should be spent on a state run CRP program. The Federal CRP program never will result in enough money to double our pheasant population since it is also distributed to many other states. We need to have a statewide goal of 1.5 million acres in dense nesting cover. We now have 2.47 BPM and could then go to 7.9 (as in 2007) birds per mile. Using bounties again is like re-inventing the wheel. We all went through that before in the 50's 60's and 70's.

Marta Olson-Rangitsch

Rapid City SD

marta@rushmore.com

Comment:

The bounty program Governor Noem is proposing is irrelevant responsible. By asking trappers to turn in tails she potentially promoting horrendous trapping practices. We know the heavy toal bounty hunting has historically had in our state —nearly driving our bison to extinction and removal of top predators has lead to the many of the over population issues we current face. Please do not go forward with this policy.

Eva Bareis
Rapid City SD
eva1365@hotmail.com

Comment:

Please rethink this. If it is necessary to reduce the numbers of these animals, please find another method. A simple goggle search will show how these bounties bring out the lunatics who kill hundreds of animals. That does nothing to promote sensible conservation and a compassionate method of wildlife management. It also emboldens those who take pleasure in killing and aren't doing it ethically in the interest of nesting bird populations. We have evolved better than this. It is NOT the way to get more people interested in hunting, certainly not a good example for our youth (says this teacher and mother.). Thank you.

Doug Cook
Hartford SD
dougcook@goldenwest.net

Comment:

Putting a price on the lives of sentient beings for the purpose of attracting hunters to come to our state to kill other sentient beings is wrong on so many levels. "Come to South Dakota and kill the beautiful animals we have been blessed with.". Is money more important to us than our humanity?

Jan Humphrey
Hill City SD
plazykranch@hughes.net

Comment:

I vehemently OPPOSE this. Trapping our wildlife in this matter for money is abhorrent . I will harass any trapper found in my area until they remove their traps. My dog was already caught in a leg trap and that is absolutely unacceptable.

Kristi Petersen
Hot Springs SD

Comment:

This would be totally detrimental to our natural scheme her in South Dakota! All of these predators are beneficial to us with their primary foods being mice, rats, snakes and insects. These animals also take only what they need to eat to survive. Free running dogs and feral cats from farms probably destroy more pheasant and water fowl nests than any of the natural predators do. Also, pheasants are not a native species. They also are farmed and chicks distributed throughout the state every spring. Do not put a bounty on the wild life we need to save a minuscule number of birds we do not. Thank you.

Katy Stulc
Rapid City SD
plagmkaa@hotmail.com

Comment:

Improve pheasant habitats, not kill other beneficial animals to our ecosystem such as opossums, foxes, etc. With the increase in tick borne illnesses, opossums are especially beneficial to our area. Please do not allow this program to come to fruiti

Lucy Barr
Plymouth MN
organizeme777@aol.com

Comment:

Stop this egregiously cruel and misguided plan! The SDGFP Commission will consider adopting Governor Noem's "Nest Predator Bounty Program" proposal at a public hearing on April 4, 2019. What's wrong with you - pretty soon all the animals will be gone and none will be left - who made you all G-d

Janette Mcintyre
Rapid City SD
jkmcintyre408020@yahoo.com

Comment:

oppose

Jennifer Cramer
Rapid City SD
jenbruns@gmail.com

Comment:

These animals are crucial to our eco system. Opossums are our marsupial that eat ticks and other pests.

Dianna Torson
Brookings SD
Torsond@itctel.com

Comment:

We need to protect wildlife diversity.

Kenneth Coyle

Yankton SD

shipmate2003@gmail.com

Comment:

This is a great idea. Coyotes and coons are very plentiful and reak havoc on nesting ducks and pheasants. Where I am on Yankton County the coyotes are thick as hell. Coons all over. Bounty is a great idea. Finally a Governor with common sense.

Chandra Mengel

Rapid City SD

Chandramengel@hotmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Tammy Jungen

Watertown SD

tjungen@gmail.com

Comment:

Wildlife management professionals across the U.S. have long acknowledged the ineffectiveness of bounties and predator control, including South Dakota's own Habitat Work Group in its 2014 report to Governor Daugaard: "Under a bounty system, predator control would not be targeted enough to be effective. Additionally, bounty systems in other states have been ineffective because the origin of the predators cannot be verified. Predators from other states could easily be imported for a bounty, which would be counterproductive."

The "Nest Predator Bounty Program" has no science-based wildlife management objective and is encouraging citizens to kill these native wildlife species for the sole purpose of obtaining a cash reward. This is a slap in the face to South Dakota's hunting tradition of sportsmanship, fair chase, and respect for wildlife and their environment.

To date no sound, science-based evidence has been presented to suggest that the species targeted by this "Nest Predator Bounty Program"—raccoons, striped skunks, opossums, badgers or red foxes—are adversely impacting pheasant populations.

There is no scientific justification for the random removal of the targeted species, who each play their own unique and important role in South Dakota's ecosystem. In particular, opossums are a tremendous benefit to any area they inhabit, helping to control unwanted, harmful garden pests. Their diet includes snails, mice, rats, and insects such as cockroaches, crickets, beetles, and—in large numbers—disease-carrying ticks.

Trapping is cruel and an ineffective method of wildlife conflict management. Trapped animals can languish and die slowly from shock, dehydration, starvation, or exposure to the elements. Those who survive long enough for the trapper to return may be killed by drowning, chest compression, strangulation, shooting, or any other method. Trapping does nothing to resolve the underlying problem in wildlife conflicts, and does not effectively control wildlife populations; in fact, it can actually stimulate population increases of some animals as they compensate for reductions in their numbers from trapping. Live trapping is only ever justified in those rare cases where it demonstrably benefits animals or provides necessary benefits to ecological systems.

The slaughter of these native species is a wrongheaded approach that ultimately will not help pheasants and other game birds, whose numbers are affected by weather and the availability of suitable habitat. Ignoring that by offering free traps to kill them, and a gruesome \$10-per-tail bounty, is an embarrassment to South Dakota and an affront to modern, science-based wildlife management principles.

If GFP wants more game birds for hunters, it must focus on improving their habitat, not randomly killing other species that play an equally important role in that habitat. And the Capital Journal in Pierre agrees; in January, its editorial board opposed the proposed bounty program, adding that if the state wants to advance pheasant hunting opportunities, it must "...focus on habitat, primarily grasslands and wetlands, work with landowners to secure those habitat(s) through incentives, provide hunter access through a strong walk-in program and raise suitable funding to get it done."

Dan Varns

Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

Trapping is cruel and an ineffective method of wildlife conflict management. Trapped animals can languish and die slowly from shock, dehydration, starvation, or exposure to the elements. Trapping does nothing to resolve the underlying problem in wildlife conflicts.

Randy Ristesund

Sioux Falls SD

rristes@aol.com

Comment:

no need for blood money being paid by the state, most pheasants are raised in cavity then let loose to be killed for the fun of it, I am sure the Governor will still get plenty of blood money for providing and promoting the blood lust she has already got rich off of

Scott Bakker

Sioux Falls SD

Funk8nguy@yahoo.com

Comment:

oppose

Melissa Dassinger

Rapid City SD

missydass@hotmail.com

Comment:

The animal right phanatics who want to end all animal ownership and animal interaction will tell you this law is not good, but as someone who has seen what uncontrolled animal populations can do this is necessary and a part of the American way of life.

I support trapping and the harvesting of natural food and fiber for human use.
Please send a loud message to animal rights they they are not welcome in a South Dakota.

Jan Lefthand

Freeman SD

janlefhand65@gmail.com

Comment:

Traps ate cruel and barbaric, no animal should be tortured, inhumane

Kimberly Hanzlik

Pierre SD

k_a_hanzlik@yahoo.com

Comment:

This whole idea is horrific and barbaric. If you adopt this disgusting program you're going to have everyone hunting down these poor creatures just to make a quick buck. The trapping and killing of these creatures is inhumane and should not be encouraged. I'm embarrassed to be born in raised in a state where we think something like this is ok. Please consider not adapting this policy into action. Thank you.

Terry Newman
Rapid City SD
tnewman@vastbb.net

Comment:

Please do not proceed with this horrendous plan. Show South Dakota to be the wildlife respecting and caring state it truly is. Do not succumb to this cruel and backwards plan. The will of the majority should not be usurped by a small and barbaric few.

Rachel Kopp
Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

oppose

Deeann Liesinger
Sioux Falls SD
Dliesing@icloud.com

Comment:

oppose

Bobbi Jo Horsted
Sioux Falls SD
bobbijo.horsted@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Patty Jenkins
Brandon SD
dpjenkins@alliancecom.net

Comment:

Spend the half million dollars in costs to raise pheasants on private or State Game Farms.

Brenda Verdon
Willow Lake SD
verdon2@msn.com

Comment:

I strongly oppose the bounty program being considered. Why would we want to kill everything when they all have their own purpose in life. This is just cruel and seeing an animal caught in a trap is terrible cruel. I have taught my children and now my grandchildren to respect the wildlife and this is just another example of how out of hand our society is. Please consider not allowing this

Kelsee Bessey
Pierre SD
Gaylethealligator@outlook.com

Comment:

Animal suffering like whats proposed is cruel and barbaric.

Jason Hurd

Sioux Falls SD

Fatgizmo@gmail.com

Comment:

??Wildlife management professionals across the U.S. have long acknowledged the ineffectiveness of bounties and predator control, including South Dakota's own Habitat Work Group in its 2014 report to Governor Daugaard: "Under a bounty system, predator control would not be targeted enough to be effective. Additionally, bounty systems in other states have been ineffective because the origin of the predators cannot be verified. Predators from other states could easily be imported for a bounty, which would be counterproductive."

??The "Nest Predator Bounty Program" has no science-based wildlife management objective and is encouraging citizens to kill these native wildlife species for the sole purpose of obtaining a cash reward. This is a slap in the face to South Dakota's hunting tradition of sportsmanship, fair chase, and respect for wildlife and their environment.

??To date no sound, science-based evidence has been presented to suggest that the species targeted by this "Nest Predator Bounty Program"—raccoons, striped skunks, opossums, badgers or red foxes—are adversely impacting pheasant populations.

??There is no scientific justification for the random removal of the targeted species, who each play their own unique and important role in South Dakota's ecosystem. In particular, opossums are a tremendous benefit to any area they inhabit, helping to control unwanted, harmful garden pests. Their diet includes snails, mice, rats, and insects such as cockroaches, crickets, beetles, and—in large numbers—disease-carrying ticks.

??Trapping is cruel and an ineffective method of wildlife conflict management. Trapped animals can languish and die slowly from shock, dehydration, starvation, or exposure to the elements. Those who survive long enough for the trapper to return may be killed by drowning, chest compression, strangulation, shooting, or any other method. Trapping does nothing to resolve the underlying problem in wildlife conflicts, and does not effectively control wildlife populations; in fact, it can actually stimulate population increases of some animals as they compensate for reductions in their numbers from trapping. Live trapping is only ever justified in those rare cases where it demonstrably benefits animals or provides necessary benefits to ecological systems.

??The slaughter of these native species is a wrongheaded approach that ultimately will not help pheasants and other game birds, whose numbers are affected by weather and the availability of suitable habitat. Ignoring that by offering free traps to kill them, and a gruesome \$10-per-tail bounty, is an embarrassment to South Dakota and an affront to modern, science-based wildlife management principles.

??If GFP wants more game birds for hunters, it must focus on improving their habitat, not randomly killing other species that play an equally important role in that habitat. And the Capital Journal in Pierre agrees; in January, its editorial board opposed the proposed bounty program, adding that if the state wants to advance pheasant hunting opportunities, it must "...focus on habitat, primarily grasslands and wetlands, work with landowners to secure those habitat(s) through incentives, provide hunter access through a strong walk-in program and raise suitable funding to get it done."

Gwyneth Fastnacht
Wessington Springs SD
Grdeanwitte@k12.sd.us

Comment:

Not based on science and research
Won't have intended effect

Out of state predators can be brought in to our state for bounty payment
Animals can last several days in pain, this is torturous, bounty is one thing but it needs to be implemented in a respectful humane manner. Allowing animals to suffer is not acceptable.
So science proves that the bounty program will improve pheasant population long term.
Animals on bounty list are native species. Pheasants are not native.

Once again, a proposal that appeals to a few, not based in science but will be favorable a political position for governor and legislators.
Please find a better approach.

Jamie Vanhoorn
Milbank SD
jamielynn57252@yahoo.com

Comment:

How is this at all humane!?abuse and torture against wildlife animals..abuse and torture is illegal wildlife should be included..ALL animals wildlife and domestic have feelings they all feel pain they all get scared. What kind of a person are you really mentally if you can torture an animal of any kind for the pure joy of it and for the cash reward. Trapping is cruel inefficient and is not hunting! These animals will die slow and painfully after going into shock from being dehydrated starved stressed out etc..just to have a homicidal so called hunter return to torture and kill this beautiful animal if it is still alive! Wildlife animals feel pain and fear just as any other animal or human. This is horrible! Torture, kill, collect money for lives taken horribly to save pheasants to bring in hunters for more money to kill the pheasants..this is inhumane Ludacris with a side of being a psychotic sociopath!! Shamefull to this governor! Very dissapointed this far..i really thought she was more human more heart..this saddens me please say NO to this!!!

Mary Potter
Sioux Falls SD
potters2@sio.midco.net

Comment:

I strongly oppose this measure. There are many reasons for this, but my foremost one is that it is so inhumane. Leg traps are checked only every two or three days and an animal can be there, alive and suffering, and are then killed by the bounty hunter in a probably non-humane way. This is no way to treat those we share our world with. And killing these animals is not an effective method of encouraging more game birds. These creatures do so much more good than the perceived harm. The South Dakota Humane Society has a lengthy and detailed listing of why this measure is not a good idea. I strongly oppose this measure and I urge you to vote against this measure.

Sue Hayes

Deadwood SD

Shayespeaches@yahoo.com

Comment:

I greatly oppose this proposal to trap other wildlife to increase pheasant hunting. Where are the statistics that support this proposal? This seems to be for money considerations only and there is no proof that this theory will even work. SD should support ALL wildlife in this state.

Gregory Palmer

Nemo SD

jajpalesb@gmail.com

Comment:

Initiate the Soil Bank Program again! Our govonor looks for the easiest way out any situation. Doesn't mean she knows what she's doing!!

Shayla Smejkal

Rapid City SD

shayla.ann@outlook.com

Comment:

I'm a studying Environmental Biologist. When I get my bachelor's degree, I want to work for the SD parks to help better the environment and protect the wildlife. The bounty program will greatly disrupt the balance of nature. Trapping is a disgrace and very inhumane.

Sheena Thomas

Sioux Falls SD

Sheenamthomas@outlook.com

Comment:

There are better ways of preserving pheasants and their habitats than this nonsensical bounty program.

Steven Frooman

Rapid City SD

sfrooman@gmail.com

Comment:

According to the GFP's posted numbers for 2017 Pheasant Economics, pheasant hunting is trivial in many parts of the state. Yet, this bounty program would allow payment for tails taken from anywhere in the state. That strikes me as a serious flaw with this proposed program, and if any bounty program is instituted it should contain a restriction not merely that the predator be harvested in South Dakota but that it be harvested in the specific parts of South Dakota where pheasant hunting actually matters and could actually be endangered by nest predators. Ideally, the program would also be funded solely from those parts of the state.

Because let's face it: why should a tail taken in Custer County (92 pheasant hunters, <\$0.1 million economic impact) or Lawrence County (53 pheasant hunters, <\$0.1 million economic impact) be eligible for a bounty? There's no meaningful pheasant hunting in those places, so killing furbearers to encourage it is just wanton destruction of game. For that matter, under the program as proposed people could claim bounties on urban animals from downtown Rapid City or Sioux Falls. How would that be anything but a waste of money, since mere geography means animals in those cities are not and never will be threats to game birds' nests?

I don't think a predator bounty program's a good way to enhance pheasant hunting - as I understand it, a shortage of suitable pheasant habitat is the only threat to pheasant hunting. Well, that and the cost of getting access to that habitat. Honestly, I only moved to South Dakota a few years ago and have never hunted pheasant (and probably never will, too small to be worth the effort and expense) so I don't particularly care about preserving pheasant hunting. But a lot of people do care, and think a nest predator bounty's a way to do it. Fine, try a bounty program. But structure it in a way that minimizes the likelihood of wasting tax money or license money paying bounties on animals that were in no position to endanger any pheasants in the first place. That's money that could be put to use fighting CWD, or improving elk or deer habitat, or buying out the private owners of closed fishing waters, or dozens of other useful things instead of getting wasted on roadkill from Rapid.

Kim Heupel

Aberdeen SD

Kimberly_asu@yahoo.com

Comment:

Do not allow this

Peggy Barg

Garretson SD

pegbarg@alliancecom.net

Comment:

It is cruel & unnecessary!

Julie Falor
Sioux Falls SD
Julzzlf@yahoo.com

Comment:

oppose

Carrie Painter
Canton SD
huskers0522@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Darci Adams
Hartford SD
dadams@humanesociety.org

Comment:

The Humane Society of the United States opposes the proposed “Nest Predator Bounty Program,” as well as its related scheme to provide free traps for the capture and killing of those species. Offering a bounty that encourages South Dakotans to kill raccoons, striped skunks, opossums, badgers and red foxes for the purported objective of increasing game bird numbers is not backed by science-based wildlife management principles, and is a slap in the face to South Dakota’s hunting tradition of sportsmanship, fair chase, and respect for wildlife and their environment. Effective wildlife management includes setting appropriate seasons to protect mothers and their dependent young, restricting the number of licenses, and restricting bag limits. By permitting mass slaughter of native species and neglecting these tenets, the offer of bounties fosters the very opposite.

Wildlife management professionals across the U.S. have long acknowledged the ineffectiveness of bounties and predator control. In a July 2016 meeting, the Pennsylvania Game Commission stated, “After decades of using predator control (such as paying bounties) with no effect, and the emergency of wildlife management as a science, the agency finally accepted the reality that predator control does not work.”

(<https://archive.triblive.com/sports/outdoors/habitat-not-predators-seen-as-key-to-wildlife-populations/>) And in a recent management plan, the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission pointed out, “Bounties and harvest incentive programs are prone to corruption, expensive, do not increase harvest, and do not target problem animals.”

(https://www.ncwildlife.org/Portals/0/Learning/documents/Species/Coyote%20Management%20Plan_FINAL_030118.pdf) South Dakota’s own Habitat Work Group shared that sentiment in its 2014 report to Governor Daugaard, saying, “Under a bounty system, predator control would not be targeted enough to be effective. Additionally, bounty systems in other states have been ineffective because the origin of the predators cannot be verified. Predators from other states could easily be imported for a bounty, which would be counterproductive.” (<https://habitat.sd.gov/resources/habitatsummitinfo/docs/PHWG%20Final%20Report.pdf>)

What’s more, to date no sound, science-based evidence has been presented to suggest that the species targeted by this “Nest Predator Bounty Program”—raccoons, striped skunks, opossums, badgers or red foxes—are adversely impacting pheasant populations. This is likely because the persistence of those bird species is determined by weather and the availability of suitable habitat, and not by the random removal of other species who each play their own unique and important role in South Dakota’s ecosystem. In particular, opossums are a tremendous benefit to any area they inhabit, helping to control unwanted, harmful garden pests. Their diet includes snails, mice, rats, and insects such as cockroaches, crickets, beetles, and—in large numbers—disease-carrying ticks.

Additionally, trapping is cruel and an ineffective method of wildlife conflict management. Trapped animals can languish and die slowly from shock, dehydration, starvation, or exposure to the elements. Those who survive long enough for the trapper to return may be killed by drowning, chest compression, strangulation, shooting, or any other method. Trapping does nothing to resolve the underlying problem in wildlife conflicts, and does not effectively control wildlife populations; in fact, it can actually stimulate population increases of some animals as they compensate for reductions in their numbers from trapping. Live trapping is only ever justified in those rare cases where it demonstrably benefits animals or provides necessary benefits to ecological systems. The proposed “Nest Predator Bounty Program” is by no means such a case.

In January 2019, the Capital Journal editorial board spoke in opposition to the proposed bounty program, adding that if the state wants to advance pheasant hunting opportunities, it must “...focus on habitat, primarily grasslands and wetlands, work with landowners to secure those habitat(s) through incentives, provide hunter access through a strong walk-in program and raise suitable funding to get it done.” We agree. If Game, Fish & Parks wants more game birds for hunters, it must focus on improving their habitat, not randomly killing other species that play an equally important role in that habitat.

For these reasons, we ask that you withdraw the proposal for the “Nest Predator Bounty Program.”

Darci Adams
South Dakota State Director
The Humane Society of the United States
PO Box 733
Hartford SD 57033

David Goronja

Howard SD

dlgoronjajr1@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Dave Pauli

Billings MT

wildquests@aol.com

Comment:

I am a consulting wildlife damage control professional and have worked with South Dakota Animal Control professionals on wildlife issues for two decades. This proposal to offer bounties for meso predators is not good science, good management or good in any way. Please do not consider this ill advised counter productive program.

Megan Daniels

Aberdeen SD

Megandaniels80@gmail.com

Comment:

So cruel...please please do not do this

Donna Hudson

Sioux Falls SD

donnaohana@yahoo.com

Comment:

oppose

Richard Kimmel

Sturgis SD

lowriderghost@gmail.com

Comment:

There is No need for this nonsense! One of the few remaining joys of residing in this state... as yes a person Not of great means or monetary assets... is the ability to observe Not harm the native wildlife.... and if at all possible ~ help them survive yet another day... anyway I can. Nuff' said.

Kerms Cox

Custer SD

kermarae@hotmail.com

Comment:

This is insane. Words do not express my distaste of this proposal. There is always a ebb and flow in nature. Let nature do what nature does. It will not destroy all the pheasants. This proposal is ONLY in the name of making money. Disgusting.

Donna Palmlund

De Smet SD

dpalmlund@gmail.com

Comment:

Why put a bounty on possums? They do a lot more good than harm with all the ticks and other insects they get rid of. So what if they eat a few pheasant eggs? Reducing our risk of Lyme Disease is worth it. This is not very well thought out at all. If the state wants to increase game bird population, look into bringing back better CRP incentives!

Wayne Beck

Westport SD

wayne.a.beck@nrctv.com

Comment:

I have a lot of coons and skunks around my land. And this will be a good program to build our pheasant population up once again.

Cynthia Herndon

Rapid City SD

Comment:

'Trapping is cruel and an ineffective method of wildlife conflict management. Trapped animals can languish and die slowly from shock, dehydration, starvation, or exposure to the elements. Those who survive long enough for the trapper to return may be killed by drowning, chest compression, strangulation, shooting or any other method. Trapping does nothing to resolve the underlying problem in wildlife conflicts, and does not effectively control wildlife populations; in fact, it can actually stimulate population increases of some animals as they compensate for reductions in their numbers from trapping. Live trapping is only ever justified in those RARE cases where it demonstrably benefits animals or provides necessary benefits to ecological systems.

Letha Lewandowski

Webster SD

Comment:

I am strongly opposed to the new nest predator bounty program. There is a place for every species in our ecosystem, which I am sure you learn when you are receiving your education. So why are you all so determined to play God and pick and choose which animals should live. This is wrong! Also, there is no way you should extend trapping on public land an right of ways. I though public land was for all the public! When I am out on public land with my dog, why do we feel threatened with traps and snares? I really think you should re-think what you are thinking of doing. Hopefully, someone will have the common sense to realize public lands are for all.

Henry Roghair

Okaton SD

hgrseeds@gwtc.net

Comment:

I have a BS degree in Wildlife and Fisheries Science and have farmed, hunted, trapped and fished in Jones County, SD all of my life.

South Dakota had a bounty system in place when I started hunting and trapping. I never remember seeing that it did any appreciable amount of good.

I am opposed to reinstating a new bounty system in the State.

I understand that reducing predator population helps game birds, but I think that a bounty system would be a poor, but expensive way to try to accomplish it.

Kt Willer

Tigard OR

ktwiller@gmail.com

Comment:

Programs like this are so ineffective. South Dakota should be better than this. More than anything else, kill-trapping is unspeakably cruel. Please be forward-thinking, your tourist dollars may depend on it!

Other

Travis Donelan

Garretson SD

Comment:

dumb it down for the casual hunter. 4 draws is to many. we all know the purpose is for more money from out of state and more special buck licenses. convince people the additional revenue is going to a good cause. most serious hunters donate \$10 a year for 30+ years on licenses they will never draw(big horn, mountain goat, custer elk) don't ruin deer hunting PLEASE. it doesn't have to be a rich mans sport!

PS-a lot of residents are upset with the young man who shot the world record sheep in SD. he might have been very very lucky or he might have benefited from a rigged drawing. I have no opinion on the matter.

Dan Stapleton

Wentworth SD

danstapleton@hotmail.com

Comment:

The number of NR hunters in the past few years has caused more pressure on several of our Public Lands as the NR Archery Hunters are camping and tenting on some of our best habitat areas to include draws, ridges, and timber lines. We have to start controlling these numbers if we want to continue growing trophy deer in South Dakota.

Dan Stapleton

Wentworth SD

danstapleton@hotmail.com

Comment:

We must raise the fees in order to lower NR Hunters from overcrowding our lands and to stay in competition with other surrounding states. We must also do this in order to lower the NR success rates, as I have personally witnessed many NR hunters killing young Mule Deer less than 2 years old. In order to preserve the Deer Quality we have built over the years in SD, we must control the limit of young deer being harvested. As I have visited with several NR Hunters after seeing many young Mule Bucks, two and three pointers hanging in trees at their camp sites, they have stated that these young deer are considered nice size deer in their States. We need to move quickly on this problem and control the amount of Permits to NR Hunters.

Robert Rogers

Dallas PA

bob8655@frontiernet.net

Comment:

I have been privileged to Archery hunt on South Dakota public land for over 10 years. I can count on one hand the number of times I have run into another hunter. If I find someone in the area, I find another area to hunt, it's that simple. I believe some have an agenda and are overstating the Nonresident hunters impact on hunting in South Dakota.

Robert Rogers

Dallas PA

bob8655@frontiernet.net

Comment:

The current system of issuing Archery permits appears functioning as a useful management tool. I trust the SD GF&P experts. Those who propose otherwise may be pushing their own selfish agendas.

Robert Rogers

Dallas PA

bob8655@frontiernet.net

Comment:

I believe the current system is a useful tool to manage the state's resource. This system is evaluated by highly educated biologist and the Conservation Officers in the field. I do not feel separating Whitetail/Mule Deer permits would have a significant impact, except financially.

Robert Rogers

Dallas PA

bob8655@frontiernet.net

Comment:

I have archery hunted Antelope on public land in South Dakota. I can honestly say I have never run into another hunter, resident or nonresident. If there is an issue in one area that could be addressed, but to limit a low number of nonresident Antelope Archery Licenses would be a disproportionate reaction.

Chris Gukeisen

Pierre SD

chris.gukeisen@gmail.com

Comment:

support Archery Deer Hunting on Public Lands

Chris Gukeisen

Pierre SD

chris.gukeisen@gmail.com

Comment:

Nonresident Archery Mule Deer Permits I strongly support this, and agree with the reasoning 100%!

Chris Gukeisen

Pierre SD

chris.gukeisen@gmail.com

Comment:

support Nonresident Whitetail Deer Permits

Chris Gukeisen

Pierre SD

chris.gukeisen@gmail.com

Comment:

Strongly support Nonresident Big Game Fee Increases. As other states get more expensive, word it getting out to go to SD for mule deer. I believe we will soon see over crowding worse than it currently already is in some areas.

Chris Gukeisen

Pierre SD

chris.gukeisen@gmail.com

Comment:

support Nonresident Archery Antelope Permits

Perry Peterson

White Lake SD

Comment:

Deer License Allocation Plan I oppose the plan, this needs to be dropped as the support for it is almost nothing.

Brennan Hauk

Rapid City SD

bhauk@hotmail.com

Comment:

Allowing the auction tag to be used in the Badlands unit will be horrible optics for GFP. There is already a perception (rightly or wrongl) that it is a canned hunt.

This is a true betrayal of the North American Model of Wildlife Management.

There is a reason this unit was not included in the previous year's auction tag hunt area.

Just because the state sees a world record taken and now wants to cash in, that's a horrible way to manage wildlife.

I strongly oppose this expansion of the auction tag units allowed.

I am a member of RMEF, MDF, BHA and DU. Most folks at the MDF booth at the Sports Show in Rapid City were opposed to this change.

Jon Albers
Rapid City SD
albersjon@live.com

Comment:

support Propose Change to rule 41:06:01:17 by SDBI. I completely support this change for all of the said reasons in the proposal.

Jon Albers
Rapid City SD
albersjon@live.com

Comment:

We need to get this under control.

Jon Albers
Rapid City SD
albersjon@live.com

Comment:

Why is out of state success rate so much better. Are they better hunters? More are ready to take any deer to justify traveling expenses. We need to get a handle on this to preserve some trophy opportunities

Jon Albers
Rapid City SD
albersjon@live.com

Comment:

Change to rule 41:06:02:03

Jon Albers
Rapid City SD
albersjon@Live.com

Comment:

Any funds raised by a special tag for Big Horn Sheep or any other species should go directly back to supporting that species. I appreciate the Governors enthusiasm for Pheasant hunting and am pleased we have a pro-hunting leader however, we have many species to hunt in South Dakota and only supporting pheasant hunting may be counter intuitive to the success of the others.

Wyatt Skelton

Bryant SD

wyattskelton@hotmail.com

Comment:

I strongly oppose any deviation of ear marked for sheep management only funds generated from the auctioned bighorn sheep tag. That tag was brought about to solely fund sheep management. Also oppose funds from any "super" tag being used for "other" purposes than for the management of the species of the tag. Thank you.

Chancey Odell

Camp Crook SD

chanceyodell@hotmail.com

Comment:

Due to the increased popularity of archery hunting, increased efficiency of archery equipment, and limited access to private lands, it is time to limit archery hunting, before South Dakota finds itself in a situation like Minnesota and Wisconsin. It would be nice to have 2018 data, but knowing that more deer were harvested in 35L with archery equipment than with rifle equipment in 2017 is all the research that should be needed. Given the increase in pressure seen with the early opener, the potential of increased recreation if and when Keystone XL construction begins, and limited fire suppression, Medical, and law enforcement presence in close proximity to public land concentrations, we have a definite recipe for disaster, if hunting pressure in these areas is not limited.

Chancey Odell

Camp Crook SD

chanceyodell@hotmail.com

Comment:

While I applaud SDBI for taking action, I don't believe this proposal goes far enough. The limited nature of public land mule deer opportunity in SD means a few areas see a vast majority of the pressure, namely the southern Black Hills, Harding, Northern Perkins, Eastern Pennington, Northern Butte, Northern Meade, and Lyman. These areas have seen an increase in resident hunters almost on par with non residents. While I personally hate to see this loss in opportunity, biologically and politically, it is time to take action, before it's too late. While I realize it is highly unlikely, I would like to see some kind of preference (for all big game licenses) given to residents of a unit. As more people apply for highly coveted licenses, young residents of those areas are going to be precluded from those opportunities, and this lose interest in hunting. This comes at a time when recruitment and retainment in hunting and fishing are becoming more and more difficult.

Jeff Barnes

Boone IA

jeffrey.barnes@dnr.iowa.gov

Comment:

First I'd like to introduce myself. My name is Jeff Barnes, and I'm a Recreational Safety Officer with the Iowa Dept of Natural Resources. My primary duties include our Hunter Ed program and investigating hunting related shooting incidents.

I apologize, but I didn't receive notice of your meeting until today. I understand this is within the 72 hours prior to your meeting, but I'm hoping you have the time to review the following information.

I wanted to touch on the elimination of rifles during the spring turkey season as a way to increase the safety of hunters, while continuing to allow the practice of fanning turkeys, or using a turkey fan to sneak up on another turkey.

The following is the link to a video that was made by Brian Flowers, with the Missouri Dept of Conservation, a few years back when the practice of turkey fanning started to gain popularity (2014 or 2015). It gives a firsthand look at what the practice of fanning looks like, and makes it plain to see why it creates such a dangerous situation for hunters out in the field. If the link doesn't work, it may need to be copied and pasted.

<https://vimeo.com/106120849>

Our Hunter Ed Instructors spend a lot of time talking to their students about ways to stay safe out in the hunting fields, and the fanning method of hunting turkeys goes directly against the message they preach. Turkey hunting is a sport designed to trick the turkey into coming to your calls, which can lead to people actually calling to each other. To make yourself look and sound identical to a strutting turkey while sneaking up on a turkey is an extremely dangerous tactic.

I also spent a little time over the weekend going through the Hunting incident Clearinghouse on the International Hunter Education Association-USA website to see what was actually happening during the spring turkey season on a nationwide basis. I was able to gather information to reflect shooting related and safety incidents that have occurred over the last 15 years. I feel it provides a fairly accurate representation of where the dangers primarily lie during the spring season.

Over the last 15 years, there have been 508 incidents entered into the Clearinghouse. Of those 508 incidents, 491 involved the use of a shotgun, only 15 involved a rifle of any kind, 1 with a bow, and 1 with a crossbow. Of the 15 rifle incidents, 10 of those were either self-inflicted or accidental discharge, which left 5 as "failed to identify target" over the last 15 years. I should note South Dakota has never had a reported incident involving a rifle in the spring turkey season. 393 of the 491 shotgun incidents were the result of someone being shot by another hunter either mistaking them as a turkey, or being further downrange of an actual turkey. The remaining shotgun incidents were accidental discharges of one form or another. Fanning accounted for two of the incidents in 2015, and most of the incidents haven't been entered for the last couple years, so there's likely a few more than reported here.

Based on the incident numbers, the elimination of rifles to hunt turkeys would do very little to increase the safety of hunters in the field. Based on the fact that rifles are most often equipped with a scope, I would argue that they could actually increase safety simply because they provide a magnified and much clearer view of the target.

I would encourage the decision to eliminate rifles to be reconsidered. It not only provides a method of take for people with mobility issues, but there are a large number of responsible folks who truly enjoy hunting with a rifle who would likely not buy licenses if that method were removed.

Please let me know if anyone has any issues or questions.

Respectfully, Jeff Barnes
515-290-4907

Wes Wingen

Whitewood SD

Wrwingen@yahoo.com

Comment:

I personally witness the large influx of out of state archery hunters in the slim buttes each year, and can attest to the impact it has on the overall quality of the hunt. It is discouraging to say the least. I support limiting these licenses for non-residents and I support increasing the fees as well.

Wes Wingen

Whitewood SD

Wrwingen@yahoo.com

Comment:

support Archery Deer Hunting on Public Lands

Wes Wingen

Whitewood SD

Wrwingen@yahoo.com

Comment:

support Nonresident Whitetail Deer Permits

Chancey Odell

Camp Crook SD

chanceyodell@hotmail.com

Comment:

I am in favor of increasing nonresident fees to levels consistent with other western states, but only if resident fees are decreased to a level similar to other western states.

Wes Wingen

Whitewood SD

Wrwingen@yahoo.com

Comment:

support Nonresident Big Game Fee Increases

Wes Wingen

Whitewood SD

Wrwingen@yahoo.com

Comment:

support Nonresident Archery Antelope Permits

Chancey Odell

Camp Crook SD

chanceyodell@hotmail.com

Comment:

I do not see this as a big of an issue as archery deer permits, but am in favor of limiting nonresident permits, and considering limiting resident permits, if pressure and success rates increase, or if populations decrease.

Chancey Odell

Camp Crook SD

chanceyodell@hotmail.com

Comment:

While alternative funding sources for habitat improvement are a noble cause, I am not sure selling outdoor opportunities that many people wait years for to the highest bidder is the best route. Turning hunting into a sport only for the wealthy may very well end hunting in America. I am especially opposed to using funds raised from a very specialized, native species (that is one of the hardest for the common man to get the opportunity to hunt) to promote habitat for an introduced, often invasive species, simply because of it's impact on the states economy. If anything, it should be the other way around. Funds raised from pheasant hunting should be used to promote specialized, native species.

Scott Loecker

Mitchell SD

sloecker@mitchelltelecom.net

Comment:

I don't oppose opening more areas to hunt for the Governors tag but I do oppose any money raised by the tag to be spent on anything other than sheep. The tag was originally allocated to raise funds for that purpose and should not be changed.

Ed Hiller

Arlington SD

Comment:

I do not see a need to change what we have, but when you change it the special buck tags should be in the same draw as the east river and west river

Tom Riddle

Mitchell SD

Riddleandsons@gmail.com

Comment:

This is not something that majority of sportsman want, this commission needs to listen, thank you

Jerrud Kruse

Ranona SD

Comment:

I don't support a change to are deer tag draw system and I don't know a single resident of South Dakota who does support the new proposal. It's not fair to every resident of South Dakota!

Kent Siemonsma

Humboldt SD

ksiemonsma@goldenwest.net

Comment:

Sounds like another joke from gf&p & the big money people that are telling them what they want them to do
CANT YOU LEAVE ANYTHING ALONE INSTEAD OF COMPLICATING THINGS

Kent Siemonsma

Humboldt SD

ksiemonsma@goldenwest.net

Comment:

This habitat problem isn't too hard to figure out. It starts with the FARMER. They tile everything they can, break up pasture and mow every bit of grass they can. Evidently governor NOEM wants everybody else to take care of what the grain farmer has caused.

Sharon Blais

Sioux Falls SD

sharonb479@msn.com

Comment:

Please just leave our wild life animals alone. It is nature and each animal is here for a reason.

Ivan Maya

Niagara Falls ON

alexandermaya79@hotmail.com

Comment:

How can the government allow all this cruelty and destruction of our environment??? We need new laws the can ban all kinds of hunting activities that are leading to the destruction of the environment. Be more conscious of the situation, we only have

Chad Savey

Harrisburg SD

saveyhunter@hotmail.com

Comment:

First, I am very excited that Kristi is pro hunting and is trying to get the ball rolling to improve hunting in SD. I commend the idea of harvesting predators, but until we have habitat to support our pheasants/deer, this is going to do very little good. Habitat is the #1 part of this equation and until you have that, everything else you try will barely make an impact/dent on solving the problem.

With habitat, how are we going to get landowners to want to put their ground into switchgrass? With the new CRP program, ya, they increased the acres, but I heard payments are going to suck compared to what they were. What is the incentive to want to get people to sign up now? Are we thinking of supplementing that payment so it is appealing to landowners? Doesn't MN require all farmers to plant switchgrass buffer strips along waterways? This would help with water quality and habitat. I'm super excited that this conversation is rolling, but we need to be focusing on habitat, habitat, habitat!!!!!!!

Resident Nonresident

Dan Stapleton

Wentworth SD

danstapleton@hotmail.com

Comment:

As stated in earlier issues, I believe raising the fees for NR Hunters and the purchase of a habitat stamp will help slow down the pressure for hunters and hopefully raise more monies for habitat.

Robert Rogers

Dallas PA

bob8655@frontiernet.net

Comment:

I do not have a "Much higher disposable income" than resident hunters, but if the Commission feels this would assist South Dakota Game, Fish, & Parks accomplish their mission, than I am more than ready to do my part. I love the State of South Dakota and will pay my part to preserve the resource and hunting opportunities, if fairly implemented.

Special Buck Licenses

Kelly Koistinen

Spearfish SD

kkoistinen@fs.fed.us

Comment:

"The proposal calls for an allocation of 4 percent of the total resident West River deer licenses that includes an any whitetail deer tag from the previous year or 500 for each for resident and nonresident hunters; whichever is greater." What exactly does this mean? These proposals are made up so quickly and so ridiculously, that they aren't even understandable! Stop making these ridiculous proposals! Enough! Stop trying to mess with the tradition of Deer hunting in this State! Enough is Enough! Why are you taking away from the total number of deer tags available and making them available in another stupid possible drawing? Quit taking away available tags from the Residents and offering them up in some nonsense drawing! Leave the system alone!!!! This commission is Still Way out of Control on the proposals. Why are you constantly trying to improve on a system that WAS perfectly fine? Before you started trying to manipulate the application system back in 2016, everything was working fine without the intrusion of this Commission! Look what you've begun! Every time I turn around you are trying to stack the deck of the license system. LEAVE IT ALONE! Do not take tags away from the residents and try and give them to someone with more money to contribute. If you take away 500 tags away from the West River Deer Hunting season, then you are stacking the deck!! You will be taking away deer licenses from the residents! Don't even think about doing this. It is taking away the rights of the citizens of this State for the sake of money! Where are you people coming up with these stupid proposals? Greed in the South Dakota Game Fish and Parks!! That will make a great headline for the Rapid City Journal, you can bet on that! Do not take away licenses from the West River Deer season and set them aside, you're manipulating the system again, just like you tried with the License Allocation crap!

Jim Zirbel

Aberdeen SD

jim@zirbelfamily.com

Comment:

This new tag has the appearance of something to satisfy the Non-resident or residents that don't want to participate with the new lottery system. The problem is that we keep pulling these type options from the general pool and the average Joe that can't afford the high price Special Tags has less opportunity to get a tag. I am strongly opposed to this option. It seems like your just trying to satisfy a group that is unhappy with the new system.

Justin Allen

Pierre SD

Comment:

I'm opposed to the proposal to increase the whitetail only special buck permits for NR and/or resident hunters. I'm taken back that this proposal was brought forward to GFP by a special interest group and proposed by GFP without going thru the public petition process yet at the same time NR bow hunting issues are forced to be petition and then tabled. It seems like a double standard. In one breath you preach you're listening to the hunters by addressing NR deer pressure but in the next breath you are increasing special buck permits which obviously do no favor to the majority of folks that are against the commercialization of deer hunting in SD. What has happened to the transparency GFP used to pride itself in?

Justin

Use of Parks and Public Lands

Jeffrey Lerud

Mobridge SD

coloradojeff_2000@yahoo.com

Comment:

The Commission also proposed repealing a rule that prohibits uncased .22 rimfire firearms in the state parks, opening up the opportunity for hunters to pursue small game during legal hunting seasons. You are doing a great job and most items I totally agree with, but opening or in any way allowing firearms, even 22, is asking for accidents. I am 71 and I ask you to reconsider. Thanks

Tanner Starr

Watertown SD

tannerstarr18@gmail.com

Comment:

I am sure there is a reason that this law is currently in the books. However, it seems this law has no purpose. Small game hunting is allowed after October 1st in state parks but this law prevents me from using my firearm of choice, a .22 rimfire rifle. As an avid squirrel and rabbit hunter I would appreciate this law being abolished.