

Public Comments

Archery Deer License Allocation

Jarrett Perry

Rapid City SD

Comment:

Leave it the way it is for residents let them be able to hunt west and east river sd with bow

Jarrett Perry

Rapid City SD

Comment:

I support category 2a to make non residents have cap on archery

Arnold Veen

Milbank SD

arnieveen@yahoo.com

Comment:

In reading the new Archery Proposal to be discussed at the May GFP commission meeting I would like to submit the following comments.

Most of the options do not address the concerns of the SD Bowhunters with the exception of Category #2 Option A and Category #3 Option A. My main concern is that we need a way to limit Nonresidents number of archery tags in our state as have SD Rifle hunting license have with the % of the total licences. Most other states have a limited number of out of state archery hunters licenses on a draw system or limited access to certain high pressured areas and I think SD should follow their examples.

Thanks You

Don Massa

Edgemont SD

drdon@massadentaloffices.com

Comment:

I am a landowner in both Clay County near Vermillion and Fall River County near Edgemont. I provide habitat and food for numerous elk, turkeys, mule deer and whitetail deer. My oldest son, Thomas and I are avid archery hunters and have been hunting archery deer with the east river and west river permits for many years. With the proposal to do away with the east river and west river tags and replace them with a statewide tag, it will limit my opportunity as a sportsman and a landowner to hunt with my weapon of choice on land that I own.

It is still possible to obtain both an east river and west river firearms tag as per the latest regulations and I feel that the SD Game, Fish and Parks is removing this option for archery hunters only.

I strongly oppose the recommendation to limit the archery tags available to South Dakota residents.

Lance Verhulst
Hot Springs SD
callmtoya@gmail.com

Comment:

I am strongly opposed two limiting archery tags to only one when you can still have more than one rifle tag. I would gladly forgo applying for any rifle season if I can still have my East River and West River archery. Lance Verhulst . Hot Springs.

Craig Hargens
Miller SD
Hargens34@gmail.com

Comment:

I am opposing the elimination of having both an ER and WR archery tag(s) and only allowing a state wide. This in my opinion is limiting our hunting opportunities and taking money away from the GFP. I like the opportunities to have both options rather than continuing to take away resident options which seems to be your goal or the trend lately. If you want to limit opportunities start with the nonresidents. I would support category 2 option A and strongly suggest raising nonresident fees which seems to work in other states. I used to hunt primarily State owned land ER but the past several years more nonresidents seem to be taking them over and limiting local residents. Public land as you know is limited and everyone appreciates it but as i see it maybe we need to limit nonresidents. Go WR and most of the available opportunities are public and outfitters seem to be continuing to tie up a chunks of private. It truly is becoming pay to play and the everyday working person is losing out and taking the next generation with them.

Clint Barber
Aurora SD
Clint.barber@jacks.sdstate.edu

Comment:

Hello Commission, I have seen 2 separate Archery plan sheets for the upcoming seasons. 1 that just set the season opener date as September 1st, and the other that had the new allocation requests. I would be in favor option 2A, of all the options on the sheet. With that said, the most important issue to me is keeping the September 1st opener. 1 year is not enough of a sample size and with other states such as Kentucky (other western surrounding states) that have been wildly successful whitetail bow hunting, I would hope we keep the September 1st date. I have heard rumblings of pushing the date back, and I don't understand the concern, or unintended consequences. If people are concerned with flooding the western part of the state with early season non resident mule deer hunters, please just push back the non resident archery start date, or move them to a draw system that is limited tags. Based on last years comments, I felt there was an overwhelming amount of support for the September 1st start date. Thank you for the consideration.

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 make a limited number of Archery license 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 effect all the west river outer fitters, 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 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 Lermeney

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

Bighorn Sheep Auction License

Justin Broughton

Sioux Falls SD

justin.broughton@premierbankcard.com

Comment:

I see the Commission's May agenda again contains an effort to hijack funding for wild sheep conservation and research in our great state and to move those funds to pheasant habitat programs. Our auction tag has been a boon to wild sheep in the state of South Dakota. Our partnership in coordination with the Wild Sheep Foundation has raised an incredible amount of money to help us better understand the needs of wild sheep in SD and to ultimately put more sheep on the mountain through research, habitat, and relocation projects. I absolutely 100% oppose the earmarking of ANY funds raised from the auction of the bighorn sheep tag going to any programs which are not directly related to the conservation and preservation of wild sheep in South Dakota. The money grab that is being attempted to earmark sheep funds for the second century habitat initiative is a backhanded insult to South Dakotan's who have worked tirelessly to preserve and improve the health and viability of our wild sheep herds. There are a multitude of fundraising avenues available to fund pheasant habitat initiatives while sheep have but one. This tag auction has funded ground breaking research at South Dakota State University, assisted with transplanting new sheep from Rocky Boy reservation to bolster our herds, as well as funded conservation and preservation initiatives with our sheep herds. Please consider alternative funding methods for the Governor's pet program and help us continue to build strong sheep herds for SD's future. Thank you for your consideration.

Keith Prischmann

Kindred ND

Kprischmann@kwh.com

Comment:

Keep the sheep money with the sheep

Christian Harrington

Johnstown CO

charrington@servprofortcollins.com

Comment:

Back at it again, eh? Please reconsider what you're proposing. Funding pheasant habitat with money directly contributed to bighorn sheep is a terrible, terrible idea. Sell a \$10 "2nd Century Habitat Stamp" and you'll bring in far more money than you

Keith Prischmann

Kindred ND

Kprischmann@kwh.com

Comment:

Keep the sheep money with the sheep

Jason Zins

West Fargo SD

jjzins@gmail.com

Comment:

I believe the funds raised by WSF should go to habitat and species development of the Bighorns, not pheasants or any other area not pertaining to sheep.

Darrel Jones

Dell Rapids SD

darrel.jones@k12.sd.us

Comment:

All the money raised from the Bighorn Sheep Auction tag should only go to programs designed to benefit the Bighorn Sheep populations in the Black Hills and Badlands. If it is funneled to pheasant habitat/programs, the commercial operations will be the only ones to benefit.

Scott Loecker

Mitchell SD

sloecker@mitchelltelecom.net

Comment:

I don't have a problem with the bighorn sheep auction tag being allowed in both Custer County and the Badlands but I am completely against any of the proceeds of the auction to go anywhere but back to funding for the sheep in our state. None of it should be allocated to Second Century project.

Kyle Sipma

Sioux Falls SD

kyle_sipma@yahoo.com

Comment:

I appreciate the effort given by the department and commission to balance opportunity and quality. We are in a unique position in South Dakota, sandwiched between states to the east that have deer tags sold over the counter and states to the west that have more complex drawings and allocations of tags. I am of neutral opinion for the proposed tag allocation process. Change can definitely ruffle some feathers and the process does seem to be getting more complex. A thought for future review that may simplify things rather than complicate them.... could preference points be applied to each species(deer, antelope, elk...) instead of each application type? Subsequently preference could only be used on only one first choice application. This would gain advantage for someone's preferred tag of choice and not limit the number first draw applications. There could also be added a small application fee to offset the decrease in annual preference points purchased each year.

(Existing preference points would be combined, as everyone has already paid for them. ei if someone has 1 west river point, 1 east river point and 1 muzzleloader point, the next season would start them with 3 deer points.)

Thank you again for your continued efforts.

Kyle Sipma

Chad Savey
Harrisburg SD
saveyhunter@hotmail.com

Comment:

What a joke! Everyone was hesitant to agree to auction off a bighorn tag because our gut told us this would only open the door to other things. We were promised these funds would go back to helping the bighorns only!!! Shocker, now we're trying to rob some of those funds. I don't know why I even get surprised anymore by the decisions surrounding our big game in this state. It's been nothing but a disaster and trying to dig out of a hole because of poor management decisions for over 10 years! I thought we were back on the right path and now you just spit in everyone's face by even suggesting this! Great job getting hunters believing in you again. The only thing you have done is upset us and turned hunters belief in you even more. I don't even know what to say. As a hunter I feel deflated yet once again! There are so many things we can do to raise more dollars without having to do this!!!!!!!!!!

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
clkezar@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 wouldn't have sheep or goats in our state. However, there needs to be more transparency on the amount the sheep get or don't 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
docjcpearson@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

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 Burluson

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 Uecket
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 scenarios. 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

robriestesund@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
bernalire@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 bit 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.

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.

Other

Brad Croucher

Mitchell SD

bkstickbow@mitchelltelecom.net

Comment:

Two or three years ago the commission voted against reducing the velocity requirements for airguns. Please bring this back to the table. Trying to keep this short and sweet I can understand why half the commission would not vote for the reduction when the proposal was from 1000 fps to 600 fps I assume some folks thought that forty percent was not acceptable. Although 600 fps generates adequate foot pound of energy to cleanly dispatch small game I may have had to think twice when the vote came up. I also believe that the vote would or should have passed if the proposal was 750 fps. The rifle that I shoot propels a 15.89 gr pellet at around 900 fps which generates over 26 foot pounds of energy. It takes around 5 pounds of energy to kill a rabbit. Look at the European regulations 12 ft lbs max unless a special license is issued. Please get back to me and let me know if you can put this to a vote this year, I have done the home work. I am not good at public speaking but would be more than willing to come and share what I have discovered in a very short amount of time. If I shot a rabbit with my gun (that is capable of the above stated foot pounds of energy and above with 18 gr pellet and shoots 11 pellets in a dime size group at 35 yards) I would be breaking the law. Gentleman it is time for a change.

Thank You

Brad Croucher

I have brought this to others attention, I get some support from GFP people and Fed warden was to push me in the correct direction yet never hear from the folks again. Please respond

Mark Gatlin

Rapid City SD

Redtrez@Yahoo.com

Comment:

I think it was a good idea the past 2 years I met several tourists who were disgruntled at the fact they had to quit fishing after catching one fish.

All the fish I caught were over 14" so I brought my grandkids, but still we only fished for an hour or so.

Maybe raising the the length to 16" or 18". Also you should change the signs to reflect the new regulations as quickly as you were to post them!!

Mark Gatlin
Rapid City SD
Redtrez@yahoo.com

Comment:

I would support a discounted fishing licenses for Oglala Sioux and the other bands or tribes that are the original owners of the Black Hills. The federal government already recognized this and tried to buy them off. Charging a fee to fish on their own lakes and rivers is just perpetuating the farce.

Wyatt Skelton
Bryant SD
wyattskelton@hotmail.com

Comment:

Would like to see muzzleloader deer open during rifle antelope season

Robert Eddy
Spearfish SD
reddy@rushmore.com

Comment:

I encourage the commission to oppose the request to increase the Special Buck allotment. A further increase in this tag will only decrease the access to private lands. This access issue is difficult enough.

James Boyd

Watertown SD

james.m.boyd@outlook.com

Comment:

Please, Don Not for the sake of our resource change the boating restrictions on Long Lake. This is an excellent fishery and has been for a long time.

i believe this is such a tremendous fishery because of the current regulations and the inability to exploit the resource. By lifting the restrictions that is what is going to happen is the resource is going to be exploited.

1. the boating restriction is in place and currently this limits the harvest of an established population of quality sized Walleyes. This is similar to Reetze Lake however this is open to ice fishing. Why not counter Reetze Lake and leave the ice fishermen with a place to have a chance to catch quality fish through the ice.

2. Last fall you just imposed a boating restriction for Swan Lake and Indian Springs in Clark County. The same restriction is currently in place on this Lake in Codington County. Why would we remove something that is already in place. Are the waterfowl hunters in Codington County less important than the ones in Clark.

3. Finally with the open waters compromise, We sportsman are told that we have plenty of access, how ever now we need to open up Long Lake for more access.

Please again help us protect a resource, at this point quality over quantity. I don't want another lake that has been fished out. Why not look at the resources as a diversified portfolio vs. making Long Lake an over fished slough doing no good to anyone.

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.