

Public Comments

Cancellation Policy

Karleen Dagit

Lead SD

Position: support

Comment:

I was charged \$168.00 for a cancellation from June 6-9 at Blue Bell Campground for two rustic cabins and one tent site. By mistake the reservation clerk did only 2 nights, so I needed to make another reservation for the third night! Quite upset and feel this is terribly unfair since they were so hard to get in the first place back in January and needing to cancel because of medical necessities. A total or much smaller refund would help me and so many others. Will never book again if this policy is not changed.

Elk Season

Ron Schauer

Crooks SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am opposed to the large increase in proposed elk licenses in the Black Hills units. This is too large an increase and will result in a drastic decrease in overall elk populations in the hills. Resulting in substantial decreases down the road. This same scenario was used several years ago, and the results were not good. I am not against increasing tag numbers but not at the rate proposed. The second area of comment involves the CSP elk proposal. I do not understand why there are no cow elk licenses proposed? With all the black hills units surrounding the park proposing increases in any and cow elk tags, why not propose a "few" cow tags in the park. It is my firm belief that having a few cow tags in the park (5-10) would not effect the overall elk population and allow those people sitting on many years preference have a possible opportunity to draw a cow tag. Thanks you for your time and consideration.
Ron Schauer, retired GFP employee.

Kelly Koistinen

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am opposed to the allocation of Elk Licenses to non-residents who own land within SD, but don't live in SD. The Elk are for SD residents only! Don't allow non-residents to hunt elk in South Dakota. It is reserved ONLY for the citizens of this state. If the G, F, &P allows non-residents who own land, to hunt elk in this state, then the next step will be allowing non-residents to hunt here in SD also! I'm not in favor of allocation of elk licenses to any non-resident!

Caitlin Gust

Hermosa SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Dustin Rice

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am writing in response to the proposal of increasing Elk tags across the Black Hills as I strongly oppose this increase, specifically for the September and October Black Hills hunting seasons. Having the privilege of hunting elk the past 5 years here, either with a tag or with family/friends who have drawn tags, I am a little worried about what the extra pressure will do to the quality/age class of the bulls and more importantly what it will do to the quality of hunt hunters will get to experience. I am all for getting more people elk tags but I don't feel we should hold these hunts in the category of "opportunity hunting". With hunters, on average, waiting into the high teens to draw these tags we need to retain the top-quality hunt and animals the Black Hills is known for while not having to battle crowds of people in doing so. We must remember the pressure each additional tag is going to present not only during the hunting seasons but also during scouting season. We cannot blame the rifle hunters who are out scouting during archery season, but every extra tag holder just compounds on the pressure these animals experience. If this is an actual high population issue, I am all for the December hunting seasons as I think that is an excellent way of managing a herd size.

Having also hunted elk in other states (Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming) over the past 6 years and there is nothing that compares to the quality of hunt that the Black Hills provides. I really hope we don't make the mistake of trying to make this hunt an "opportunity hunt" just trying to please a few people who believe they deserve a tag. We have created a truly special hunt here in South Dakota so let's not ruin it.

Wayne Johnson

Vetal SD

Position: other

Comment:

Qualifying Landowners, with a minimum 10,000 dollars of provable actual damages per year, need to have at least one transferable Any Elk license every year.

Reduce the Any Elk licenses by a minimum of 50% for the PRE-11 units.

Structure a different set of guidelines and regulations for Prairie Elk as opposed to Black Hills Elk. The vast majority of the land in the Black Hills is Public, while the vast majority of Prairie is Private Land. One size doesn't necessarily fit all.

If these three changes are not made, there will be no free Elk access of any kind on the Wayne Johnson Ranch for the foreseeable future.

Lake Francis Case Walleye Regulations

Bill Barnett

Hartford SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

License Forms and Fees

Timothy Mueller

Omaha NE

Position: other

Comment:

You should offer a discounted price for seniors on non resident fishing and hunting permits ,I've purchased a SD fishing liscence for over 30 years consecutive 8f you want us to keep growing the sport and bringing our families ,you should consider this

Kurt Van Vleet

Redfield SD

Position: other

Comment:

To Whom it may concern, I have several spring snow goose hunters during March and April. It is very for me to try and explain why South Dakota has a Habitat Fee for this Spring Conservation hunt. This is a migratory bird. Can you please explain what habitat is needed for them. Thank You for your time. Kurt Van Vleet with Pheasant Country Lodging 605-460-1423

Missouri River Pierre Waterfowl Refuge

Jason Rumpca

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I pass shot geese in January and February by the dam. I also live near the water in Pierre and keep tabs on the migration and geese on Sharpe. I witnessed fisherman in boats below the dam fishing by the bridges and the mouth of the stillin basin. Boats do not move geese out of the area. Geese would move slightly if boats drove right next to them, but that's about it. Geese are not moved out of the area due to boat access. There are plenty of refuges up and down the river around Pierre. Adding the proposed refuge will not change the pattern of geese in the area, but it will clearly limit access to public hunting. Please do not add the proposed refuge.

Thomas Kallemeyn

Pierre SD

Position: other

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Aaron Rumpca

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I don't think this is a rational solution to decreased birds numbers. They currently have enough water habitat. Lake Oahe and Sharpe are huge. People barely pressure these birds on the water as it is. This will just limit public hunting to our youth. Private land owners need to stop and even reverse drain tiling. This will actually help waterfowl habitat and let the birds flourish. Just look around in the winter. It's grazed to nothing and farmed from ditch to ditch. Heck even the ditches a cut. Habit is everything. How many nests do Stephens farm over in the spring? Let's do a study.

Bob Brandt

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a terrible proposal; it takes more publicly accessible land from the average SD hunter and forces us to go to high priced pay to hunt outfits. They already get away with baiting geese to their land, now they want you to restrict or ban hunting on thousands of acres of accessible land. This would have been a bad proposal when the geese population was high, but it is especially bad with the waterfowl numbers very low. Goose hunting on public land around Pierre has always been a very tough hunt, this bad proposal would make it much harder. I am 68 years old and have been hunting in SD since I was 12. Everyone wants to increase the numbers of new, and younger hunters, this bad proposal will restrict their opportunity to hunt geese on thousands of acres of land that has historically been available to the average hunter. Please defeat this proposal. Thank you for your consideration. Bob Brandt

Felix Recek

Elkhorn NE

Position: oppose

Comment:

Why have a early season for Canada geese when you people are trying to protect them

Sam Sommers

Sioux Falls SD

Position: support

Comment:

Waterfront need roosting areas ! Keep working on making this happen. Thanks Sam

Pat Malcomb

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I strongly oppose closing PUBLIC land to goose hunters. Why is this even being seriously discussed, its a money grab by an outfitter that will backfire. Those of us that hunt this public land will never pay to hunt, we will just quit hunting the Pierre area altogether. As sportsman we have the right to hunt land we helped pay for vote know to this proposal

Kyle Villa

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Bill Barnett

Hartford SD

Position: other

Comment:

I do not care about Pierre and the area landowners and their friends. Gave up on Pierre hunting waterfowl years ago unfortunately the GF&P rule making disease has moved over to NE South Dakota the past 20 years and soon I will be done hunting any waterfowl as a freelance public access resident hunter of 50 years in South Dakota. Our state elected and appointed officials have done miserable job and do not even listen to their own subject matter experts for guidance for example John Cooper and Bill Antonides. As a landowner in Spink County I have not placed one piece of Drain Tile in the ground and this fall the NRCS office of Redfield will help me enroll our crop ground into CRP. Similar direct Action On the GFP has to been done to reverse the ongoing depletion & mismanagement of access to public resources and growth of privatization of natural resources impacting South Dakota residents. Signing OFF the "Last of the Mohicans" . Pray for Ukraine. To be subjugated is wrong.

Marlin Fallon

Ft.Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

James Bowers

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Your proposal to increase the area of the Pierre Waterfowl refuge will DECREASE waterfowl hunting opportunity for our community. Why, given the projection of the decrease in the popularity of waterfowl hunting and thus a decrease in funding, would you want to take away opportunities to hunt? South Dakota should be considering ELIMINATING some refuges, and INCREASING hunting opportunity. This proposal does not add to the quality of life here. Quite the opposite actually, it decreases quality of life for local residences.

Susan Leach

Pierre SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Pat Malcomb

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Other

Nancy Hilding

Black Hawk SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Nancy Hilding
President
Prairie Hills Audubon Society
P.O. Box 788
Black Hawk, SD 57718
Feb 27th, 2022

We oppose proceeding with buying the proposed shooting complex property at Meade County off Elk Vale Rd at this time. We fear the site may be too hilly to adequately provide of control of lead, especially in the north unit. We believe there will be many other adverse environmental impacts. The draft EA is totally inadequate and does not support a FONSI. We doubt you have figured out the true cost yet, because you have not factored in the full costs of environmental mitigation,

You should wait to purchase until after the National Environmental Policy Act review is complete and the USFWS issues a FONSI or a ROD, so you can adequately understand all the costs, of this site.

Thanks,

Nancy Hilding
President
PHAS

David Johnston

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I do not support the building of a new shooting range north of Rapid City. We have a shooting range down by Hot Springs. If we need something better, use the money to improve and expand that range.

Cheryl Whetham

Hill City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am writing to oppose the 175 Bay shooting range planned in Meade County, close to Pennington county. I am against spending \$5 million taxpayer dollars for an item that a small percentage of the population will use or benefit from. In addition to spending taxpayers dollars, there is a concern for noise, safety and the environmental impact of being so close to Elk Creek. A better use of 5 million taxpayer dollars would be to give people some property tax relief.

Chloye Anderson

Rapid City, SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Article in March 2, 2021, Rapid City Journal. GF&P looks to purchase land for gun range.

Mr Scull purchase land in late 2020. He then transferred the purchase agreement for the purchase agreement to parks and Wildlife Foundation. The foundation completed the transaction on March 25, 2021.

Apparently This deal has been a year in the making and the newspaper public is just being informed.

Between purchase date and transfer date who is responsible for property payments and land taxes, Mr. Scull or GF&P and Wildlife Foundation? Years ago the city of Sturgis , SD tried to have a gun range built. Location to close to Bear Butte and Rally bikers bar and campgrounds. No gun range was built in Sturgis.

Today the House Appropriations

Committee is meeting for funding of the bill.

If it is voted down, who will be paying for this property now?

Thank you for reading my comments

Sincerely, Chloye M. Anderson

Jackie Dittman

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

See attached letter for meeting in Pierre Friday regarding the shooting range.

Thank you.

Jackie Dittman

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Sorry to be a bother, but I am hoping to switch the previous version of my letter regarding the shooting range to this version.

Thank you so much!

Jackie

Scott Wright

Hermosa SD

Position: support

Comment:

AS a Hunt Safe instructor we have always needed a safe structured(shooting range) place to allow kids to shoot, let alone what a place to educate it would be! It would also be a huge boost to western South Dakota's economy. Please make this range happen! Thank you for your time.

Leland Breedlove

Rapid City SD

Position: support

Comment:

Please do whatever is necessary to facilitate the development of the Meade county shooting range.

I moved here 6 months ago from Oregon. One of the motivators for the move is the freedom concerning firearms in South Dakota. I am shocked at the lack of training facilities.

In Oregon, I lived in a town of 16,000 population, and we had four shooting ranges within a 20 minute drive of my house, three of which have 100 yard or greater rifle ranges. Here in Rapid City, population 75,000, there is one indoor 30 yard range. The nearest rifle range is a 1 hour drive away.

Shooting is a perishable skill. People who own firearms should practice with them! And practicing with firearms requires a safe place (NOT Barretta Road!!!). I will happily support with my time and money a safe place to practice with firearms.

Please facilitate the development of the Meade county shooting range.

Thank you!

Leland D. Breedlove
503-998-8681
lelandb@gmx.com

Physical address:
2912 Chapel Lane #20,
Rapid City, SD 57702

Mailing address:
PO Box 1381
Rapid City, SD 57709

David Heikes

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Hello GF&P folks: I write primarily to oppose the use of dogs for hunting on public lands (not related to bird hunting). A practice that can have negative effects on a range of species. I say not to the Custer expansion and a maybe to the gun range (but people need to be heard).

Andrea Kipp

Norfolk NE

Position: support

Comment:

Expanding Palisades State Park is a great idea! My family enjoys camping but we have a pop-up camper. It doesn't have a toilet or other facilities, so we rely on the facilities provided at the campsite. We would love to see showers included in the expansion plans!

Ryan Nichols

Hot Springs SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

"limit the number of archery access permits for Unit WRD-27L to no more than 20 "any deer" access permits for residents" What is the rationale behind such a decision? Having archery hunted WRD-27L quite extensively for the last 8 years, I fail to see what this will accomplish. There is more pressure from upland bird hunters, road hunters and rifle hunters without the proper license than what I have encountered while archery hunting. I will agree that the adult male mule deer population is not what it was since 2018 and the number of mature animals has declined. However, I have observed over 100 whitetails in a single evening from one stand. I would definitely support a limited access for mule deer, but limiting whitetails, is absurd since their population has exploded.

Public Waters

Felix Recek

Elkhorn NE

Position: oppose

Comment:

The game commission needs to lower the limits have you guys ever heard of active Target and panoptics that is going to take a lot of fish out of the lakes

Bill Barnett

Hartford SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Waterfowl Seasons

Bill Barnett

Hartford SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Eric Pulis

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose adding the merganser bag limit to the traditional duck bag limit. As the justification stated, there are few mergansers harvested in South Dakota. Merganser inclusion in the duck bag will not significantly reduce or increase harvest of mergansers or ducks. Additionally, the separate bag limits did not lead to hunter noncompliance with regulations (exceeding baglimits). I oppose the reduction waterfowl hunting opportunity. I do support the addition of mergansers to the bag limit to those who choose the three splash rule. As the reasoning for having the three bird option is for hunter who may not be entirely confident identifying waterfowl.

Chuck Dieter

Brookings SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am opposed to allowing nonresidents to hunt Canada geese during the September season