

Public Comments

Big Game Ammo Minimum Size and Type

Brett Donley

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Crossbows should be allowed to be used by everyone not just disabled persons.

Lacie Smith

Manhattan SD

Position: support

Comment:

I'm Lacie Smith—writer, artist and inspirationalist. My words have touched millions over the past two decades through my children's books and gift products.

Basically I put love into words and help you connect with the people + moments that matter.

Nest Predator Bounty Program

Steven Nash

Prairie City SD

Position: other

Comment:

Being a producer and a landowner I am in favor of the nest predator program. I do want to offer a couple suggestions for the implementation.

First being the March 15-July 1 season.

In regards to the nesting period of pheasants why not continue the program until August first. Any producer could tell you hens are still setting. If not then why hold off on haying CRP acres until August 1? Lengthening the season would show more transparency between programs.

Second being the animals targeted.

Is there a specific reason coyotes are not part of the bounty? If the 75% of all nests disturbed number is accurate. I don't believe that number is attainable without coyotes. Here on the plains of northwest South Dakota, the coyote is the lead predator. I have many other comments about the coyote, but I will keep this specific to nest predators. None of the pelts are worth anything to the fur market, so if nothing else I would appreciate a few good reasons as to why they are not part of the nest bounty.

Thank you for your consideration.

Robert Whipple

Wilmot, Sd SD

Position: support

Comment:

My son and I have participated the last two years in the program. The first year we trapped 50 raccoons, last year we got 30. Our ranch is located in a mostly range area with some crops. Our pheasant numbers have never been very good. During the last two years, our pheasant numbers have been increasing. I contribute that mostly to our trapping efforts. Also it has gotten my son involved in trapping. Please continue the program. I believe it its worth! Thanks

Scott Christopherson

Volga SD

Position: support

Comment:

Awesome! This is an awesome program. I participate in the program but do not claim payments. This program is keeping nest predators at bay. It would be hard to imagine how many predators would be on the landscape without this program. Albeit, it would be great to include coyotes in the program and remove badgers. Increasing the payment back to \$10 will keep the interest with people that are going out after nest predators. Thank you GF&P and commission.

Jacob Geis

Parkston SD

Position: support

Comment:

I appreciate the changes proposed for the program this year. \$10 per tail and starting in mid-March are both great ways to get folks interested.

James Horning

Watertown SD

Position: support

Comment:

I fully support the Nest Predator Bounty Program. However, raccoons mate from Jan-Jun and moreso in Feb so we should be trapping them now.

Maia Moore

Brookings SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Betty A Deberg

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The most effective way to increase pheasant population is by increasing/improving habitat. Please dump the cruel, anti-wildlife bounty program in favor of better incentives for landowners to plant buffer strips along waterways. More pheasants and a cleaner Big Sioux! THAT'S good public policy.

Dianne Schnabel

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Heidi Madsen

Carpenter SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program is inhumane and adds suffering to animals. Also, pets can get stuck in traps and die from the traps not being checked daily. No evidence has been shown that this program has increased pheasant population.

Renee Lefthand

Freeman SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

All this does promote cruelty

Teresa Hicks

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a terrible waste of money and animals lives. It does not work! Put money towards habitat for pheasants not killing animals.

Eva Scott

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Cruel, inhumane and unnecessary! This whole program is a total waste! Get rid of it.

Lynda Powell

Garretson SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Linda Greene

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Cruel and not necessary

Sharee Heier

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Susan Schlichenmayer

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Rhonda Doyscher

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jon Sorensen

Monroe SD

Position: support

Comment:

One thing i wish was that a trapping license be required to do this program for those that need one. (age) i feel it would slow down the people cutting tails off on the highway so much. Since it was announced that we will have the program in 2021 i have already seen many animals with tails cut off along side the road. It would also get more income back into the state for license fees.

Michael Stark

Mitchell SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Unnecessary program

Shannon Steckelberg

Harrisburg SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Traps are cruel. They may not only harm the animal you intend to trap, but others or people as well. It was not hugely successful last year and did not save pheasants. If we do not have enough predators we end up with more of their prey, which can cause problems to farmers and homeowners.

Steven Rindsig

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I have been a hunter and trapper for more than 50 years and I am a supporter of the GFP and, almost without exception, its policies and programs. I am not, however, in favor of killing wildlife for the sole purpose of preventing it from living and eating other wildlife. Either the pelt or the meat (or both) must be used out of respect for the animal and to not give those opposed to hunting/trapping in general additional fuel for their fire. The program's stated goal to increase nesting success is valid, but I believe the same results could be achieved by focusing instead on improving nesting habitat. Alternatively, pay a bounty to hunters and trappers for full pelts which they either can sell themselves or donate to a charity. GFP even could enlist experienced hunters/trappers to show young hunters/trappers how to properly skin, flesh, and stretch pelts and market them. This is particularly important now when pelts prices are low. Thank you.

Don Andersen

Hill City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I feel it is inhumane, trapping without an ID on a trap leads to a trapper (experienced or a "hobbyist) being a bit lax on checking their traps. (all they need is a tail)

Douglas Block

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

For 53 years of my life I have been a resident of SD. Grew up on dairy farm, have a BS in Agriculture and own a couple agricultural properties in the state including our four generation family farm. I have a strong interest educating and conserving our natural resources and perhaps most importantly married to another SD resource proponent and together attempting to guide our three children into adulthood with a responsibility for conservation. That background is necessary to provide perspective on why I strongly oppose the "Nest Predator Bounty Program". At best this program is misdirected if not outright deceptive. Even the title is strategic to demonize these ecologically critical natural mammals. The science certainly does not support that reducing these select mammals will have any significant effect on nesting success overall. It is clear that this effort is merely a guise to provide attention that the state is doing something tangible to enhance the economics and optics of pheasant hunting and ever dwindling next generation participation in GF&P relevance and licensing funds. It is boasted that the funding for the bounty comes exclusively from mandatory "habitat" licensing fees. Did it ever occur to the Commission that it is exactly these ever increasing fees that discourage the very next generation you are attempting to court into GF&P regulated activities? It is disingenuous to rationalize increased engagement because of the "bounty" financial incentive. If one has to subsidize such engagement, just to get them to engage, then consider their true interest/commitment to the activity. I cringe when I hear GF&P personnel on the radio touting how these new habitat fees are merely, "one time fee". Under that logic, all reoccurring licenses, fees, taxes etc etc. are "one time fees". In my family, we pay hundreds of dollars each year and my college age children are suggesting it is just not worth it anymore to keep paying such fees to perhaps fish out of our canoes once or twice a year. Yes, another example, our four canoes have never seen a boat ramp or any other GF&P improvement, polluted any waters, yet annually taxed to pay for "economic generating" GF&P "improvements". My point is the bounty does not improve nesting success, is paid for, and hence discourages the very participants you are purporting to attract, the "nest predators" targeted are clearly an ecological critical component to healthy ecosystem. This is all much to do about non-native pheasants, not even that it improves those nesting successes, rather that it provides good optics for economic marketing and justifies ever increasing GF&P fees. There is indeed a serious shift in SD outdoor "traditions" but healthy, diverse habitat and education is the cornerstone. Consider that perhaps it is the policies of the various "governing" agencies that is actually distancing the people ever further from knowledge or interest in the natural resources. Please do not blame and disparage the fox for doing what it does natural. The natural ecosystem lived in harmony long before humans "improved" it.

Thanks for considering my perspective.

Paula Edwards

Hot Springs SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please don't renew this program.

Catherine Foos

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Elizabeth Adamson

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I see this as a reason for all the SouthDakotans with guns to go out and shoot em up.
Send them to the mall to the shooting gallery.

Ferne Odegaard

Keystone SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Lusa Quellar

Hermosa SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am rural resident that has to deal with alot of dying babies I have been here for 11yrs and never have I ever had so much wildlife looking for help than I did last year . This program needs to stop there are other ways to keep wildlife in check that to do this inhumane way I

Antonio Felix

Hermosa SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Ridiculous way to be rid of wildlife

Kristi Petersen

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

These are species important to our local ecosystem. They eliminate pests, pocket gophers, gophers, snakes, insects, rats and mice, and the list goes on. More nests are damaged by farm cats and dogs than by these native species.

Kathy Flanagan

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Amy Poole

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

To kill fur bearing animals in the spring and summer wrong. Their fur is no good, and they are raising their young.

James Leflore

Belle Fourche SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Charlotte Johnson

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Penny Kemmer

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I OPPOSE!!-I feel this is very inhumane to stalk a nest or den site to kill the mother and all the young.

Pamela Dereu

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Suzann Stoner Wyngaarden

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jennifer Mccambridge

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Savannah Johns

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Do not approve this barbaric and cruel program. We need to protect our wildlife.

Jake Waldner

Salem SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Adair Fisher

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is incredibly inhuman and disappointing. I would think we are more civilized than this.

Matthew Konrady

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

There is no evidence to support the efficacy of this program. Nuisance animals don't deserve cruelty.

Johannas Stahl

Wessington Springs SD

Position: support

Comment:

I think this program is great for getting the younger generation interested in the outdoors. And basically all the other reasons our awesome governor started it for.

Nonmeandered Waters Navigation Lane Process

Sandy Antijunti

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am totally against this program! It is inhumane and anyone with feelings for animals would never approve of the conditions that these poor creatures have to endure. Please stop this program.

Reuben Parks

Webster SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

My name is Reuben Parks.

I oppose the non-meandered proposal.

My feelings would be that a property owner needs to be informed and needs to be allowed the time to litigate and prepare for rebuttal before any action would be taken.

The standards for approval of a lane of ingress and egress need to be set " high" to protect property rights and to avoid abuse of a new rule.

Only after taking into account all of the impact to the existing property, should such a ruling be made.

We all know that it takes very little disturbance to effect things on a property.

Property owners need to have input in establishing the criteria in this proposal.

I would suggest the following:

1. the existing conditions and recreational opportunities that exist prior to a transport lane need to be maintained in a pre- corridor condition.
2. only after taking into consideration the impact on the existing conditions on the property, should a lane be established.
3. the effected landowner needs to be allowed an appropriate amount of time to prepare a rebuttal and defense , if said landowner wishes to challenge said petition before a petition is finalized by the commission.
4. the act of ingress and egress will not allow hunting, fishing, trapping, lingering in the corridor, nor shall it cause an undue disturbance to the property or the wildlife on the adjoining property.
5. any violation of these terms will be considered a violation punishable by fine, a loss of a person`s license , and a review of the ingress- egress permit.

Thank you and please consider these proposals to your action.

Reuben Parks

district 1 landowner

Other

Kevin Osborn

Rapid City SD

Position: support

Comment:

I understand you are going to set the August Canada season boundary which is west of the Cheyenne River. I would recommend you please extend it to the include the entire county. Allowing the boundary of all of Pennington County would increase the land mass to hunt geese, help control the goose population and increase hunting numbers for waterfowl which are falling each yr.

Thanks for your consideration.

Anthony Filholm

Brookings SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Leave the preference system as it is. People are always trying to tweak it to move things in their favor.

Steven Nash

Prairie City SD

Position: other

Comment:

I would like to discuss the habitat stamp and its correlation to the food plot program. My family and I have voluntarily taken part of the food plots provided by the game and fish. While most of you know what the terms are I would like to give a background as to how I understand the program.

We provide up to 3– 10 acre plots on different quarters. We control the weeds and plant seed. We keep the cows out of the crop and ensure that the crop is left specifically for the wild life.

We are given the seed and compensated 20 per acre.

While I realize private rental rates in western South Dakota are less than eastern South Dakota, we still elected to do the program.

With the new habitat stamp in place I feel as though I am paying myself to plant food plots. Furthermore many of my family members buy a habitat stamp.

We are already giving up the production on those acres.

I purpose any producer who voluntarily participates in conservation or habitat programs in South Dakota should be exempt from the habitat stamp.

Brad Schriber

Sioux Falls SD

Position: other

Comment:

I'm not in favor with the 3 splash daily limit of ducks. This could well be 3 hen mallards or 3 hen pintails. This doesn't appear to address the problem of people to lazy or ignorant to study ducks and be able to identify their birds before shooting.

Rodney Worth

Shawnee KS

Position: other

Comment:

Hello. My name is Rod Worth. I live in Shawnee, Kansas but was raised in Keya Paha County Nebraska which is just south of Tripp and Todd county South Dakota. I own 950 acres in Tripp County South Dakota along the Keya Paha River. I pay over \$5000/yr in property taxes. My question is: Why is there not a landowner permit available for nonresident landowners? I currently have to pay \$286 just to get a bow permit and have to purchase many preference points just to have a chance at a rifle permit to hunt on my own land. I'm being treated the same as a typical nonresident hunter who does not own any land or pay taxes. Please create a nonresident landowner deer permit that gives out of state landowner/hunters like me to have a better chance at attaining a rifle permit and turkey permits at a reduced rate since we contribute large amounts of property tax revenue to your state. Please make this happen and respond to my email. kcrodworth@yahoo.com Thank you.

Dorn Barnes

Harrold SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

we have been hearing rumors' that GF&P is considering raising the Peasant bird limit to 4 birds a day. We are totally apposed to that. The bird numbers are getting better but as a hunter guide service I feel it would be bad for that would make for longer harder hunts. We only hunt wild birds and if the limit is 4 birds the hunters will not want to stop until they get there limit, and if they don't get there limit they will feel that it wasn't a good hunt. It's hard enough trying to get a three bird limit most of the time. What will happen is we will have to raise our prices so we can get the same income we do now because there are only so many birds out there. That will make it harder for hunters to find decent places to hunt, that will discourage hunters from coming to S. Dakota to hunt, and that will cut down on the licenses that you sell.

Waterfowl Refuge

Chuck Clayton

Huron SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

On the Antelope Lake Refuge change, If the boundaries are to be changed, the the restriction on boating after Oct. 1 on the Indian Springs portion of the water body should be removed. The private gun club that owns the north side of what is a refuge now, should not get to have parts of what used to be a refuge to hunt and keep the public off the rest of the water body for access to fishing and hunting. The hunting club on the north side has been working at this for years.

Waterfowl Season Recommendations

Tyler Steen

Pierre SD

Position: other

Comment:

I feel your recommendation on the "Splash Option" is a good concept but requiring hunters to make the decision on whether they are going to hunt Tier 1 or Tier 2 at the time they purchase their license is wrong. No one has the ability to know what the migration may look like in the fall and by forcing hunters to choose one option before the first shot is fired will cause hunters to not hunt at all. We in South Dakota have the benefit of having many species of waterfowl migrate through our state. Some days you may see 10 different species on a particular body of water, another day you may only see one. If there is an abundance of pintails on a pond, the hunter who choose Tier 2 would shoot three pintails be done for the day. Another hunter in the same group chose Tier 1 and was only able to shoot one duck that day because of his selection. The argument can be made that if the hunter who only shot one duck the first day limited with six ducks the next day and the "splash hunter" also limited their averages would be the same. Like in any situation, the more options you give individuals the more likely they are to select one that works for them. Allowing the hunter to opportunity to choose which option they are going to take each day they hunt will promote the program and achieve the intended goal.