

-----Original Message-----

> From: George Clements [<mailto:gjclements@comcast.net>]

> Sent: Monday, April 01, 2013 7:16 PM

> To: GFP Wild Info

> Subject: Proposed Bison Hunt

>

I have read the proposed changes for both trophy and non-trophy bison hunt in South Dakota. The proposed changes are fine with me. Of course, I wish the prices did not increase but I understand the market pricing. Earlier I had expressed an opinion with others that accumulating preference points would certainly make hunt planning much easier. Being limited in vacation it is important to have a good idea if a hunt is going to occur. If someone sets aside a week for this hunt, and the hunt does not occur, then there could readily be times when one scrambles to use this vacation by the end of the year. If the hunt does happen, and I wish to hunt again in the future, I could apply for preference points and make plans with certainty on a future date. I would also like to ask that the drawing occur earlier in the year, again for the sake of proper planning.

George Clements  
Afton, Minnesota

**From:** Mike Schrage [<mailto:MikeSchrage@FDLREZ.COM>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 28, 2013 5:13 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** comments on non-trophy bison hunting in Custer State Park

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to bison hunting in Custer State Park. I have had two non-trophy cow hunts at CSP and thoroughly enjoyed both experiences. The Park staff has been great, the country is beautiful, and I've come home with a year's worth of meat to share with family and friends. I have made extended vacations out of both trips to see the Park and the Black Hills.

I was hoping when I first saw this email notice that the proposal would include increased opportunities for non-trophy hunts at CSP. I was disappointed to see fewer permits proposed for non-residents and a dramatic jump in prices.

The proposal to change the preference system to allow more points for repeat applicants is good. It creates more predictability for when an applicant might be drawn. I would hope the Game, Fish and Parks Commission could see fit to minimize the price increases proposed for non-trophy hunting and consider ways to expand the total number of permits available. Raising the price for a cow permit from \$1000 to \$1750 makes it much less likely I can afford to make a trip like this. Certainly it would impact how much time I could spend in the area.

I believe there is value to CSP management efforts to provide abundant and affordable bison hunting opportunities as well as maintain its auction. Having a variety of effective management tools to control the size of the bison herd is a good thing and hunting creates a whole new constituency for CSP. Taking a bison at CSP has been a great experience for me. I hope the Commission will consider ways to expand this opportunity and keep it affordable for the average guy.

Thanks

Mike Schrage  
Duluth, MN

**From:** Cory Christiansen [<mailto:cory@pbsmetals.com>]

**Sent:** Thursday, March 28, 2013 7:54 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Bison Hunt

To whom it may concern;

Regarding # 5 proposed amendment, I support the application accrual. I have been applying for the past two years and will continue to apply but it would be nice to know that eventually I will get the opportunity to hunt without relying on luck.

Thanks,

Cory Christiansen  
President

---

Progressive Building Systems  
Tel: 763.497.6044 Fax: 763.497.6045  
[www.pbsmetals.com](http://www.pbsmetals.com)

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** Comment - CSP Buffalo Hunts - Boyd Schulz

-----Original Message-----

From: abpc schulz [<mailto:abpc@swifitel.net>]

Sent: Tue 2/19/2013 8:22 PM

To: Jensen, Gary

Subject: Custer State Park Buffalo Hunts

Mr. Jensen,

I would like express my thoughts regarding the Custer State Park Buffalo Hunt. I have been fortunate enough to draw a non trophy buffalo license in the past. I took my 8 year old son on the hunt as is allowed by regulations. GFP staff made the hunt enjoyable, safe, and something my son will never forget. My son now looks forward to the day he can draw a license and take part in a similar hunt himself. Unfortunately, as I examine the number of applicants versus licenses allotted, I don't see this opportunity happening for a very long time. The 2012 numbers I have from the GFP website are as follows, 116 applicants for 8 trophy bull permits, 90 applicants for 15 non trophy bull permits, 44 applicants for 10 cow permits, and 182 applicants for preference points which pertain to the non trophy bull and cow permits. As you can see there is a high demand for these permits.

I recall while on the hunt, the GFP staff made the comment about how many nonresident applications are now being received, perhaps even more than resident, and that they have an equal opportunity to draw permits.

I find this is unjust because this is the only big game season in SD which we allocate permits like this. As you know, many big game permits such as elk and mountain goat, nonresidents are not even allowed to apply. Other big game permits such as west river deer and turkeys, the permits are allocated as a small percentage of total allocated.

I believe you should consider that this hunt, although somewhat nontraditional, is important to the residents of SD and residents should get preference in the license allocation process. Nonresident licenses should be allocated as a very small percentage of the total, if at all.

There are plenty of places nonresident can shoot a buffalo if they want to shoot a buffalo but the majority, or all, of the opportunity to hunt Custer State Park Buffalo should be left to the residents of SD.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Boyd Schulz  
Brookings, SD  
690-9207

From: Dan Silvers [<mailto:dan.silvers@Hylant.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 2013 3:22 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: RE: Proposed Bison Hunt Changes

My two-cents as a non-resident:

I can understand giving residents a better chance at gaining tags, but seeing as how the bison hunts are the only hunts available to individuals outside of SD, I don't think resident preference should be given. When I hunted out there in 2010, I brought my wife and made it a 5-day vacation, which boosts your local economy. Having someone from SD drive over, shoot a bison, and leave the same day does little to nothing to gain tourism dollars for you in Custer.

Just my two-cents as a businessman.

---

Dan Silvers – Client Executive

Hylant Group | 811 Madison Ave. | Toledo, OH 43604

P 419-259-6083 | F 419-255-7557 | C 419-699-1489

E [dan.silvers@hylant.com](mailto:dan.silvers@hylant.com) | [www.hylant.com](http://www.hylant.com)

nozsecure

-----Original Message-----

From: jim fuller [<mailto:woodyslop@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 2013 10:44 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Non-Trophy and Trophy Bison Hunts

Department of Game, Fish and Parks,

I would like to know if the point system would be a preference system where the people that applied the longest are chosen first, or would it be a bonus point system where everyone has a chance, but the people that previously applied would get as many extra chances as they applied for and were unsuccessful in the past? I would recommend a system where the more you put in the greater the opportunity, but when you get to consecutive years like three and four then your chances are squared.

Year 1 : 1 chance (First Year)

Year 2 : 2 chances (Bonus point plus Second Year) Year 3 : 9 chances (Third Year Squared) Year 4 : 16 chances (Fourth Year Squared) Year 5 : 25 chances (Fifth Year Squared) Year 6 : 36 chances (Sixth Year Squared) Year 7 : 49 chances (Seventh Year Squared)

I think that this gives a fair opportunity for the newcomer without penalizing the guy that has been in this for a long time.

I would also recommend that the point system would at least be retroactive one year, but should go back 2 or three if the records are available.

I am a non-resident and I would also like to see a couple of the other Custer State Park Hunts opened up for all Americans to enjoy. Even if it is only for a small percentage of tags like 1 or 2 percent. It surprises me that your state would allow Bison to be hunted by an out of stater but not your elk and deer. I am from Michigan and our state does not charge an absorbent price for non-resident licenses. The only hunt in our state that is not open to non-residents is our Elk hunt because of the size of the herd and we only give out about 120 tags. If this is the case then I completely understand. Thank you for hearing my opinions and I hope I am lucky enough to draw the non-trophy bull tag in the near future.

Sincerely,

James Fuller  
810-542-0349  
5332 Hollow Corners Rd.  
Dryden,MI 48428

-----Original Message-----

From: [wildwingdoc@gmail.com](mailto:wildwingdoc@gmail.com) [<mailto:wildwingdoc@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 2013 8:40 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Proposed Changes to Custer State Park Bison Hunt

Hello,

I would like to enter my comments opposing the changes to the Trophy and Non-trophy Bison hunts except that I do support the accumulation of preference points. I have taken both of my sons to participate in the Non-trophy Bull hunts. We really enjoyed the experience with Chad Kremer and the other Park staff. If the price goes up further it will limit the number of young people that can participate in the experience. I am afraid that it will make the recruitment of new hunters into the sport more difficult. Hunting seems to be trending towards a rich man's sport too much as it is. As to reserving a number of the hunts for residents, I don't think that a relatively small percentage as in the Trophy Bull changes are a problem, but I think that the percentage proposed for the Non-trophy hunts is much too high. As non-residents coming into the area we spent a significant amount patronizing hotels and restaurants in both Rapid City and Custer as well as restaurants in Deadwood and Hot Springs. We also used a taxidermist locally in Custer to do the shoulder mounts and a meat processor in Hot Springs to butcher the meat. I hope that you will take these things in consideration and will not severely limit these opportunities for young people and for those of us from outside of your beautiful state. Respectfully yours,

Lane Wilson MD  
3133 Highway 309  
Ozark, AR 72949

Sent from my iPad

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** Comment - Bison - Dan Goede

**From:** Daniel Goede [<mailto:dgdds@midconetwork.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 27, 2013 12:50 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Proposed Bison Hunt changes

Thank you for taking public input.

In October of 2012, I was fortunate to harvest a non-trophy bull, with Chad Kremer as my guide. His expertise and information on Bison and herd management made the hunt extremely enjoyable.

As a SD resident, my input would be to suggest having a fee schedule that is tiered to resident/non-resident hunters. Having hunted large game in other states, my experience has always been that the cost for out of state hunters always is significantly higher.

Generating more revenue from out of state license fees, could serve CSP bison program well.

Also, the number of tags allocated to resident hunters only, seems to me, to be quite minimal. I would suggest at least an equal representation  
Of resident to non-resident hunters.

Sincerely,  
Dan Goede  
1508 E Edgewood Rd  
Sioux Falls, SD 57103  
605 376-9670

**From:** [mlueb96@aol.com](mailto:mlueb96@aol.com) [<mailto:mlueb96@aol.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 02, 2013 8:55 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Public Input

Thanks for the opportunity to provide some input on SD Elk Season. Even with new count, I'm still concerned about elk numbers. If others are too, why not lower or eliminate the number of "cow only" tags? You did it in CSP and so could it be done for all units including archery?

I see RMEF gets 1 CSP any elk tag and thousands of other applicants get to compete for 4. (Have purchased life memberships for RMEF so agree they are good group.) Wonder would it hurt the CSP elk population if Archery Bull tags were allowed? For that matter, if there could be more rifle bull tags, wouldn't there still be enough bulls to breed?

Thanks for continuing to reduce the lion population --in my opinion that can only help. Also moving some elk from Wind Cave to CSP was a no brainer and great move.

Thanks for helping return SD the great hunting state it has been.

Martin Luebke  
Garreston SD

(Hoping that my 38 pref points in CSP will win the elk lottery while I am still able to enjoy such a hunt).

**From:** Don Hausle [<mailto:dhausle@midconetwork.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 02, 2013 4:28 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Black Hills Elk Season Comments

To: SD GF&P Commission:

Since the recent GF&P Elk Survey showed about 6,000 head, I certainly hope you will authorize a lot more tags than were proposed. The Forest Service Management Plan calls for 4,500 which includes the Wyoming side of the Black Hills. Since our ranch is in unit H1, I hope the Commission will set the number at a 20% - 25% higher level than proposed to reduce summer forage loss and loss of hay which is very expensive. Heavy elk use on our place (Salmon Ranch) was verified by G,F&P Conservation Officers last fall. I estimate forage loss (conservatively) at \$2,300 ( 20 hd for 60 days). In addition, elk have eaten and damaged a significant amount of hay this winter on a neighboring ranch where our cattle are wintered. My neighbor called, but his call was not returned for over a month. He was finally informed that he should put up a stack yard or panels and purchase the supplies himself, then G,F&P would share the cost at 50%. This is NOT acceptable. Would you be willing to take a loss on your business or ranch/farm operation due to wildlife entering your private land and taking/destroying your feedstocks? Landowners should not be expected to pay for these losses. We host the public's wildlife as it is, but we shouldn't have to lose money. Most of us like wildlife, but do not want to put our Ag operations at risk because of it. As you all know, we have been in severe drought conditions which may continue so forage and hay costs are at record levels. Since our acreage is not large enough, we cannot get a landowner tag, nor is there a hardship provision, but the loss of hay and forage dwarfs the value of the elk tag.

This brings me to another point and that is the G,F&P Commission's letter to the BH National Forest (Dec.10, 2012) as a result of a tour you conducted in October, 2012 of some Forest Service pastures. Neither Forest Service personnel or livestock permittees were aware of this tour which resulted in a very critical letter regarding the BH National Forest livestock grazing program. This is a lousy way to do business (unprofessional) with another Natural Resource Agency, not to mention permittees who have a lot at stake and host the public's wildlife. We know the system isn't perfect, but it works fairly well overall. The majority of permittees also want good management of the resource and recognize there are some areas in need of improvement. Was it easier to prove a point during record drought without other stakeholders present who may know the reasons for poor conditions in these chosen areas and who could be part of the solution? How much forage are the elk taking off of these pastures? To add to elk numbers at this time seems hypocritical to me. What is G,F&P's target number for the elk in the Black Hills?

Just remember, as private landowners sell more of their Ag property in the Black Hills which has open space and prime habitat, the general public loses, especially the sportsmen and women of South Dakota.

Sincerely,

Don Hausle,  
Vice President/Ranch Manager Salmon's Inc.  
1508 Mt. View Rd., Ste. 101  
Rapid City, SD 57702  
605-721-7777  
605-391-4726

April 2, 2013

Aaron Thompson  
10326 Upper Redwater  
Spearfish, South Dakota 57783

Secretary, South Dakota Game, Fish & Parks  
Foss Building/523 East Capitol Street  
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

Dear Sir or Madam:

I ranch near Spearfish and have grazing allotments in the Northern Hills Ranger District of the Black Hills National Forest. It has come to my attention that the GFP is considering reducing the overall number of elk tags issued for the Black Hills for the 2013 season.

As a rancher and an individual who cares about his home, I oppose this proposed reduction in tags. It should not need to be stated that the area in questions is in a horrible drought. Every single grazing permittee on the National Forest will cut his numbers this year, either of his own volition or at the directive of the Forest Service, but numbers will be cut. At this time I intended to stock 75% of my allotted number of cattle and will cut more if conditions warrant at the time of turnout.

At the Spearfish Grazing Association meeting in January of 2012 Mike Kintigh told our organization that he estimated the current elk herd in the Hills at 4000 head and that the target population was 4500 head. Since that meeting, a number has surfaced, stemming from an aerial survey conducted by the GF&P, which put the elk heard at 6100 elk. I know that elk have been moved off of Wind Cave and onto the National Forest recently but I doubt that number would account for the discrepancy. It should be noted that the Forest Plan states that 4500 head is the ideal number of elk for the National Forest, a number generated by Forest Service Range staff which takes into account other forest users.

I would like to run 500 head of cows on the National Forest from the first of May through the end of November every year, but the resource doesn't allow it. Maybe the howling masses want 7000 head of elk and maybe the upper echelon of the GF&P wants 10,000 elk, but the Black Hills needs about 4500 head of elk. It should be noted again that the Forest Plan calls for 4500 head of elk and the number was generated by professional land managers. It should also be noted again that wildlife biologists within the GF&P stated that they thought the elk heard was around 4000 head in January, and in March it comes out that there is 6100 head. It should be explained how people who are paid by the sportsmen of South Dakota to know such things would be so far off in their estimates.

I truly do not begrudge the sportsmen of South Dakota the chance to hunt elk in the Hills, but there is a responsibility on the part of the Game Commission and GF&P staff to be responsible managers of the land resource and a reduction of tag numbers in the middle of a drought of this magnitude would be a complete and utter failure of stewardship on the part of the wildlife community. Further, I cannot overstate the amount of damage that will be done to the relationship between the ranching community and the GF&P that will result as a failure to be responsible and do the right thing. The relationship isn't great to start with and it would be a shame if it got any worse, because the tangible results of a reduction in tag numbers would be borne by the land, and in the long run, the sportsmen of South Dakota.

The reduction of elk tags should not be adopted and numbers should be increased in order to bring the elk herd in the Black Hills in line with available forage resources.

I remain,

Aaron Thompson

**From:** Doug Boer [<mailto:DBoer@eastriver.coop>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 02, 2013 2:12 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Elk numbers

Hello folks, in quickly viewing the elk license numbers it looks like project # 1 should be getting back the licensed numbers as in 08 of 1675 vs. 570 currently, or has it been determined that the hills can't support such numbers

Why are the numbers decreasing so drastically? Seems as wildlife managers that this issue would be number one importance, and maybe it is, sure concerns me.

Thanks, Doug

Doug Boer  
Purchasing & Warehouse Supervisor  
45341 Hwy 34 Madison SD  
P.605-256-8009 F. 605-256-8059  
[dboer@eastriver.coop](mailto:dboer@eastriver.coop)

**From:** Mike Jarding [<mailto:MikeJarding@GoldenWest.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 02, 2013 1:05 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:**

Concerns on how SDGF&P are managing the BH elk. Last commission meeting John Kanta said overall success was around 50%, and most western states would be thrilled about 50% success. In a general unit maybe. This is an average 10 year wait to get a tag in SD. I think hunters want a better percent than 50%. Talking to GF&P they told me 70% of the bulls were shot 4 years and younger. Most hunters don't want to wait 10 years to shoot a rag horn bull. Only 8 elk were moved from Wind Cave to unit 3. Unit 3 had a 38% harvest on cows last year, the lowest ever. They are still proposing to have a cow only late season. GF&P also stated they had a 1:1 bull/cow ratio in unit 3. If you hunted or spent any time in the woods you would easily know it is very far from 1:1. GF&P closed two units and two CSP hunting seasons due to over harvest that GF&P issued too many tags, taking dream hunts from South Dakota hunters. The elk management needs to change.

Mike Jarding

27201 Valley RD Hot Springs SD