

Public Comments

Bighorn Sheep Hunting Season

Patrick Moore

Ellsworth Afb SD

Position: support

Comment:

If the herds in South Dakota can support the increased licenses without impact on sustainment, then this is a fantastic move. The health and numbers of the herd is the most important.

Lynn Namminga

Deadwood SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Black Hills Fisheries Management Plan

Cody Parks

Rapid City SD

Position: other

Comment:

Add more walleyes into Sheridan and stockade lakes. Enough to where people can actually target them and not catch them as just a bonus fish. The more walleye fisheries west river the better.

Robert Eddy

Spearfish SD

Position: support

Comment:

Additions to plan;

- Allow unrestricted harvest of Rock Bass and Northern Pike in BH lakes.

- Establish Lake/Splake trout their own daily/possession harvest. 1 daily with 2 possession, minimum 24".

-Continue trout/salmon limit at 5/10. Limit rainbow/brown harvest in streams 3/6.

Thank you!

Scott Olson

Rapid City SD

Position: support

Comment:

Access to many of the smaller lakes can be an issue due to siltation build up and weed growth. Extra fishing docks would go a long way to helping alleviate this issue. I would support putting larger trout in many of the smaller lakes due to survivability as well as how much more fun they are to catch. However, these would be more apt to being kept so better management or decreasing the limit would be necessary to keep the lakes stocked with them. Also wouldn't mind seeing more wardens around or survey takers to keep people more honest.

Richard Scheiber

Rapid City SD

Position: support

Comment:

Re: stocking of larger 15" Rainbows in Deerfield, with larger fish come more anglers who seem to think catch and release is the way to go...I agree, but as I caught and released more larger Rainbows this past season, I've noticed many of these beautiful fish had 5 or 6 hook marks in their mouth areas. More education on how to release is obviously needed in my opinion. Also noticed more teeth marks on several of these larger fish this year. I hope you are monitoring the impact of those large Lakers on these Rainbows. After having caught and released a 30" and 2 26" Lakers last season, I'm getting more and more nervous about the impact these large Lakers may be having on ANY sized Rainbows. Thanks for your work.

Dean Duncan

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Your slot limit on Waleye's in Orman sucks! You have to throw all the good eating ones back. You have said it's because of all the little one's. Saint some of the litter one's out and put in another lake.

Justin Taylor

Rapid City SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jerry Meyer

Black Hawk SD

Position: support

Comment:

This looks like a pretty good plan to me.

Randy Hill

Hill City SD

Position: support

Comment:

As an avid Trout Fisherman we applaud and support any effort to maintain or improve the fishery within the Black Hills.

Living at Hill City and fishing for every species and in every body of water within the Hills is important to me and my family and our future fishermen as well.

I can remember before the Flood fishing in Spearfish Canyon and having no problem catching a few nice fat Trout to eat....or Rapid Creek or Spring Creek.....as well as many of the lakes in the Hills and C.S.P. so we support and would be only too happy to volunteer to help these future projects in anyway we can.

Thanks for your time,

Randy, Tracie, Trevor and Brittney

The Hill Family.

Matthew Pickman

Box Elder SD

Position: other

Comment:

What are the chances of getting more Black Hills lakes/West river Walleye fishing areas? Driving over an hour out to the two main lakes seems kind of ridiculous, then on the East river side it seems like every lake over there has walleye.

I know Stockade lake had some fingerlings released a couple years ago and legend has it that Curlew has some as well(allegedly). But it would be nice for some Summertime walleye fun, and more importantly Wintertime Ice fishing walleye fun.

Thank you so much for your time and cooperation in this matter (and for reading this rant)!

David Meyer

Hermosa SD

Position: support

Comment:

Please consider stocking rainbow trout in lower Rapid Creek, in town. Please consider adding a size slot limit of none kept or speared over 30" to Northern Pike in the hills lakes to provide more large Northern Pike. Please also consider closing or limiting the amount of Norther Pike killed by spear-fisherman. The number of Pike in Pactola is way down compared to years past and I believe this is due to the Spear fisherman killing so many.

Chris Horsley

Rapid City SD

Position: other

Comment:

I myself along with many others, would appreciate it if GFP would continue the stocking of walleye in Sheridan Lake. I understand that there is Angostura or Orman, however they are both an hour away from Rapid. Also, my family enjoys the hills scenery. I can take the daughter out fishing in the morning while camping at our favorite lake. Please consider continuing the stock of walleye at Sheridan Lake.

Tim Ferrell

Sturgis SD

Position: other

Comment:

Has it ever been discussed to introduce Small Mouth Bass to Deerfield Lake or any of the other cold water fisheries in the Blackhills?

Michael Schortzmann

Rapid City SD

Position: other

Comment:

I would like to see a continued effort to stock walleye in Black Hills lakes. It would be nice to be able to fish for another type of fish in the hills. It might help the quality of fishing for other species as well some lakes are over populated with small perch, rock bass, and crappie.

Michael Schortzmann

Rapid City SD

Position: other

Comment:

I would like to see a continued effort to stock walleye in Black Hills lakes. It would be nice to be able to fish for another type of fish in the hills. It might help the quality of fishing for other species as well some lakes are over populated with small perch, rock bass, and crappie.

Steven Stauffer

Rapid City, Sd SD

Position: support

Comment:

I have always wondered why there was not more emphasis put on smallmouth bass in the Black Hills, especially at Pactola. It is cold, clear and deep and it would seem to me to be an ideal smallmouth lake. I never fish Sheridan or Pactola on weekends during the Memorial Day to Labor Day time frame due to over crowding and too many hot rod boats on the lakes.

Steve Youngs

Rapid City SD

Position: other

Comment:

Not everyone wants to fish for trout .
There should be more places to fish for pike and walleye .
GFP on the west side of the state have no clue
On how manage the lakes in the BH .

Very disheartening to watch year after year
Of people not knowing what the community wants .

Ken Edel

Rapid City SD

Position: support

Comment:

Restore water levels in Slate Creek Dam

Spring Creek deep pool project below Sheridan Lake. Downstream of Center Lake is a good example.

Include ice fishing in your BH management planning.

Snow removal plan for Pactola roads

Provide ice maps identifying hazards for Pactola & Sheridan Lake on GF&P website.

Identify initiatives that support ice accident prevention.

We have 3 large lakes in the Black Hills management area and are only using 2 of them. Its a GF&P issue and a updated management plan is needed that will benefit the public and address the over crowding issue.

Conduct a BH lake use survey to determine what activity there is and what effects those uses have on the reservoir.

Restore 15" bass minimum at Sheridan Lake and include Pactola.

Provide a Bass rescue plan prior to renovation of Stockade Lake.

Increase stocking facilities for cold & warm water facilities.

Orman Dam is outside the BH management area but would suggest two items.

Provide a ice ramp to accommodate ice anglers safe entry on & off the ice.

Create a concession pad to accommodate service groups fund raising opportunity.

Thank You the opportunity to comment.

Elk Hunting Seasons

Patrick Moore

Ellsworth Afb SD

Position: support

Comment:

I support the continued use of aerial surveying to craft and adjust Elk seasons in order to gain truth data prior to the season.

Patrick Glasford

Crooks SD

Position: other

Comment:

More of a suggestion.....Anyone with over 20 years preference in a unit should get extra points toward the draw. Anyone with 30 years should be given a tag before the lottery draw.

Catlin Clifford

Porcupine SD

Position: other

Comment:

I am writing about the prairie elk hunting seasons in Bennett County. The way they stand now with the first either-sex season starting on September 1st which is completely different from the Black Hills Elk and as a tribal archery elk hunter I find it rather disrespectful to overlap our seasons on the same elk in such a manner.

Robert Eddy

Spearfish SD

Position: other

Comment:

The expanding prairie elk herds, which occupy a majority of private lands, unlike the BH units, do need further population control. I support the expansion of the prairie elk units BUT please expand the units in Butte, Meade and Lawrence Counties in this proposal. These small units reduce the opportunities hunters have due to their limited size. Many times the elk move or landowners are swamped with hunters when the elk are on their property. I would suggest Harding and Bennett counties remain their own separate units. The remaining west river be divided by I-90 north and south units. This allows some mobility for both hunters and for the elk. Thank you for the consideration.

Douglas Traub

Rapid City SD

Position: support

Comment:

Based on my observation of several large herds of elk in the park this fall, I support the proposal to increase elk hunting opportunities in the park.

Chad Johnson

Harrisburg SD

Position: support

Comment:

Leave Resident only tags

Robert Eddy

Spearfish SD

Position: other

Comment:

In most areas of west river, elk are not a managed species. Eliminate these smaller units and allow a broader range for hunter so have an opportunity at the constantly moving herds. Keep Harding and Bennett counties their own units, combine the remainder of WR into one or two units. Give the hunters a chance at filling a tag. the opportunity doesn't comes around often.

Tanner Eddy

Rapid City SD

Position: other

Comment:

Yes to expanded elk in west river, but combine all units into one mega-unit to allow hunters a chance at finding the elk.

Nest Predator Bounty Program

Nicole Gonzalez

Black Hawk SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Charlotte Petrick

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I've hunted & fished for over 50 years; I eat what I kill. I wear leather & fur; I have nothing against ethical trapping. I'm ashamed of South Dakota's Nest Predator Bounty Program. Wanton killing for profit is wrong.

Thousands of native animals are being killed & wasted to protect a non-native commodity. These animals can languish for up to 72 hours West River before being clubbed or shot. Thousands more dependent young are dying a slow death of starvation when mom is killed.

As predators are removed, their prey will increase. These lands will see a surge of mice, rabbits, rats, & moles. Pheasant habit (and crops) will suffer. The predators will rebound and pheasants will suffer. This insanity will have long term effects on the entire environment.

Hidden agendas, closed-door meetings, and my license fees spent for a special interest upset me. I'm upset that this program was implemented without the opportunity for public input. I'm upset that tail-less carcasses are being found by folks trying to enjoy the outdoors. I'm upset that South Dakota's well-earned reputation for conservation & stewardship is being tarnished.

Ethical sportsmen & wildlife biologists throughout the nation are appalled at this lame-brained plan that ignores science & research.

This isn't a Republican or Democratic issue. This is purely greed. I truly wish this whole program would be abolished. I would like to see our state's downward spiral in ethical behavior stopped.

Charlotte "Charlie" Petrick
Rapid City SD

Janine Kentfield

Garretson SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Although, I do not hunt or trap I have been around it all my life. I was taught gun safety and ethical hunting. I am FOR the balance of nature, survival of the fittest. This program teaches none of that to our kids. This program is unethical trapping and teaching our kids that one species is of greater value than another. For \$10? And in the spring? Of all times? Ethical trapping is done in the fall/winter when the coats are of greater value and there are not babies left to suffer! I understand the need to keep "predators" in check, however I feel that should be left up to the landowner. And NOT for a "bounty". This program and the fact that GF and P supports it makes me question what you stand for? Please, tell Kristy this is NOT the way to increase pheasant populations! Leave the wetlands! Save the habitat. Encourage farm raised and released pheasants. As my first line stated, I am not a hunter-per se-I hunt with a camera and I find no shortage of pheasants in this area! I have not seen a fox or a badger in years...this is personal observation from someone who is out almost daily!

Rachel Hart

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program proports to preserve pheasant habitat by killing native predators of the non-native bird, so that hunters with money can come here and kill the birds..i guess they're predators too. The science behind this does not support that killing the opossums, raccoons, weasels, badgers, among other animals, does much, if anything to increase the pheasant numbers. And the cruelty of trapping and killing of these creatures cheapens the value of animals, especially in the eyes and minds of the children that our governor encourages to participate in this horrible activity. It's completely cruel, and the poor animals suffer so that a ten dollar bounty can be earned with their blood. Fifty thousand killed. Please disallow this cruel horror to ever happen again. Thank you for your consideration.

Cindi Mullins

Belle Fourche SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I do not support this program. There is no reason to have it and is inhumane. The money spent can be used for teacher salaries.

Klara Parks

Piedmont SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Stop this ridiculous, cruel and completely unnecessary program. It is a waste of money and has not proved to benefit the pheasant population as has been claimed. Please listen to the people this year. You ignored us last year, and I feel the majority of us opposed this program but you went ahead with it anyway. Shame on you!

Klara Parks

Piedmont SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Stop this ridiculous, cruel and completely unnecessary program. It is a waste of money and has not proved to benefit the pheasant population as has been claimed. Please listen to the people this year. You ignored us last year, and I feel the majority of us opposed this program but you went ahead with it anyway. Shame on you!

Klara Parks

Piedmont SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Stop this ridiculous, cruel and completely unnecessary program. It is a waste of money and has not proved to benefit the pheasant population as has been claimed. Please listen to the people this year. You ignored us last year, and I feel the majority of us opposed this program but you went ahead with it anyway. Shame on you!

Tina Startz

Deadwood SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Beverly Caserio

Lead SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Sue Hayes

Deadwood SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I have been researching other states programs for population growth for pheasants and all of them have detailed means for increasing effective habitat for pheasants. The predator program has not shown any positive results so why keep doing what is not working? Other states have indicated that it is ineffective. I certainly would like to see my taxes go toward a program that shows promise. Come on.. let's do something that makes sense. In addition to the meth campaign, this program is making a mockery of our state. Please discontinue this program and research something with proven results.

Sue Hayes

Deadwood SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I have been researching other states programs for population growth for pheasants and all of them have detailed means for increasing effective habitat for pheasants. The predator program has not shown any positive results so why keep doing what is not working? Other states have indicated that it is ineffective. I certainly would like to see my taxes go toward a program that shows promise. Come on.. let's do something that makes sense. In addition to the meth campaign, this program is making a mockery of our state. Please discontinue this program and research something with proven results.

Margaret Mann

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Stop this barbaric practice for reasons too numerous to list. I will never vote for Noem again and I'm a die hard Republican. Shameful to do such cruelty and ruin our ecosystem.

Christine Backens

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Highly oppose this program. It's extremely cruel to trap not only the species targeted, but anything else that helplessly encounters one...most especially domestic pets AND their owners who have to endure their cries of pain and struggle to release.

Gregg Yonkovich

Aberdeen SD

Position: support

Comment:

I support this program, but personally would rather see the funds spent on additional land acquisition. If GF&P decides to provide traps again, I'd suggest charging a nominal fee for each trap, rather than giving them away \$10 or \$20/trap is still a bargain. Support change to allow shooting of predators, rather than just trapping.

James Zeck

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This ranks right up there with the "We are on Meth" campaign. Lets take a limited resource (\$\$\$) and spend it on a program that will not increase the numbers of game bird species. A better use of those dollars would be to restore habitat and increase public access not by having a bunch of traps built and given away to only sit in some ones shop or garage.

Cheryl Stone

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please do not renew this unnecessary and cruel program. Thank you.

Connie Blair

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Scott Bakker

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please do not have this program anymore. This is very wasteful of animals. There is also benefits to having the animals that would be killed after being trapped.

Tacy Paul

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

There is no evidence this program increases the pheasant population. It is inhumane, unnecessary and expensive.

Carolyn Ellington

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Do not run this program. This program is not based on scientific data. The data actually shows that loss of habitat is the reason for the declining quail population. It is an expensive program that is not needed, especially in a year where state funds are low.

Denton Fastwhirlwind

Kyle SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please DO NOT choose another nesting program.

Jacqui Hatzell

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I believe this is a horrific program and should be banned! Not only is it ecologically unsound... But there are far better things to use this money on. Just a couple ideas: fix the roads in town...especially West of West Blvd...they are horrible! Or new programs for the homeless in town that empower them to find ways to break through the poverty and find employment and safe housing.

Heather Spaich

Lehigh KS

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am not opposed to responsible hunting. Such as for food. However, I am against the abhorrent act of hunting and trapping for no other reason than money and trophies. All animals have a right to live. This planet is their home as much as it is ours, if not more so, considering they were here first. Although, most humans are to selfish, greedy, and ignorant to believe that. I may not live in your state, but I care about animals everywhere. Please, don't kill innocent animals for inhumane reasons. Be a better human than most.

Jared Wolf

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Chuck Ellington

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

As I understand this program, hunters receive a bounty for each "predator" killed so as to preserve the quail population for quail hunters. The dropoff in the quail population is not due to their falling prey to carnivores, but to destruction of their habitat. This bounty program is ridiculous. Get rid of it.

Kathleen Kroeger

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

You are the worst Governor SD has ever had. But hey, your husband and daughter are making money, right?

Charlotte Bruce

Woonsocket SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Not enough data and research to justify this program. Use the \$ elsewhere! Education, research, habitat! Stop making South Dakota a joke across the nation. Posting photos in social media with children and caged animals is NOT educational!
My family enjoys fishing, hunting and trapping, this is not encouraging trapping. It's encouraging cutting tails of road kill.

Susan Fischer

Lead SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Renee Arnio

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Oppose!

Angela Duvall

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please do not renew this in humane program!!!

Marsha Howard

Menno SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Stop this horrible cruelty to animals! These traps are also dangerous for people too!

Joe Kosel

Lead SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Ineffective, needlessly cruel and a huge waste of taxpayer dollars.

Vicki Koebernick

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This a cruel and inhumane practice that is not effective and harmful to domestic animals as well. Trapping needs to be illegal.

Claire Windle

Seward NE

Position: oppose

Comment:

I'm a SD native living out of state. This is the most I'll conceived cruel and inhumane program I've ever heard of. SD you can and must do better. I'm ashamed to call SD home. I oppose.

Kelly Hanson

Lead SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Margaret Maloney

Edgemont SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am an avid hunter and angler here in SD. I don't believe this program is necessary at least in West River, SD. So many of these animals aren't even in areas where there is a problem with lack of pheasants. Also the open season for the program can leave offspring without a mother causing them to die. If you're going to implement a program like this it should be restricted to areas that really need it. As I understand it, this program didn't really make a positive impact on pheasant populations anyway. There are just too many unintended consequences of the program with domestic animals as well. Thank you for considering something different.

Patty Larson

Nisland SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a cruel and unnecessary program that cost the state over a million dollars. Killing native wildlife to try to increase non-native Pheasant numbers is ridiculous. Killing our small predators will only increase numbers of rodents. Rodents who do much damage. Teaching children that killing an animal in a trap is "good" shows a complete lack of empathy and fails to set a example of responsible "hunting".

Krisallen Bean

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Paula Demersseman

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Cruel and a ridiculous waste of resources. There are many better, positive ways to get children (and others) to out into and learn about nature.

Andrea Helwig

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Rita -- Greslin

Sturgis SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

If this is implemented again, don't be surprised when Kristi Noem is not re elected. I am NOT an animal rights person, but there is so much wrong with this program! I voted for Kristi last time, if this is implemented again I will not vote for her again. Keep in mind for every one person who speaks up there are at least 20 who don't but think the same.

Ray Hayes

Deadwood SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is alot of money that has PROVEN to have insignificant effects on the pheasant population. There are better ways to spend this money that would benefit SD. Please dont waste money or animals lives any further.

Jack Morgan

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Cheryl Ulvestad

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I realize pheasant numbers are important to tourism and the sale of hunting licenses, but I believe using the money to improve pheasant habitat would do more good for their population. So far there's no conclusive proof that the bounty program increased the pheasant numbers, however it cost far more than what will ever be recouped, and upset numerous people turning them against GFP. I think there are other ways to get young people interested in hunting and the outdoors, such as offering more youth archery/shooting classes and making Hunt Safe classes more hands-on rather than mostly on-line. Thank you for allowing public input.

Tonya Graham

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

David Graham

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Shari Ridgway

Brookings SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

What a waste! This is an absolutely despicable "program". Over \$1.7 million spent on this. Where else could this money go? Giving teachers a MUCH DESERVED raise! The disgust I have with our state, it's current leadership, and the regression is more than I can put into words. End this disgusting program NOW! Use the funding for something that affects everyone in this state, NOT just those with children in school.

Lori Wood

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Unproven, unnecessary, brutal, impotent attempt to manipulate populations for monetary gains masquerading as conservation management. Ecosystems are self-sustaining and dynamic. We need to get out of the way. Have we learned nothing from history?

Rondi Torrence

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please abolish this barbaric program.

Janet Olson

Deadwood SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Do not mess with Mother Nature. Let the ecosystem exist without mindless human action.

Rachel Welch

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Unnecessary, waste of tax payers' dollars

Rachel Welch

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Unnecessary, waste of tax payers' dollars

Barry Betts

Oacoma SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Cara Feckers

Lennox SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is absolutely atrocious. There are other ways to control the population of this is such an issue. In my opinion all trapping should be illegal.

Marnee Aschoff

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jeanette Williams

Vermillion SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

For God's sake please do not continue this program in any shape or form. It is wasteful and as cruel as cruel gets. South Dakotans are better than this.

Kathryn Kling

Saint Onge SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a cruel program that is a waste of taxpayer money. I've already had two friends and their families from out-of-state who won't visit South Dakota because of this program. Another friend was thinking of relocating his business here, and now won't consider it. It's embarrassing.

Jacqueline Burcham

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please stop inventing ridiculous laws and screwing with our ecosystem! You're leaving young animals to starve!

Gary Lanphear

Belle Fourche SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

DO NOT VOTE FOR the Nest Predator Bounty Program!

Gary Lanphear
Belle Fourche SD
Position: oppose

Comment:

DO NOT VOTE FOR the Nest Predator Bounty Program!

Clay Schweitzer
Rapid Citu SD
Position: oppose

Comment:

Nature has always had its own ways of controlling populations. What a wasteful program with no real to kill these animals except for cash. They aren't consuming their meat etc just killing them and cutting off tails. I implore game fish and parks to remember their objective to protect the ecosystems nature has put together and the creatures residing in it. This program is not the answer.

Gary Lanphear
Belle Fourche SD
Position: oppose

Comment:

DO NOT VOTE FOR the Nest Predator Bounty Program!

Madonna Goodart
Rapid City SD
Position: oppose

Comment:

This did not improve pheasant numbers. Please do not waste additional resources on a program that was not successful. Direct those dollars to habitat improvements. Get our children outside in a more positive way-teaching them to kill trapped animals will have negative effects long term. Listen to your voters.

Kelly Banning
Rapid City SD
Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Emelie Haigh

Volga SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

These animals are necessary for a balanced ecosystem.
Please do not renew this program. Thank you.

Victoria Hinek

Sturgis SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Tonia Wagoner

Hot Springs SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Amanda Boyd

Hurley SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Susan Copeland

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Cindy Rains

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Wasteful, cruel and teaching children this cruelty is teaching them no respect for life. This cruelty teaches sociopathic behaviors. Killing for no reason , not using any part of these animalsoh but the governor's pheasant business ! this wasteful cruel program did not help last year. Learn about the ecosystem, the experts told you truth last year you did not listen , STOP THE SENSELESS KILLING!

Karen Pettigrew

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jenny Kozak

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Teena Otoole

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Voneta Neill

Box Elder SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Karen McGregor

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The results of this program last year proved that the loss of habitat is the biggest problem. Also the supposed intent was to get kids interested in hunting and that was a failure too. Use the money for other purposes.

Laura Inman

Hot Springs SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Waste of money. This is covered with the small game licenses already. I do not approve of trapping as many dogs end up in the traps.

Kendra Ham

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is ridiculous. I'm ashamed that this is happened one time and now twice? Be smart. Be humane. You are acting like you uneducated bafoons. Stop this nonsense.

Julie Mendelson

Summerset SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am a mother of two young children and an avid outdoorswoman. Time in and respect for nature are high values we instill in our children. I am vehemently opposed to the Nest Predator Bounty Program. This, and similar programs, are ineffective, cruel, and costly. Furthermore, I am opposed to teaching young children to torture, murder, and dismember animals. Please end this program.

Teresa Degolier

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please stop the nest predator bounty program!

Brenda Manning

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am highly opposed to this program. It was ridiculous that it was even started. We have no numbers on how many young were also killed when their mother was killed. What is this teaching kids - that an animal's life does not matter? Please do not have this program again!

Jami Jones

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Dana Livermont

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jamie Conlon

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Laural Bidwell

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a waste of government funding. More funds should be put into habitat protection and not in a bounty program. Trapping on public lands is already not regulated enough for public safety. As an example there is no rule as to how close to hiking trails a trap can be set. Do not extend the season, do not pay bounties, do not continue the program. Thank you.

Glenn Paul

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

As a hunter, I chose to respect our wildlife and not senselessly murder them so we can profit from another.

Randee Huber

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

It had no effect on pheasant numbers last year. It's a waste of money and a waste of life. It's immoral.

Simone Wind

Newell SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a terrible program. These animals are part of an ecosystem. Killing "predators" will unbalance the system. Do you really want an explosion of mice, voles, rabbits, etc.?

Catherine Ratliff

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please do not do this again. Ecological balance is lost faster than you realize, and when animals are gone from an area they are gone. Witness the jackrabbit whose misfortune was to turn white in winter.

Jacki Schoenrock

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Renee Ponzio

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Let us please be good stewards of the land, instead of always choosing to kill. Other living beings deserve to live too, not just us.

Jenna Canaday

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Erica Harvey

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program is revolting and unfounded. Besides killing thousands of NATIVE animals for a NON-NATIVE species, the killings of these innocent creatures for sport did nothing to improve pheasant numbers. I am opposed to killing animals to garner money from outside supports for political gain. I want what is best for my state and ALL her inhabitants. Please DO NOT bring this policy back it is not what SD residents want. Please listen to the voices of our people not the voices of outside investors.

Miriam Wright

San Diego CA

Position: oppose

Comment:

My parents were South Dakotans, I have relatives in SD. This is a cruel program, not in the best interest of the environment.

Roxanne Huber

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Inhumane program that does not stop decline of pheasants. Stop it now.

Amber Christians

Whitewood SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please don't spend all this money on a failed program that is not good for the environment and is inhumane to animals. It is wasteful spending and will not accomplish the goal of helping pheasants. Pheasants need the proper environment and nature needs to maintain a balance.

Maureen O'brien

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Karen Delicate

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Not only is this program an irresponsible and unnecessary use of tax payer funds, it has proven to be ineffective and egregious. I have live in Rapid City for 57 years and have never seen Pheasant in Western SD. Please stop this program.

Daniel Bjerke

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Use the money budgeted for this program to invest in habitat. This program has been tried in the past and wasn't success in increasing pheasant or waterfowl numbers. Habitat is the key to increasing and maintaining successful hatches and to ensure pheasant survival rates over the winter months. Organizations like Pheasants Forever and Ducks Unlimited focus on habitat rather than eliminating predators.

Gail Saxonis

Hot Springs SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

John Halverson

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Until such time as SD GF&P can provide peer reviewed scientific research that this ridiculous indiscriminate slaughter of mammals has a positive net effect on nesting game birds, please suspend it! SD biologists proved time and again that indiscriminate killing of mammals has no appreciable effect on pheasant populations. This is a ridiculous boondoggle waste of MY license dollars. Spend that money on habitat and supporting actual science and quit this pandering to the fee-for-hunting crowd!

Linda M. Hasselstrom

Hermosa SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am a rancher and landowner in Custer County. I ferociously oppose this wasteful program and will not allow any trapping under this program to occur on my land. Nor, while this program is in effect, will ANY hunters be allowed on my land. This program is completely the brainwave of Gov. Noem and is poorly considered.

Mark Zimmerman

Deadwood SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Vernie Krogstad

Chamberlain SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am opposed to using traps. I feel these are cruel. Also people do not check them every day and the animal suffers in the trap.

Eva Bareis

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This goes against what you very own programs teach about not harvesting when there could be possible orphaned young.

Maggie Engler

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Scientific studies have repeatedly shown that bounty programs DO NOT work. What works is quality habitat. Quit wasting our hunting and fishing license dollars on this stupidity.

Dan Ray

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Dana Rogers

Hill City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Commissioners,
I have no issue with South Dakota putting a bounty on predators to encourage further take and management to benefit wildlife. What I do see as an issue is that our hunters dollars have been 'diverted' from needed programs like improving habitat and gaining more public lands for hunters to access.

If our Governor wants to continue to force SDGFP to use hunters dollars exclusively to buoy this program, I just can't support it. Trapping is already available as a season and most landowners allow predator hunting and trapping to ethical and responsible sportsmen.

If the elected politicians want to push this for further improved pheasant hunting tourism, fine. But then let the funds come from the direct benefactors like SD Tourism, SD Legislature, different businesses that specifically gain financially. Perhaps also any agriculture groups, farmers and landowner groups that wish to push the 'bounty' narrative.

Again, people can already trap and I encourage that. Getting more nest predators and coyotes reduced isn't a bad thing but past biological studies PROVE that for trapping and removing predators to actually have a measurable effect, they have to be targeted and constant. Otherwise, the predator reproduction will simply increase and natural dispersal will simply replace them in the next year.

GFP dollars are after all sportsmen dollars. I would hope the powers that be would understand what is really most critical. Habitat and access to that habitat that hunters need.

Thank you for your time and thought.

Carolyn Behrens

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program had no impact on pheasant numbers last year. It is also supports cruelty to animals that is uncalled for

James Bingham

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Matt Bones

Chancellor SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

William Anderson

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Mary Clawson

Frederick SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

That was the largest waste of money that could have been conceived by anyone with half a brain. Bounties are a waste of money - money that could have spent improving habitat on state owned lands. Do NOT throw any more money down this rat hole.

Candy Manthey

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

As a farmer/rancher, hunter, and avid outdoors person I strongly oppose this entire program. It mocks the very purpose of your office, IMHO. As caretakers of our natural resources it is a crying shame to think that this state program, which traps animals during nesting season when young animals are in the most vulnerable period, is being sponsored by your office. This is a cruel time to trap. The furs are worthless and it is simply a "killing field". You don't hunt deer or big game or birds during this time because it is cruel and inhumane to do so. So should it be considered for small mammals, regardless of their impact on pheasants, etc. Killing something in a limited area that is problematic is one thing. I shoot coon or badgers or skunks as needed when in my farmyard doing damage. But to trap like this is against anything I was taught as a kid by my parents and grandparents...real nature conservationists in their every day farming lifestyle. I hope someone will stand up to the East River, money hungry minds that support this awful program and say, "Enough!" Please look at the statistics and be honest about what you are promoting here and why. Thank you.

Tammy Jungen

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please discontinue this horrendous and cruel program. It is doing nothing but damaging the ecosystem. It has hurt tourism, angered many and has done nothing to boost the pheasant population. Funds are better used for habitat.

Steve Bareis

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Yeah, right. 80 percent are in support of this program because they cut raccoon tails off on the highways. Why don't you provide more habitat and cut pesticide use so the chicks have more food?

Kevin Dorsman

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jessica Fenner

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program is a tragic waste of life, money, and resources. Natural predators exist for a purpose.

Brandy Petersen

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Wanton Waste

Brandy Petersen

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Wanton Waste

Kara Azevedo

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jessica Henrichsen

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

So much money spent that could be going else where far more important. Not to mention leaving wildlife without the care of their mother if she's trapped- heartless. We allow trapping while these critters are young but not the hunting of fowl and big game. What makes one animal, pheasant, more important than the other- money does- what a shame that that is what is boils down to.

Lindsay Stephens

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please discontinue the ridiculous nest predator bounty program. It badly disrupts the ecosystem. Surely there are better and smarter ways to deal with a struggling pheasant population. But wiping out our predators is not the way to go about this. This program is a grave mistake.

Joy Stevens

Billings MT

Position: oppose

Comment:

The rest of the country is watching and is horrified at the ignorance of this program. We know these programs do NOT work. You will simply have larger litters of predators next year and that is a fact. What is also a fact is that you are teaching the youth of your state that needless killing of wild animals is acceptable. Shameful.

Ruth Milne

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is an inhumane and wasteful program. Please don't approve another Nest Predator Bounty Program. Traps are dangerous to all creatures.

Kelly Harnett

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program shows a blatant disregard for life. As an outdoors woman, hunter, and former wildlife biologist, I am appalled. Not only has this program killed countless young left to starve because their mom was killed, this program has also left beloved pets to die in traps. This program must not be allowed to continue.

Courtney Huse Wika

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Studies show that loss of habitat is the main reason for pheasant decline in our area, and even national pheasant organizations do not support such a program.

The animals being trapped and killed—often painfully through elements or starvation, not to mention the orphaned animals who starve or succumb to the elements— are important to our ecosystem, which you know. This is institutionalized animal cruelty, in direct violation of your obligation as officers to protect our native animals.

Hayley Bowen

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program will cause serious damage to the native species in South Dakota and will upset the ecosystem. Additionally, it's blatantly supportive of gross animal cruelty.

Darsha Cecil

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Courtney Pierce

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I strongly oppose this unscientifically sound program that is cruel to animals and does nothing to help the pheasant population. Listen to science. For once. Please. Stop rewarding children and adults for animal cruelty.

Sybil Rounds

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please stop this horrible program.

Matthew Bauman

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please end the nest predator bounty program!

Matthew Melanson

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

It's a ridiculous program!

Tracy Downs

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Timmi Bubac

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Science is not there to back this and it is cruel. Please don't ignore science, and cancel this cruel and ignorant program.

Eric Roach

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

It is a cruel and inhumane program.

Susan Maynard

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Sharon Kirkpatrick-Sanchez

Whitewood SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Comparing SD to MN data on 17% drop in pheasants this year - SD had predator program and MN did not - indicates no effect on pheasants, but where is your data on increase in moles, voles, and insects that the predators control? So trapping did no good to help the commercial pheasant farmers, did it?

Annie Bussler

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Have more land used for habitat

Richard Getting

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

April Oedekoven

Rapid City Sd SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Not necessary and cruel and doesn't work

Nico Pierce

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program is extremely cruel. It is also unscientific. Pheasant loss is much more likely to be due to habitat loss than anything.

This is not the hunter's way of respecting the natural environment.

Clara Crater

Cavour SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I believe that the decline in pheasant population is due to weather, not predators

Jacob Jackson

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I support hunting and fishing but this is a ridiculous program. I hope SD doesn't actually employ a biologist who supports removing predators from an ecosystem to protect a non native species.

Dorothy Young

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Bonnie Edwards

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is an unconscionable treatment of animals. I ask you to elim8nate this program.

Wendy Parent-Johnson

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Trudy Schreiner

Piedmont SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Susan Towne

Delta CO

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a program which is very detrimental to the balance in nature and wildlife. I am horrified as to the ramifications and the pain and suffering this program is putting on wildlife and offspring, not to mention encouraging children to KILL, all for the love of revenue \$\$\$. It needs to STOP!

Peggy Griffith

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a very cruel and inhumane program. I strongly oppose this and oppose using my tax money for it.

Jason Cole

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Christian Lerback

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Waste of money, poorly regulated.

Lynn Taylor Rick

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please end the next predator bounty program. It has been ineffective as noted in this article.
https://www.aberdeennews.com/news/opinion/other-voices-brood-counts-blow-holes-in-south-dakota-predator/article_80824b4a-f27d-5e68-8aef-49c96bb824c0.html

Please do not use our tax money to continue this program.

Donna Watson

Lead SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The fact that South Dakota established such a cruel program in the first place is unconscionable. Leaving animals in traps for three days is cruel enough, but leaving their offspring to starve is barbaric.

Larry Kutz

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Senseless and wasteful destruction of resources that has shown no positive effects on brood counts. Wasteful spending in promoting and administering the program as well. We have better things to do with the GF&P budget.

Anna Ball

Piedmont SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is barbaric and besides that--hey! it didn't even work! and btw--I am NOT anti-hunting

Kelli Shaw

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program is too broad. If there is a specific species to target that is one thing, this feels like a crapshoot. I find it inhumane as well, and would rather encourage other hunting techniques for youth.

Joel Adams

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This has to be one of the dumbest programs ever implemented.

Bob Wilson

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Waste of money, cruel, ineffective, terrible image of South Dakota.

Brad Schneck

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The Nest Predator Bounty Program is not a policy of conservation designed to optimize the ecological balance in South Dakota. It is an invasive and destructive policy designed to support the economies of small hunting towns by destroying predator populations in order to promote the proliferation of one species. There are other ways to ensure the sustainability of hunting birds in South Dakota that would have much less impact on native species and the ecosystem they inhabit. This program needs to end.

Karen Conley

Box Elder SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am writing once again to oppose the Nest Predator Bounty Program. While I support hunting as a tool to manage wildlife, I cannot support the trapping. Trapping is cruel and not checking traps for up to three days causes undue suffering for any animal caught in a snare or trap. Additionally, the chances of family pets or even unsuspecting humans, being caught in a trap are very high and it should be banned. The needless suffering of any living creature for nothing more than a tail for a bounty, is barbaric and to not utilize the entire animal is a waste of a life. I suspect that this program was started by our governor to support hunting habitat for her friends and family. It needs to stop. The use of traps and snares should be illegal due to the barbaric nature of it and if it is done, traps need to be checked 2-3 times per day to eliminate suffering of animals. All lives matter.

Marian Westbrook

Nisland SD

Position: support

Comment:

I fully support it, but they should have to check the traps every day.

Sandra Kant

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

We need to teach our children compassion and respect for all living things. This is not the way.

Cari Heupel

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a cruel & unnecessary program! We are living in 2020 where inhumane killing practices should be outlawed! Please stop spending money on a program that tells the world that South Dakota is a backwards, redneck state!

Cari Heupel

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a cruel & unnecessary program! We are living in 2020 where inhumane killing practices should be outlawed! Please stop spending money on a program that tells the world that South Dakota is a backwards, redneck state!

Debbie Renner

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please stop this program, we should be focused on habitat for the game birds instead of trapping. Young people should be encouraged to get outdoors but not to kill creatures that benefit our ecosystem.

Kendra Koski

Winner SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is an expensive program that has had no impact on the declining pheasant population. The only way to increase the population is by increasing CRP and other programs to combat habitat loss. Trapping is cruel, and leaving animals to suffer for days to die of shock is a brutal death. This program needs to stop. Nest predators are not the problem, overhunting and habitat loss is the real culprit behind declining pheasant numbers.

Debi Ulrey-Crosby

Brandon SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is such a disgrace for the state of South Dakota! It reeks of cruelty to animals for something so disgusting - cutting off the animals' tail for money. Don't you think this goes beyond our state's reputation for hunting? I have friends who come here to hunt but decided not to last year because they thought this program was horrible - and they are hunters. They e also decided to hunt elsewhere next year - most likely Minnesota. PLEASE DO NOT RENEW THIS ARCHAIC PROGRAM!

S.F. Lee

Belle Fourche SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program is already proven to be unsuccessful. I may not like predators, but to wantonly waste their young (and they) through human predation of their parent(s) is unethical and unsportsmanslike. Opossums are definitely not on the same predation level as coyotes. Coyotes do not eat ticks. We are not seeing any research or results that show this being a beneficial program. Why not spend this money on introducing more pheasants if that is the goal? Or maybe just not waste over \$1.5 million and find better ways that are actually beneficial to our overall conservation efforts, rather than focused on just pheasants. Seems quite one-sided to me. I am firmly opposed to this program, it was not even sent through a scientific process. It's not just a waste of money, I feel it's an unethical program as well. Research shows that we need an even distribution of predator vs prey. I have been involved in local programs that bought & "seeded" with young pheasants (no predator control involved) and we had quite good luck. Why can't our great state look to the positive future and try to spend that money to try to populate (and why pheasant habitat only)?

Vaughn Boyd

Whitewood SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a disgusting program and upsetting the balance of nature. The 1st year proved no gain for nesting birds. It is an embarrassment. And for the record, i am not opposed to hunting.

Christy Rodgers

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Susan Hey

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The conservation page of SDGF&P website says that the agency is a steward of SD's variety of native habitats and that the habitats support a diverse collection of plants and animals.

Does targeting several small species of animals support diversity and balance?

I think the bounty program is in direct opposition to the Game Fish Mission as well as the Conservation aspect.

As a native South Dakotan, I am grateful for these small mammals who do their part in the balance of nature. I think the program is cruel and teaching children that it is OK to be cruel to any animal is wrong. There are many other ways for families to enjoy the outdoors rather than checking traps to see what creature has chewed its foot off this time.

No to the Bounty program.

Sonja Bundy

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please, South Dakotans can be humane, as the laws require in nearly all other states!

Chelsie Bauer

Deadwood SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please do not approve another year of this program, it's cruel and inhumane. This program will have devastating effects on South Dakota's environment in the future.

Else Biesman

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Tina Kunz

Sturgis SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please don't do this. Most pheasants actually come from pheasants farms. My friend Holly Christensen owns one of these farms. We need to keep a fair balance of animals and to make animals suffer at an expense to a few extra dollars to the state is just cruel.

Dawn Erk

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Dusty Hirsch

Summerset SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Julie Anderson

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Trapping is cruel and inhumane.

Renee Lefthand

Freeman SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose the trapping program and it should be stopped for many reasons

Linda Torlay

Fort Myers FL

Position: oppose

Comment:

Insane to live in such a beautiful wild state only to want to kill everything that lives in it.

Annika Caneva

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Darci Adams

Hartford SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

There is no scientific evidence the program increases pheasant & duck numbers! The program exists purely to promote the unnecessary and inhumane sport of trapping in S.D. Trapping causes needless suffering of animals left to languish in traps for days. Trapping is particularly inhumane in S.D. because trap check times are every 3 days west river and every 2 days east river (with exceptions for weather and illness of the trapper). Traps are indiscriminate so protected species and even family pets are being caught in traps. I urge SDGFP commission to reject the Nest Predator Bounty Program for 2020 and beyond. It is an embarrassment to our state.

Darci Adams

Hartford SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

There is no scientific evidence the program increases pheasant & duck numbers! The program exists purely to promote the unnecessary and inhumane sport of trapping in S.D. Trapping causes needless suffering of animals left to languish in traps for days. Trapping is particularly inhumane in S.D. because trap check times are every 3 days west river and every 2 days east river (with exceptions for weather and illness of the trapper). Traps are indiscriminate so protected species and even family pets are being caught in traps. I urge SDGFP commission to reject the Nest Predator Bounty Program for 2020 and beyond. It is an embarrassment to our state.

Jeanette Williams

Vermillion SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I cannot believe I live in a state that teaches children to trap and kill innocent animals. And then pays them for it. And the fact that it is now going to be part of the 4-H program. Unbelievably cruel. Teaching our children to kill for food is one thing. But teaching them to kill for money. I'm disappointed in our state.

Jan Humphrey

Hill City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The species that are targeted in this program are a vital link to the balance of the ecosystem here. Trapping is inhumane and unacceptable. I STRONGLY OPPOSE THIS PROGRAM!!!!!!

B. Radtke

Redfield SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please stop wasting taxpayer money on the cruelty of trapping. If you continue to waste my money on this, at the least require traps be checked every day! If predator control is truly needed, emphasizing the varmint shooting license would be preferable, as long as it requires the hunter to ascertain the animal is dead and not left to suffer like trapped animals. do.

Shaun Grassel

Reliance SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Zero emperical data support this.

Kristine Muko

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Waste of money, trapping is unsportsmanlike

Laura Dressing

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Doug Simmons

Sioux Falls SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Sheena Thomas

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Theresa Giannavola

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program did not result in more pheasants last year and in fact the only thing that will work is to increase habitat, and breed/release. Running this program again will further damage the ecological balance of SD aside from the fact that trapping in general is barbaric and outlawed in civilized states!

Justin Herreman

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program is a boondoggle and a significant waste of resources. The science shows this program will not improve pheasant numbers and has a high potential to in fact have the reverse effect, reducing pheasant numbers.

Please cancel this program and direct thee funds towards habitat creation and other scientifically backed programs that will positivly improve pheasant numbers.

Kyle Kranz

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Mahatma Gandhi once said, "The greatness of a nation can be judged by the way its animals are treated."

Susan Schlichenmayer

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Kathy Gerash

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please spend the money on medical/public education to benefit children and adults most in need. Please allow the state agency that deals with wildlife to continue to manage the populations. This program, while I understand the attraction for some folks, is not aiding with learning respect for life due to the bounty payment. And do we want to get into parsing types of life? Please financially support medical and education programs instead. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Julie Anderson

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The cruelty of the Nest Predator Bounty Program cannot be overstated and is morally wrong. It will also put the natural ecosystem out of balance, causing among other consequences a huge rise in the tick population. To kill all of these animals so that people can kill more pheasants is cruelty disguised as tradition. Abolish this abomination of a program permanently.

Chandra Knowles

Tea SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Trapping is awful and cruel.

Andy Dicus

Tea SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Opposing trapping because it is cruel.

Terri Mccarty

Ramona SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

this is an unnecessary program, have kids do photography instead

Denise Reed

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Wayne Thompson

Rapid Coty SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Rita Chapman

Hill City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I do not want state dollars going to the bounty program. There should not be a monetary offering

Barbara St. Clair

Brookings SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please do not continue the Nest Predator Program. There are many reasons to stop this program, certainly it is inhumane and barbaric. But it is not even a successful way to maintain/enlarge the pheasant population. We live in a time where people are showing more and more respect for the ecological balances of the earth, and this program shows blatant disregard for those balances. Please do not let this program continue. I do not want to be ashamed when I tell people I am from South Dakota.

Cindy Siebrecht

Redfield SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The money would be much better spent on enhancing habitat.

Linda Greene

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is cruel and inhumane. We don't need it.

Stacy Braun

1312 3Rd Ave Se SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please DO NOT continue the Nest Predator Bounty program. Thank you.

Kathryn Hess

Summerset SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please stop this cruel and inhumane killing. Thousands were killed last year not counting the babies. I don't believe it helped the pheasant population. There are other causes if there really is a decline. Please stop.

Denise Parker

Lead SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Rex Rhodes

Kalispell MT

Position: oppose

Comment:

Badgers and the other targets of the bounty should not be killed for the reasons of the program. They deserve to live their lives as nature intended them to, not as targets for death just because they are born animals that some people do not like. They serve a vital function in the world and people should learn to accept them for the good they provide. Thank you for listening to me.

Katherine Maccrimmon

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a barbaric practice that should never exist anywhere in today's world. Traps in SD are only required to be checked every 3 days west of the Missouri River and every 2 days east of the Missouri River (with exceptions for weather and illness). Animals caught in traps for several days may starve, dehydrate, be attacked by other animals, or mangle their mouths and limbs in futile efforts to free themselves. Traps are indiscriminate, and any wildlife or companion animal can fall victim.

Heather Allmendinger

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I beg of you to oppose this inhumane program. These are all living beings. If you're killing a mother animal, all of her babies will also die when she does not return to the nest. This is animal cruelty. The money spent on this program could be spent doing some good for our state. Please consider my opinion when making this decision. thank you!

Lori Linco

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

STRONGLY OPPOSE this barbaric practice. Nature takes care of nature and interfering with the natural order of things is WRONG. I especially despise this because it is done and promoted to "increase" the number of birds for people with fat wallets to pay for the privilege of killing. Just disgusting!

Dale Kringen

Belle Fourche SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a complete waste of my tax dollars. We can't attract industry and our schools are suffering. We also have a serious meth problem. I think Governor Noem should be spending our tax dollars in areas that are far more important.

Kurt Russow

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

To be frank, this is a waste of life and taxpayer dollars.

Crystal Brock

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is inhumane. Please do the right thing.

Trish Scriptor

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Cherrie Martenson

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I beg you to stop this ridiculous atrocity of a program. There is no scientific reason to be doing this! All animals serve a Purpose in a healthy ecosystem and removing them for the sake of an imported animal is short sighted and ignorant. Value South Dakota wildlife- the native species that belong here!

Heidi Herren

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please do not renew this ridiculous program. How is it of any benefit in any form?

The only things it succeeds in is torturing animals and teaching children that they don't need to respect animals (and encouraging possible future degradation of lives, be it animal or human)

Think about the reality of it and vote not to accept this program.

Vicki Peterson

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

You are also killing the young who cannot survive on their own and starve to death. You have to look at the whole picture. Trapping a female may also have wiped out a litter . Wait a year and see how much of the species has already been reduced.

Jason Shell

Council Bluffs IA

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Sharon Rose

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Deanna File-Kennedy

Blackwood NJ

Position: oppose

Comment:

Leave the animals alone!!! Must you have murder these animals in such torturous ways!!!! It's inhumane and cruel and if you condone it you should be charged with animal abuse and cruelty and face jail time!!!!

Rebecca Fleming

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

There are better ways of managing predators.

Kimberly Groszhans

Fargo ND

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please do not renew this cruelty

Trista Polley

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Morgan Andenas

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I think this not only damages our ecosystems, but is a HUGE waste of taxpayer dollars that doesn't even have a significant impact on the problem it is stated to solve.

Mary Fortin

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Leave these animals alone. You are destroying the entire ecosystem. Ignorance is too prevalent in Pierre. There are much more important issues you should be working to resolve.

Michael Mendelson

Summerset SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a barbaric program.

Richard Blechinger

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Lynne Loverich

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I feel that native animals matter too and not just pheasants. I feel there are other opportunities and solutions that can better emphasize teaching the value of life and grow an appreciation for the great outdoors. Thank you for your support and the wonderful programs you offer!

Gwyneth Fastnacht

Wessington Springs SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Julie Blechinger

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Strongly oppose bounty program. Please don't renew in 2020!

Kathy Petersen

Madison SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

it does not help the pheasant population all it does is kill animals that we need.

Dean Parker

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am writing in opposition of renewing the "Nest Predator Bounty Program" for 2020. Not only is trapping an ineffective method of wildlife conflict management, but it is a cruel way for any animal to die – including pets and other non-targeted animals that will get caught in these traps.

Wildlife management professionals across the U.S. have long acknowledged the ineffectiveness of bounties and predator control, including South Dakota's own Habitat Work Group in its 2014 report to Governor Daugaard. To my knowledge, no science-based evidence has been presented to suggest that the species targeted by this "Nest Predator Bounty Program" (opossums, raccoons, skunks, badgers or red fox) are negatively impacting pheasant populations.

Furthermore, each native species plays an important role in our ecosystem. In particular, opossums are a great benefit to any area they inhabit. Their diet includes snails, mice, rats, and insects such as cockroaches, crickets, beetles and disease-carrying ticks.

This program is simply not backed by science-based wildlife management principles. If GFP wants more game birds for hunters, please focus on improving their habitat - not killing indigenous species that play an important role in that habitat.

Kathryn Leuning

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Erica Cooper

Cavour SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is wrong!!!!

Lucas Fischer

Hartford SD

Position: support

Comment:

Five dollars a tail is not enough money cover the expenses. Ten dollars a tail is a good number.

Paulette Krby

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Irrational. Supports poor human behavior. A poor use of money. Cruel .

Lisa Aksamit

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Cynthia Christensen

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Stephanie Samavarchian

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

We DO NOT support the program. It is inhumane and unnecessary.

Stephanie Samavarchian

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

We DO NOT support the program. It is inhumane and unnecessary.

Emily Nimick

Hill City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please end this inhumane program

Denise Etzkorn

Hill City, Sd SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program is messing with the natural order of nature. Many control mice, ticks, etc. populations. The trapping requirements of checking every three days is cruel. I strongly oppose this program. Thank you for this opportunity to state my opinion.

Douglas Traub

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Pheasant numbers are dependent upon 1) Adequate habitat. 2) weather.

The predator trapping and bounty programs provided free traps (many of which went to trappers who already had many traps and to residents of municipalities, which is not pheasant habitat) and a bounty for tails. This effort was funded by an unethical raiding of the GFP license fee fund, paid for by hunters without public or GFP commission input.

I oppose funding this misguided program with license fees paid for by hunters.

I oppose the bounty program because it does not affect the two main determinants of pheasant numbers.

Jason Berghammer

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I think the money could be better spent on habitat improvements and more WIA/public land access programs.

Winta Horsa

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Furry friends should live in peace :(

Sarah Stout

Hill City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

David Hagen

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I would like to see the results of your so called "Professional Scientific Survey" that stated that 83% of the general public supported the NPBP.

Please be good stewards of our tax dollars.

Morgen Crawford

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose the Nest Predator Bounty Program. I am asking the GFP Commission not to approve another Nest Predator Bounty Program. This is a wasteful, ill-conceived and cruel program!
Traps in SD are only required to be checked every 3 days west of the Missouri River and every 2 days east of the Missouri River (with exceptions for weather and illness). Animals caught in traps for several days may starve, dehydrate, be attacked by other animals, or mangle their mouths and limbs in futile efforts to free themselves. Traps are indiscriminate, and any wildlife or companion animal can fall victim.

Sandra Kringen

Belle Fourche SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please discontinue this bounty program. Thank you!

Trish Anderson

Rapid Ciry SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Spend the \$\$ on taking kids to fabulous outdoor centers and teach them appreciate nature. Do not teach them how to kill animals senselessly.

Erin Crawford

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Mahala Bach

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program is nothing but the promotion of killing animals for no reason! No scientific data supports this insane government sponsored murder program. STOP THIS CRUELTY NOW!!!

Jonas Hofer

Lake Andes SD

Position: support

Comment:

This program has drastically help get young kids on there feet and away from gadgets to go out the and trap these animals. I think it was a great idea and should be carried on.

Charlotte Petrick

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I've hunted & fished for over 50 years; I eat what I kill. I wear leather & fur; I have nothing against ethical trapping. I'm ashamed of South Dakota's Nest Predator Bounty Program.

Wanton killing for profit is wrong. Thousands of native animals are being killed & wasted to protect a non-native commodity. These animals can languish for up to 72 hours West River before being clubbed or shot. Thousands more dependent young are dying a slow death of starvation when mom is killed.

As predators are removed, their prey will increase. These lands will see a surge of mice, rabbits, rats, & moles. Pheasant habit (and crops) will suffer. The predators will rebound and pheasants will suffer. This insanity will have long term effects on the entire environment.

Hidden agendas, closed-door meetings, and my license fees spent for a special interest upset me. I'm upset that this program was implemented without the opportunity for public input. I'm upset that tail-less carcasses are being found by folks trying to enjoy the outdoors. I'm upset that South Dakota's well-earned reputation for conservation & stewardship is being tarnished. Ethical sportsmen & wildlife biologists throughout the nation are appalled at this lame-brained plan that ignores science & research.

The Nest Predator Bounty Program has thrust South Dakota into the national spotlight as a cruel, redneck, backwards state and the decline in hunting license purchases reflect this.

This isn't a Republican or Democratic issue. This is purely greed. I truly wish this whole program would be abolished. I would like to see our state's downward spiral in ethical behavior stopped.

Charlotte "Charlie" Petrick, Rapid City SD

Carolyn Stout

Hill City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Don't be stupid.

Eliza Loughlin

Bison SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

It's very frustrating that in 2020 folks whose job is to make regulations regarding wildlife still think radically reducing any part of an ecosystem (i.e. predators) isn't going to have unintended negative consequences for all of the species (including human) involved.

Deborah Gangloff

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am appalled that the state is again considering this failed program. South Dakota should be better than this. Please do not go forward with this ineffective and counter-productive program. These "predators" help keep down the mice, vole and tick population. We need them.

Deborah Gangloff

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a ps to my previous comment. What a waste of money! We can surely find a better use for these funds. To ignore the needs of the people to go forward with this useless bounty program shows an administration out of touch with the population. Please rethink this.

John Halveraon

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please dump this boondoggle near predator bounty in the trash immediately! Thw science does NOT support it, and the money...MY.LICENSE DOLLARS...is better spent on what South Dakota GF&P has proven in study after study to be effective - HABITAT. End this or sportsmans groups will organize and boycott all funding g of GF&P.

Suzanne Martley

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Pheasant declines are attributable to habitat loss. Obliterating species from an ecosystem will not bring back pheasants, but it sure opens the door to a population explosion of harmful vermin. And does little to educate young people about conservation.

Kim Tysdal

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program proved unsuccessful last year. Why are we instituting such barbaric ways to get children outside. South Dakota is a beautiful state, with many out door activities for children. Let's teach our children how to respect the wild, or destroy it.

Dede Farrar

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

One year of this is plenty. I think there are better ways to enhance pheasant habitat than to encourage trapping statewide. Please use our public tax payer dollars on something better. I am not opposed to hunting and trapping per se but I don't think trapping statewide should be promoted. Trying to eliminate predators ends up causing other problems. Enhance pheasant habitat at the site of pheasant habitat, and not statewide. I was caught, along with my dog, in a leg hold trap in the Black Hills set by a careless trapper. I don't want things like this to increase.

Lonnette Olson

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

For the second time, I wish to be on record that this is an insane program. We are not overrun with these predators and they are not consuming an abnormal amount of pheasants or eggs. Totally upsetting the balance of nature for the benefit of the money that pheasant hunters bring in will be a real problem in the future. How many thousands were killed last year? Are you trying to totally eliminate these native animals? Please, common sense!

Louise Mcgannon

Mitchell SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I opposed this program last year and I oppose it this year. Stop wasting our tax dollars on animal cruelty. This program has proven that it did not work last year and it will not work this year. Habitat and weather is what is hurting pheasant numbers not predators. This is one stupid program that waste our dollars that could be well spent in so many places like education of our young people. Stop wasting our tax dollars for special interest groups!

Margie Rosario

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a self serving program for the Gov. Pheasants are an introduced species, not native to SD. This is not sensible from any standpoint (biological, ethical or economic) except that it keeps the Gov family in business. Everyone who signs off on this should be ashamed.

Carol Kendall

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am writing to implore Gov. Noem and our South Dakota politicians to please eliminate the Nest Predator Bounty Program. It is inhumane and serves to inflict damage to our fragile ecosystems.

Promoting the barbaric practice of wantonly killing animals and cutting off their tails for money is not a healthy nor ethical way to encourage families to spend time outside enjoying nature. When impressionable kids learn they can make Money by killing and Maiming a living creature, we have planted a very dark seed.

Please please end this program.

Ronelle Thompson

Siouxfalls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Targeting these animals will have unintended consequences across the animal spectrum. For example, opossums consume enormous numbers of mosquitoes. This program will not save pheasants. It is the elimination of wetlands and protected land areas that have led to the decreased population.

Karen Thunshelle

Minot ND

Position: oppose

Comment:

I'm truly disgusted by South Dakota's " Nest predator " Annihilation plan. This is the most barbaric thing I've ever heard of. Every time I go through South Dakota the only thing I can think about is how many animals are suffering and how crappy you treat your wildlife.

Deb Klebanoff

Baltic SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Ridiculous program that totally ignores the science of predators and prey. Not only that, the idea of encouraging children to take part in "hunting" animals to take only their tails for a lousy 10 bucks of my tax dollars is repugnant. Pheasants need habitat and this money would be much better spent on programs to improve natural habitat in ways that correlate to the most recent environmental research. Let South Dakota be seen as a powerful steward of our natural resources, not a barbaric state paying money to those enrolled in a program that makes no sense.

Nancy Neumann

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program is unbelievably barbaric and will have very negative consequences to SD wildlife. Not to mention a huge misuse of public funds

Nancy Neumann

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program is unbelievably barbaric and will have very negative consequences to SD wildlife. Not to mention a huge misuse of public funds

Jeannie Farley

Baltic SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Linda M. Hasselstrom

Hermosa SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Game, Fish and Parks, encouraged by Gov. Kristi Noem is encouraging the state to continue the nest predator bounty program. As long as it is in effect, I will allow NO HUNTING AT ALL on land I own or control. On this land raccoons, skunks, red foxes and badgers are protected; I'd protect possums too if I'd ever seen one here. From Susan Braunstein: Update on the Nest Predator Bounty Program. The Game Fish and Parks Commission met in January. They are considering a draft resolution of support for a \$250,000 expenditure for a second year of the nest predator program targeting the same species as last year. This includes raccoons, opossums, striped skunks, red foxes and badgers. 50,000 of these animals were killed last year in this program. Our governor encouraged families to go out and trap animals, cut off their tails and mail them to the state to receive \$10.00 per tail. All in the name of outdoor family fun and creating better habitat for the pheasant population. In this latest resolution the bounty would be \$5.00 per tail, applicants must possess a hunting, fishing or trapping license (unless you are a youth or landowner on their own land)

The season would be April 1st to July 1st.

The commission will meet to discuss this resolution on March 5 and 6. There will be a communications hub established at the Rapid City Game Fish and Parks office so we won't have to drive to Pierre (where the actual meeting takes place)

The commission will meet from 1 to 5 p.m. on Thursday and 8 a.m. to noon on Friday. Please attend the meeting and voice your concerns if you can.

You can also contact Keith Fisk, who is the trapping director in Pierre. You can e-mail him at Keith.Fisk@state.sd.us. You can also write, or e-mail or call the commissioners and contact the governor's office. Jason Simmons is in charge of this issue.

The deadline for comments is midnight March 1. Please let them know how you feel. It is important that they hear from us. Thank you.

Linda M. Hasselstrom

LindaMHasselstrom@windbreakhouse.com

Windbreak House Writing Retreats

PO Box 169, Hermosa, SD 57744

Website: www.WindbreakHouse.com

Facebook: www.Facebook.com/WindbreakHouse

Blog: WindbreakHouse.WordPress.com

Author of:

Gathering from the Grassland: A Plains Journal

Dakota: Bones, Grass, Sky, collected and new poems

The Wheel of the Year: A Writer's Workbook

Dirt Songs: A Plains Duet, with Twyla M. Hansen; No Place Like Home: Notes from a Western Life, Between Grass and Sky, Feels Like Far, Bitter Creek Junction, Land Circle, Dakota Bones, Going Over East, Windbreak, Bison: Monarch of the Plains, When a Poet Dies, The Roadside History of South Dakota, Roadkill, Caught By One Wing.

Editor of *Leaning into the Wind*, *Woven on the Wind*, *Crazy Woman Creek* with Gaydell Collier and Nancy Curtis; also editor of *Journal of a Mountain Man*, by James Clyman.

Joanne Marz

Deadwood SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program is unnecessary. This state has many, many opportunities for hunting and trapping . To put a bounty on certain species is not in the interest of wildlife at large and it is only designed to protect a non- native species . I respectfully request that this program be discontinued immediately. Thank you.

Tony Kellar

Gayville SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please stop the insanity.

Joe Lapka

Spearfish SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Margaret Lane

Hill City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Traps are designed to crush animals in a vice like grip rather than kill them. In other words, traps are indiscriminate, catching the first animal (or human) to step on them. They are inhumane, exposing animals to psychological trauma, dehydration, excruciating pain, injury, self-amputation, depredation, and a slow death. This is an insanely barbaric way to deal with what is perceived as a danger to the pheasant population. I am appalled, ashamed, and embarrassed that my beloved state encourages this type of torture be inflicted on our wildlife.

Kristen Levander

Hermosa SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Tamara Rogers

Hermosa SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am writing to explain why I do not support trapping (or now apparently shooting at) our small-mammal (and marsupial) population in a misguided attempt at increasing the number of game birds in the state.

Please adhere to the scientific research on how to increase wildlife instead of following some old-fashioned knee-jerk views from the 1950s. Increasing habitat, especially along riparian areas will help waterfowl nesting numbers. Increasing diverse cover for nesting will help pheasants to survive in eastern SD. Cutting back on pesticides and herbicides that damage the birds and kill off insects and "weeds" that supply food for the birds will increase their numbers. Killing off scavengers and omnivores that keep our pest species (mice, voles, insects) in check is not the way to do this. It will only upset the balance of nature even more than it is already.

Please don't blame predators for declining ground-nesting bird numbers when we are having periodic climate change floods and downpours that drown nests and kill off pheasant chicks. Give the birds better habitat so they can withstand the climate chaos.

Trapping and shooting small mammals (and marsupials) indiscriminately in the spring months will leave the young of nursing mothers to die slowly of starvation. Perhaps some people aren't bothered by that thought, so let me remind you that when the babies come into contact with humans and their domestic animals (pets, livestock) as they desperately search for food, that is how diseases and parasites are spread.

I think if the goal is to give children in SD a lifelong love of nature, letting a few families across the state with kids kill animals for profit is not the way. Hundreds of thousands of dollars could be better spent giving ALL children in SD a chance to enjoy nature through school field trips or other programs put on by the SDGF&P. Instead of spending money on giving away traps and paying for animal parts, why not spend that money supervising kids outside, improving habitat.

I do not want my tax dollars spent teaching children that the way to interact with nature is to kill and dismember animals for money. Yes, I raise and butcher my own animals for food and I support ethical hunting for food-- I am not anti-hunting.

However, as long as this ill-conceived program continues I am closing my ranch to hunting and I will be sure to tell all the hunters who stop by just why I am doing so.

Anne Fuehrer

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am writing in opposition of renewing the "Nest Predator Bounty Program" for 2020. This is an ineffective way to manage habitat which was your number one goal. Trapping an ineffective method of wildlife conflict management, it is a cruel way for any animal to die – including pets and other non-targeted animals that will get caught in these traps. Trapped animals will suffer from dehydration, starvation and exposure to the elements not to mention the young that starve to death as their mothers are trapped and killed. Not only is the Nest Predator Bounty Program a waste of state money and damaging to our ecosystem, it is inhuman. The state's own recent results have shown that the program has not had a positive effect on the game bird population.

In addition, wildlife management professionals across the U.S. have long acknowledged the ineffectiveness of bounties and predator control, including South Dakota's own Habitat Work Group in its 2014 report to Governor Daugaard. To my knowledge, no science-based evidence has been presented to suggest that the species targeted by this "Nest Predator Bounty Program" (opossums, raccoons, skunks, badgers or red fox) are negatively impacting pheasant populations.

In addition, the South Dakota Pheasant Brood Survey 2019 Report does NOT reflect that the Nest Predator Bounty Program was successful in increasing pheasant numbers last year. In fact, page 3 of the pdf says "the decline was significant for the Pierre, Mobridge, Huron, Mitchell, and Brookings local areas." Note that Beadle County (Huron) had the 2nd highest number of tailed submitted in the program.

Furthermore, each native species plays an important role in our ecosystem. In particular, opossums are a great benefit to any area they inhabit. Their diet includes snails, mice, rats, and insects such as cockroaches, crickets, beetles and disease-carrying ticks.

This program is simply not backed by science-based wildlife management principles. If GFP wants more game birds for hunters, please focus on improving their habitat - not killing indigenous species that play an important role in that habitat. Spending over \$1,700,000 on this program was not good stewardship of our states limited funds.

Jeff Ruenz

Hecla SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Douglas Traub

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

A Golden opportunity was missed in 2019 to determine if the trap give away program accomplished anything to justify its cost. People with predator tails received their bounty payment check in person (or a member of their family brought it in). Surveys taken from the trappers (or road kill recoverers) did not include any questions like "Did you use your free trap?" or,"Did you catch your predator with your free trap"

This would have helped determine if the free trap program worked or not.

I am in favor, if there is going to be a trapping for predators program, of reducing the bounty payment to 5 dollars and capping the payments.

Shari Kosel

Lead SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Patrick Hybertson

Sioux Falls SD

Position: support

Comment:

Please read the attached document.

Patrick Hybertson

Sioux Falls SD

Position: support

Comment:

I submitted a Word document previously but to ensure that what I had to say is read I have included it in this comments box as well.

I am all for the Bounty Program again and thought that it was a great way to get the youth in SD involved in trapping. My only question is if there was truly consideration for a second year of a bounty program would halving everything from the first year still pull in the public's interest? I am asking from a trapping mindset where trappers are influenced by the fur prices of various species where one may be higher than the other and that's what is targeted for the year.

I myself got really into trapping when there was an average of ten to fifteen dollars for raccoon on carcass and sometimes a high of twenty five for a really nice raccoon. Then back in the fur boom of the seventies and eighties everybody was trapping and all sorts of people were getting involved because of the high prices that sparked interest in the activity. But once the fur market crashed plenty of people hung up their steel and never really looked back. Even in present day it's hard to find people trapping a whole lot since the only thing currently worth money is coyotes. But for the youth those are a tricky species to trap especially with footholds. Currently a raccoon on carcass is averaging probably around five dollars or less which doesn't pay for the traps, gas, and equipment invested in the process. Because of that kind of pricing for fur, people have lost interest and don't even consider bothering with the time put in the trap line knowing full well that not only are they not going to break even, but they are definitely going to lose money.

I believe that the listed nest predator species of raccoon, fox, badger, opossum, and skunk are excellent species to get our youth hooked into trapping. Raccoon, opossum, and skunk are some of the easiest species for kids to start trapping and gradually work their way up in the furbearers list. This leads to improving on the variety of sets, and being able to read sign and setting on it.

My main point from the previous paragraphs is that I believe to truly peak the public's interest especially the youth I would like to make a counter proposal of offering ten dollars a tail again like the previous year. If that is unreasonable then meet me in the middle at seven dollars and fifty cents. People are already not trapping like they used to due to fur prices. If you were to offer the same prices that fur buyers are offering, what would cause the public to start trapping all of a sudden? I believe if you would want a successful goal of outreaching to our youth and even getting their parents interested, you would need to offer better prices to spark that interest and excitement we have all felt when first selling fur with the possibility of making decent money from something that you worked hard for.

Overall I think the program is great on getting more people involved with trapping and helping with an increased localized game population. Educating the public on habitat and wildlife management is really commendable for increased support and the learning aspect as a whole.

I fully support the GF&P and just wanted to voice my opinions and concerns on making a successful outreach. If \$250,000 is for sure the cap then so be it. I am also for the possibility of increasing the sales of licenses within the state as mentioned in your proposal. The only thing I would like reconsidered is the price per tail, offer better prices than the fur buyers and maybe the public would fully consider investing time and money into a fading tradition that has run deep in our history.

Dorothy Schulz

Pickstown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Its so bad to teach young children its ok to trap an animal then kill it. Its like starting a class for serial killers. Totally disgusting.

Larry Fredrickson

Chamberlain SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

See my uploaded paper.

Jan Humphrey

Hill City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Predator Nest Program initiated by Gov. Noem. This is a cruel and inhumane practice for the apex species of indigenous animals to this state. Speak to any biologist and they will clarify that these animals are crucial to a good balance of the ecosystems. Her practice is also a waste to our tax payers. We will vote her and be sure to remember your actions as well.

Seth Hill

Centerville SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

John Blackburn

Yankton SD

Position: support

Comment:

Nest predators defeat our State's goal of being a pheasant capitol of the world. A gentlemen told me before this program he trapped 62 raccoons in (memory) 2 quarters near Brookings. Evidence of excess nest predators is how many are killed along highways. PLEASE allow a bounty on next predators. Thanks!!! John P. Blackburn, Yankton, S. D.

James Pace

Mina SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Robert Bye

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

How dumb can we be to mess with nature.

Richard Bell

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

You need to stop this wasteful, ineffective and cruel killing program and reject the planned 2020 Nest Predator Bounty Program.

Cyrus Rasmussen

Hudson SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

David Love

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

For the love of God, grow up and discard evil practices from the 18th century.

Shane Rist

Centerville SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Russell Suda

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Danny Oswald

Huron SD

Position: support

Comment:

I think this is a good program. We also need a bounty on coyote . They are getting to be a problem.

Laura Quam

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program seems ineffective. In addition to that, anything that might encourage trapping is something that I am opposed to.

Heather Philbrook

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I find this program absolutely disgusting.

Jodi Hildebrand

Wakonda SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jane Amiotte

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

It has not proven to help the population of the non-native pheasant in SD. Use the money for habitat restoration (like the CRP program) which increased pheasant numbers. This is inhumane and just a way to try to increase hunting license income for the state and a few farmers that cater to pheasant hunting (aka Governor Noem). She chooses to govern on her personal pocketbook. If it doesn't do that (Hemp legalization) she is against it even though it could solve so many of the state's problems (building materials, textiles) and help the farmers and others in the state.

Tammy Jungen

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please do NOT renew the very much ineffective and cruel Nest Predator Bounty program. South Dakotan's do not support this program. What's more, the science of it does not support it either! Money better spent is on habitat.

This is NOT a family activity. Killing needlessly teaches nothing but cruelty. Worse yet, the animals were discarded like nothing. Living, breathing, feeling animals that do nothing but benefit our environment, left rotting on the roadsides.

Shame on South Dakota for supporting this cruel program in the first place, with no scientific findings to back this type of thing up.

For exhibit: https://www.aberdeennews.com/news/opinion/other-voices-brood-counts-blow-holes-in-south-dakota-predator/article_80824b4a-f27d-5e68-8aef-49c96bb824c0.html
<https://listen.sdpb.org/post/bounty-program-ends-questions-linger-about-effectiveness>

How much has this program in 2019 hurt our state in loss of tourism, funding, and respect of our neighboring states? No body wants this. You are deluding yourselves on behalf of the slim majority that participated.

Sandra Faltemier

Brookings SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a dysfunctional inhumane program that kills wild animals and leaves their babies to die after trapping and I oppose it. Please remove this program from South Dakota this year what a waste of money. Thank you

Beth Millard

Hot Springs SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

ABSOLUTELY OPPOSE!!!!!!

Linda Greene

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is cruel and inhumane and promoting it as "family entertainment" is sickening.

Charlotte Bruce

Woonsocket SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Michael Stark

Mitchell SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Shana Huls

Lennox SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

We live in a rural area and are worried our pets will end up in a trap, it happened to our neighbors dog. Traps are cruel.

Gwyneth Fastnacht

Wessington Springs SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please STOP the nest predator bounty program. It was not based in science, will have a negative impact on the healthy environment and Gov Noem did not include statistics that are supported by data collected by the GF&P.

I strongly urge the discontinuation of this program.

Kris Stapelberg

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please, please, please, I beg you once again, do not approve another Nest Predator Bounty Program.

Rich Nickerson

Pierre SD

Position: support

Comment:

Only suggestion would be to require the animal carcass, so there aren't any tail less critters running around. A friend has caught 2 raccoons that were tail less in his lice catch trap

Erin Campbell

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I strongly oppose this cruel, expensive, useless program. I would like the money to be spent making more pheasant and wildlife habitat. This would much better support the pheasants. Habitat loss is the real reason pheasant populations are suffering not the predators who have always been in SD. This program is yet another assault on our wildlife.

Denise Parker

Lead SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program is both inhumane and provides no value added to the overall pheasant hunting population. Furthermore why is this program even in West River, we have no pheasant population. This program does nothing but kill needlessly thousands of animals cruelly. Many of these innocent animals play a significant role, like eating ticks, to our environment. I urge you please stop this horrific practice.

Audrey Prince

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jerry Wilson

Vermillion SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

To South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks,

My wife and I just returned from a walk across our restored native prairie. We scared up a pheasant hen and nine deer. A bald eagle sailed overhead, looking for something to eat.

I am 74 years old, a rural resident most of my life except years in college and in the US Army during the Vietnam War. As a boy, I hunted and trapped. I am not proud that I killed fellow creatures like possums and raccoons for “sport,” and for the \$3 I could get for their hides, and that I then discarded their bodies. But gradually I did learn respect for fellow creatures, for their needs and their ways of life. I came to understand through careful observation that the key to every healthy ecosystem is natural balance.

Balance necessarily includes the presence of predators—that is predators besides human beings. I learned that human intervention in the form of eliminating certain threads negatively affects the entire fabric of life. For the past thirty years my wife and I have been actively engaged in native prairie restoration and other efforts to enhance natural habitat on the Missouri River Bluff in Clay County. From this perspective, I would like to offer a pair of observations about the SD GFP Nest Predator Survey, and by extension, about Gov. Noem’s misguided program to promote commercial ventures by making war against our native wildlife.

As every opinion researcher—and every propagandist—knows, responses to any question will be influenced by the language used, and by how the questions are posed. Surveys used by political campaigns, for example, are sometimes designed not to truly determine opinions, but to formulate or influence them. I find the present survey tinged with such a motive.

For example, the questionnaire uses loaded language, such as “harvesting” and “predators” (but never killing native wildlife, animals or species). “Harvesting” is a word loaded with positive connotations, while “predator” is laden with negative subtext. Both words are intended to influence perceptions, not to encourage critical thinking.

The questionnaire states as a given, “that a primary goal is to increase interest and participation in outdoor recreation and conservation among youth.” Who could be against encouraging outdoor recreation and conservation? But there is no hint that this “outdoor recreation” involves indiscriminate killing of native mammals, as well as cementing in young minds a lack of respect for those fellow creatures. A red fox is no longer a beautiful, elusive and wily fellow inhabitant, and an indispensable part of the ecosystem of which I am part, but a commodity to be “harvested” for ten bucks.

And what is the goal of “conservation”? True conservation means preservation and restoration of habitat—and of biological diversity—not the destruction of diversity in the interest of another commodity, in this case the money-generating non-native bird, the pheasant.

I understand that promoting hunting and fishing is part of the mission of Game, Fish and Parks. I do not condemn ethical hunting, and I don’t deny that these activities, which some adults still find attractive, can be compatible with larger conservation goals. That is why we have seasons, limits on how many individuals of some species can be killed, and regulations on which can be regarded as “game” rather than animals, mammals or fellow life forms. That is why we require that sportsmen and women purchase licenses, and why some of that money goes to maintaining scraps of our shrinking wildlife habitat.

But true conservation, a true “land ethic,” to use Aldo Leopold’s term, cannot be driven by commercial exploitation. “The old prairie lived by the diversity of its plants and animals,” Leopold says in *A Sand County Almanac*, “all of which were useful because the sum total of their cooperations and competitions achieved continuity.” That should be our goal, and our programs should reflect that goal.

I have tried to explore these and other themes of nature, rural life and conservation in two of my six published books, *Waiting for Coyote’s Call* and *Seasons of the Coyote: A Year on Prairie Bluff*. After a lifetime of observation and thought, I have concluded that I will go to my grave with very limited comprehension of the mysteries of the natural world of which I am part. But of one thing I feel certain. The possibilities of comprehension and appreciation, and of fostering healthy ecosystems instead of destroying them, begins with open eyes, open heart and respect for fellow creatures.

Linda Hasselstrom

Hermosa SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The nest predator bounty program was a ridiculous waste of money the first time, as well as a threat to useful native predators that reduce the population of rats, mice and other vermin. It is unconscionable that the Gov. Noem is encouraging a second season. As long as this program is in effect, I will allow NO hunting at all on the ranch land I own and control, and will encourage my neighbors to resist it as well. I hope you will do all that you can to stop this ridiculous idea. I would be against it even if pheasants were common in West River, which they are not.

Lonnie Jeffries

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am very concerned about the inhumane killing of the animals listed in your program. I don't care if it supports more pheasants as some suggest, I personally think killing these animals is so disgusting, I cannot begin to analyze the thought behind giving a "bounty" of 10 bucks per tail? What do they do with the rest of the animal? Let it die and rot where it is? Please stop this inhumane program from happening. There has got to be a better way. I do not agree with killing for sport. Find another way!

William Schultze

Hendricks MN

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Ann Haber Stanton

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Part of why we love living in SD is being surrounded by nature. Our wildlife, including predators, is a huge and valuable part of the natural system. Disturbing that system throws everything off balance, and we are asking for unintended consequences. We're seeing that happen worldwide, and we don't want to see that in our beloved home state.

Furthermore, trapping is cruel and should be revisited as a legal method of killing wildlife. Cutting off the tails of trapped animals, dead or alive, is the very opposite of a family fun experience.

Thank you for reconsidering this seriously wrong bounty resolution. It should never have been introduced to begin with, and please include my name among those who strenuously object to it.

Nonresident East River Special Deer License

Matt Eldridge

Pierre SD

Position: support

Comment:

Noem said it in her speech. South Dakota is open for business. What more is there to say about that. 500 tags think about the money it will bring into the state. The families that want to have their kids come home and deer hunt the family farm should be considered in this also. Let's stop splitting the state with the River.

Jeffrey Flood

No. Mankato MN

Position: support

Comment:

Please consider this Special Buck License good for "ANY BUCK" not just Whitetail. I hunt where there is a good MULE DEER population.

Thank you!!

Lance Gerth

Brandt SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

After the recent hullabaloo recently about changing how we needed to change how we apply for deer tags and how this was necessary because of less tags available all of the sudden we find 500 tags available for non-residents. This a wonderful turn around, and so quickly too. Or will this merely be subtracted from residents opportunities. Either way it shows a willingness for our GFP to give in to the desires of the pay-to-hunt crowd at the expense of resident opportunities.

Nicholas Gilmore

Milbank SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The goal of bringing money into the state from non resident hunters only serves to dishearten resident hunters and drive the continued downward spiral of resident license sales. I believe the quality of life for the common residents of our state should be more important than the continued push for the commercialization of hunting.

Gregg Yonkovich

Aberdeen SD

Position: support

Comment:

I know many non-residents that already hunt with archery equipment. I don't see a problem giving them an opportunity to also hunt with a rifle. I appreciate limiting the number of tags to 500, and also limiting hunting to whitetail only.

James Zeck

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

One could very much see this coming with the deer application changes. This will significantly decrease opportunities for residents on private land and open the door to fee for access which most South Dakotan's will not be able to afford. I strongly encourage the commission to not adopt these changes.

Drake Mohr

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Ernest Stirling

Miller SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I FEEL THAT THE PROPOSAL TO ISSUE 500 NONRESIDENT EAST RIVER SPECIAL DEER LICENSES IS TOO HIGH OF A NUMBER TO BEGIN WITH. I WOULD RATHER A NUMBER LIKE 150 TO BEGIN WITH UNTIL SEVERAL SEASONS HAVE PASSED TO SEE WHAT THE RAMIFICATIONS ARE OF MAKING THIS LICENSE AVAILABLE TO NONRESIDENTS. I AM CONCERNED THAT IF A NONRESIDENT IS WILLING AND CAPABLE OF PURCHASING THIS LICENSE THEN THEY MAY ALSO BE WILLING AND CAPABLE OF PAYING FOR HUNTING RIGHTS ON PRIVATE GROUND THEREBY MAKING LESS LAND AVAILABLE TO THE SD RESIDENT THAT CAN NOT AFFORD TO PAY A FEE FOR THE PRIVELEGE TO HUNT. THANK-YOU FOR LISTENING TO MY CONCERNS.. ERNIE STIRLING

Adam Golay

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This proves that the 2019 deer allocation change was not about getting people their preferred deer license but what I've been preaching for the last 2 years & it's about the money. Some east river resident hunters will lose their hunting spots because some non residents who draw these \$554 east river special buck tags will lease up land for this hunt. Then GFP will once again be scratching their head trying to figure out how to get that 12 year old kid out in the field to hunt deer.

Ryan Fliehs

Corsica SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Cody Shoultz

Miller SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Matt Bones

Chancellor SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Patrick Glasford

Crooks SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

You guys just changed the whole drawing process because of tag allotment. Now all of a sudden we want to hand out tags to non residents. Please dont throw the out of state family card....This is all about outfitters.

James Dahlberg

Hot Springs SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Why is the commission considering allowing more nonresident tags at the same time discussing the possibility of curtailing some resident tags? Where is the logic in that?

Jeremey Backous

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Justin Allen

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I'm strongly opposed to any additional Non-Resident big game opportunities in SD. Additional Special buck licenses only further commercializes hunting in SD. As the state is rapidly seeing, in the decrease of hunting licenses sold (NR & Res.), commercial hunting limits access and opportunities for all others. Hunters are putting their guns away in masses and not passing on the tradition. It is a short sided approach for increase revenue with large lasting effects. Deer tag are already hard enough to draw as is. Many landowners will push residents/friends/family aside in the name of making a buck to allow a NR to hunt deer. Are we concerned about resident opportunities in SD or not? Please renew my dwindling faith that the SD GFP commission is here to represent the sportsman of SD. Thank you for your time. Justin

Kyle Bye

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Don't let non residents hunt

Cyrus Mahmoodi

Woodbury MN

Position: support

Comment:

I think this is a great idea. Giving more opportunities for hunters to visit South Dakota is the right decision. South Dakota needs to be proactive in doing it's part to continue hunter participation. This helps.

Matthew Hines

Southlake TX

Position: support

Comment:

I am a non-resident hunter, and i generally make at least one trip to SD each year. I support this license, because it would allow me to make another trip to SD in hopes of harvesting a mature whitetail buck with my firearm.

Frank Reilly

Flower Mound TX

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Robert Eddy

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Do not support this proposal. Add a Non-resident license (8%) to the total, similar to WR seasons before adding to the special buck concept.

Danny Limmer

Lake Norden SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please protect resident opportunity first. South Dakota is not a shooting preserve.

Clayton Knudsen

Salem SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

These licenses would lead to more difficulty for resident deer hunters to obtain private land to hunt on because the non-resident tags typically bring in out of state hunters willing to pay big money to hunt. And with if they are able to hunt any private land East of the river, outfitters will be out leasing up more ground so they can take hunters to whichever property has the best deer.

One of the biggest challenges to getting more people in the field hunting is the difficulty in finding permission to hunt so you don't have to deal with over-pressured public hunting areas. Pay hunting is one of the main causes for not being able to get permission, and nonresidents are by far more willing to pay for hunting privileges. If you want more youth hunters, we need to help give them an opportunity to deer hunt in a quality atmosphere with good opportunity to see and harvest a deer.

All you have to do is look to the pheasant hunting in South Dakota for support of my position. I find it is often easier to get permission East River to hunt deer than it is pheasants. - unless you are willing to pay the high fees of course.

I understand the situation with our pheasant hunting history and heritage and am okay with that. I just hope we can keep our deer hunting from going down the same path. I have five children - two boys and three girls and they all love to hunt and grew up hunting deer on private land we obtained permission on. I have warned them for years that the day would come when the State would allow non-resident tags for East River and eventually we would loose much or all of land we have permission to hunt deer on. And with it the annual family hunt we all enjoy together.

I respectfully ask you to not allow Non-resident East River Special deer tags.

Thank you.

Robert Eddy

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please do not support additional Special Buck tags for ER Deer. Special Buck has taken the place of the Non-resident Deer licence process. The inclusion of the 8% NR ER Deer is first acceptable step. It is highly encouraged to eliminate the Special Buck completely, and compromise with an increase to 10% NR Deer statewide. This will disperse NR pressure throughout the state verses all in prime areas leased by outfitters who have eliminated opportunities for resident hunters.

Douglas Traub

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This proposed rule supports paid guided deer hunting for non-residents at the expense of resident hunters deer hunting opportunities.

The opportunity to hunt deer for residents is already declining. A further sell out to the play for pay crowd will further hurt resident deer hunting opportunities.

I have read the complaints of resident's out of state relatives not being able to draw an East river deer tag every year. I feel this proposed rule change is not the proper approach, as it benefits the guiding industry, without positively affecting the desire for more family hunting opportunities.

I therefore oppose this rule change.

Pierce Smith

Alexandria SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

2019 was the first time since I was 12 that I did not have one rifle deer tag. I strongly oppose giving non-residents tags on land that is already locked down to the average sportsmen already. If this passes, landowners who now give access to residents will now be trending to only letting non-residents come in because of the higher profit. One individual gains profit while hundreds of hunters take the hit. Why take residents out of the field and hurt a deer population that is already trending downwards?

Pierce Smith

Alexandria SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

2019 was the first time since I was 12 years old that I did not draw a single rifle deer tag. I strongly oppose giving Non-residents tags on land that is already locked down to the average sportsmen. If this passes, landowners who now give access to residents will now trend to giving access to Non-Residents because of a higher profit. One individual gains profit while thousands of deer hunters take a hit. Why take residents out of the field and hurt a deer population that is already trending downwards?

Brendan Gerth

Clear Lake SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

500more resident buck tags would meet the R3 requirements much better. If you need more money charge more money, the resident deer hunters will pay it. Buck only tags-private and or public land-will always sell good. Nonresidents can buy archery tags and hunt anywhere even during rifle season.

Rena Eddy

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please do not support more Special Buck licenses. Add 8% NR to the normal draw, but no more Special tags catering to pay-to-hunt operations. It has gone way too far now!

Tanner Eddy

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No to Special Buck License.

Jay Groos

Colman SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Another attempt to commercialize hunting in our state. There has to be other ways to generate revenue rather than this.

Ryan Mckinney

Champlin MN

Position: support

Comment:

I am very supportive of the proposed 500 non-resident east river buck tags. I have access to hunt a ranch in Buffalo County and have only drawn a tag once in the last five years. My friend who is also a MN resident has owned the ranch for 30+ years. This past season, no non-residents drew tags in Buffalo County despite an abundant deer population. Apparently, residents were able to get five tags prior to non-residents having access to any. My friend pays significant taxes, has local ranchers using the land, routinely cooperates with Fish and Game on their projects and provides significant winter habitat. Not being able to hunt his own property seems unfair. Thank You for your consideration.

Phil Kooima

Rock Valley IA

Position: support

Comment:

Dear Sirs, I am a non resident deer hunter. I hunt the Bald Eagle Ranch in Buffalo county. Last year I had no opportunity to hunt deer b/c there was zero non resident deer licenses.

Please consider adding more Non- resident licenses for future years.

I spend about a week in South Dakota when I go to this ranch. I typically buy all my supplies and gas and food and entertainment in South Dakota during this trip.

Other

Wendy Luedke

Lead SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose the Nest Predator Bounty Program for the following OBVIOUS reasons:

1. It is not an ecologically sound plan. Killing the predators of pheasants does not solve the dwindling population, it just causes more ecological issues such as an overrun of other animals the predators eat. Providing more marshlands is how to solve this.
2. Our wildlife is not here for sacrifice to the few, seasonal businesses that thrive on the killing of animals. Our State needs a more solid economy and employment plan.
3. IT IS CRUEL AND INHUMANE and SENSELESS!
4. I am not a supporter of providing graft for our governor.

Kris Stapelberg

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I cannot believe you are seriously considering having a Nest Predator Bounty again this year. It did nothing to help our Game Bird numbers and did everything to hinder the rest of our wildlife. It also cost the state a whole lot of money that could be better spent elsewhere. With all the negative media we got throughout the country last year (despite you trying so hard to show how wonderful it is for kids to kill animals on your Facebook page), you can bet a lot of people will be crossing South Dakota off the list to visit this year. And I don't blame them. I love this state, but I am thoroughly embarrassed by it right now.

Dean Parker

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am writing in opposition of renewing the “Nest Predator Bounty Program” for 2020.

Not only is trapping an ineffective method of wildlife conflict management, but it is a cruel way for any animal to die – including pets and other non-targeted animals that will get caught in these traps.

Wildlife management professionals across the U.S. have long acknowledged the ineffectiveness of bounties and predator control, including South Dakota’s own Habitat Work Group in its 2014 report to Governor Daugaard. To my knowledge, no science-based evidence has been presented to suggest that the species targeted by this “Nest Predator Bounty Program” (opossums, raccoons, skunks, badgers or red fox) are negatively impacting pheasant populations.

Furthermore, each native species plays an important role in our ecosystem. In particular, opossums are a great benefit to any area they inhabit. Their diet includes snails, mice, rats, and insects such as cockroaches, crickets, beetles and disease-carrying ticks.

This program is simply not backed by science-based wildlife management principles. If GFP wants more game birds for hunters, please focus on improving their habitat - not killing indigenous species that play an important role in that habitat.

Eva Bareis

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I strongly oppose another nest predator trapping season. The timing of the season ensures that orphaned young will starve and goes against the very ethics that Fish and Game teaches youth. I'm also unable to find any research to suggest that such a strategy works.

Linda Zachow

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose the nest predator program because I believe it messes with nature's normal ecological balance and as a psych nurse I think this promotes cruelty to animals as I don't see this related to normal hunting practices.

Jamie Al-Haj

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am greatly opposed to reinstating the Nest Predator Bounty Program! The financial cost of \$1 Million for this program benefits ONLY those who participate. The state of South Dakota and it's residents are the total losers when we decimate our native species and disrupt our ecosystem while using funds that could be used in many productive ways. It is the responsibility of Games Fish and Parks and it's commissioners to act as stewards of our wildlife. Where does allowing such a fatuous program fulfill this responsibility?

Please respect the views of such a vast number of South Dakotans by not recommending the Nest Predator Bounty Program be reinstated in 2020!!!

Nadine Thomas

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am totally opposed to the Nest Predator Bounty Program. What an waste of my hard earned tax prayer money I give to the SD! I want my taxes to pay for programs that help all people. We need that money to be used on infrastructure, schools, healthcare, etc... not killing innocent animals to save the pheasant population! Plus it is not the predators reducing the number of pheasants but a loss of habitat! Spend the money on increasing habitat rather than killing innocent animals!

Lucinda Gallagher

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose bringing back the Nest Predator Bounty Program for 2020. This program did nothing to help the pheasant population and the money Game, Fish & Parks spent on it in 2019 would have been better spent improving habitat in known pheasant nesting areas. I have few objections to normal winter trapping practices, but I feel that trapping during the spring and summer when the animals have young that may lose their parents and die as a result, is needlessly cruel, and just collecting tails is a horrible waste and disrespectful to animals that have a valuable place in the ecosystem. Please do not bring this program back this year.

Bryan Goeden

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Considering that non resident hunters are already getting 10 percent of our special buck tags I strongly oppose giving out more tags. The result of these tags being given out will increase nonresident trying to buy or lease hunting ground making it harder to find land owners willing to give people permission an already increasing problem. Instead of focusing on more expensive nonresident tags we should try focusing on Hunter recruitment and retention.

Karen Wallace

Newell SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am against the Nest Predator Bounty Program. I don't think this should be allowed to go through with an additional \$1,000,000 in state spending when there is no money available for a raise in school teacher pay.

Teah Homsey-Pray

Deadwood SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Regarding predator bounty program

Could a non-lethal engagement with wildlife for our children be a more productive activity versus a program that is not an answer to pheasant population? SD dollars may be better spent on equipment, books, and ID nature walks and the like versus traps that animals suffer in and then are killed. Mind you with our children doing the killing or watching it. Is this really what we want or should it be appreciation for nature, because the more we know about wildlife the more we know about ourselves. I'm a retired teacher who opposes the nest predator bounty program. I tried hard to teach compassion and respect for all living things to my students. What in God's name is this program teaching? And what are the results of this barbaric activity on our wildlife and youth?

Laural Bidwell

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Nest Predator Program: Please do not continue this program that wastes government funds "to get kids outside" when in fact there are plenty of ways for families to get outside. We all know this program does nothing to save pheasant habitat. I'm hearing that the state is looking to throw away another million dollars on a program that teaches children to kill and mutilate animals. Please please stop.

Kris Norlin

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please do not implement the nest predator bounty program again. It is horrible to think of making a sport (for kids- there are so many other outdoor sports that can be taught) of trapping and cutting off the tails of opossum and other animals that are necessary to our ecosystem. What an awful way to spend that much money when it could have been put to better use keeping habitats viable.

Tacy Paul

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am writing this letter to urge you to end the Nest Predator Bounty Program for a number of reasons.

One, the numbers of pheasants did not increase from this program last year and there is no scientific data that proves it will work. According to many experienced biologists, pheasant numbers have been decreasing in SD since the 1960's because of the decline of farmland.

Two, what part of children watching animals killed and mutilated accounts for quality outdoor family time?

This program is barbaric to say the least.

Three, animal cruelty is a felony in the state of South Dakota, and leaving the offspring of those trapped and slaughtered is about as cruel as you can get.

Four, it is a complete waste of money as there has been no proof or data collected that this is a solution to the dwindling population of pheasants.

There has been a LOT of discontent among the voters of SD on this program. I urge you to listen to the voters and the taxpayers, not just the wealthy out of state hunters.

Thank you.

Tacy Paul

South Dakota Resident, taxpayer & voter

Cassandra Bockorny

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I strongly oppose the Nest Predator Bounty Program. The funds spent on this program could be used to preserve or create habitat rather than devalue our native predators for a non-native species. There is no proof that the program results in an increase to the pheasant population. This money should be directed to help the state prepare for climate change by restoring more natural habitat.

Sandra Seberger

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I would like to comment on the Bounty Program. I am opposed to the killing of native species to increase a non-native bird.

Cheyne Cumming

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I STRONGLY OPPOSE THE NEST PREDATOR BOUNTY PROGRAM. NO SCIENCE IS INVOLVED. KILLING OUR WILDLIFE FOR A BOUNTY TAKES SD BACK TO THE 1800'S. TEACHING CHILDREN TO KILL ANIMALS IS WRONG!

Nancy Hilding

Black Hawk, SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a comment letter on pending proposal for a nest predator bounty program. Comment will be uploaded as a PDF letter, from Prairie Hills Audubon Society

Carter Klatt

Brandon SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This regards the "3 option" proposal convening nonresident waterfowl licenses. My vote is that we keep the licensing system the same way that it currently is for non residents. Each and every one of the 3 options proposed will severely impact and greatly decline the quality of waterfowl hunting in South Dakota for resident hunters.

Nancy Hilding

Black Hawk, SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Nancy Hilding,

I submit this short comment in my own name, versus former letter on behalf of an organization.

I am opposed to the nest predator bounty program and to giving away free traps. Please don't do it again.

The wildlife, whose lives you sell to hunter, fishers and trappers, belong to all the citizen's of SD. You raise much of your funding from these transactions, but the owner of the sale item (the wildlife) are all the citizens -- whether they are avid hunters or members of PETA. Hunters, fishers, wildlife watchers, photographers may all give donations to Game, Fish and Parks, but purchasing a hunting, fishing or trapping license is not a donation.

It is a consumptive use....an exchange of dollars for the opportunity to successfully capture meat or furs --- things of dollar value.

Vickie Hauge

Deadwood SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am writing to ask you to oppose Governor Noems idea for the renewal of the nest predictor program. Our state does not have the money to put into this program & the concept of this program is flawed. God gave us these predictors for a purpose. The diversity of our wildlife is so important & nature takes care of over population in mice & voles, and so on. When you remove the important predators, everything goes out of balance. Our state has so many other things that need to be funded & the money taken from the state treasury last year to teach children the way to be cruel to animals & that is okay to feel that the animals are not worth anything, was a tremendous waste of our resources. It is not okay to use our state money to support the pheasant hunting lodges over our more important state needs. Use some of this money to get kids into nature & teach them how to appreciate the animals instead of teaching them to kill. Cruelty to animals is & has never been a healthy thing for a child or any age. Live trapping & then killing the animal or just leaving them in the trap to die, is Wrong.

Thank you for your attention & we hope you will consider not catering to the governor & her cronies.

Carla Marshall

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose the predator programs. This is not a family fun activity. It teaches children to kill those critters that are essential to these habitats.

Kristina Garrett

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose the Nest Predator Bounty Program. Please don't renew this program.

Chad Taecker

Brookings SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please
Leave
The non-resident
Waterfowl
Season alone. Everything is fine the way it is.

Merle Bach

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

;Nest predator: That is prbably the worst program to ever come out of GFP I cant believe you would even consider it!!!!!!

Nick Falj

Harrold SD

Position: support

Comment:

As a landowner conservationist I support the petition for rule change to allow 500 Nonresident East river rifle tags.

Ken Carter

Woodland CA

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Leann Baloun

Highmore SD

Position: support

Comment:

I support special buck tags for east river non resident for private land owners

Jason Taylor

Fort Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

To GFP & Commission, I writing this in reference to the NR East River Special Whitetail Buck Allocation Petition and letting you know that I strongly oppose the petition and hope that you deny it.

There is absolutely no biological reason behind this petition. The ones for this petition (the outfitters which came up with it) will say that it will bring in tax \$\$ to SD, but what you won't hear from them is that it will be at the expense of the average resident sportsmen. All this will do for hunting is boost up and expand the commercial hunting in South Dakota which is/has already taken over western SD. It is already hard for residents to find private land to hunt in western SD because outfitters are tying it up. Look at Stanley County, between Ted Turner's 2 ranches and all the land the Black Mountain Outfitters have tied up, a person that is lucky enough to draw a Stanley County tag has an extremely hard time finding private land to hunt, unless they have the \$\$, or their only other option is to hunt the highly pressured overcrowded public land. Now if this petition is accepted and then approved by the commission, those outfitters are going to start tying up the private land in eastern SD and force more resident sportsmen to the already overcrowded public lands East River.

I ask that the Commission thinks hard and look at what is best for the wildlife and the resident sportsmen not the Outfitters. All the public hears from the Commission and GF&P is how SD sportsmen numbers are dropping, that is because people don't have a place to hunt unless they PAY. I hope that the Commission will open their eyes and not be a yes man for the commercial outfitters and start looking out for the average SD sportsmen and deny this petition.

Russ Roberts

Hulett WY

Position: support

Comment:

I am writing regarding the East River Special Buck proposal for non-residents. It has been long overdue that there is a non-resident license allocation for east river deer hunting for a firearms season. There are many non-residents that are either family members of existing farms or grew up in the area that no longer have a chance to hunt deer there because they have no opportunity at licenses. This is a good proposal that should be passed.

Shari Kosel

Lead SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Nest Predator Bounty Program

Matt Eldridge

Pierre SD

Position: support

Comment:

I would like you to support the East River Special buck tag. This tag will help the people that move away from South Dakota to come home and hunt their home state.

Ronald Pringle

Norfolk VA

Position: support

Comment:

I am currently a nonresident landowner who owns 4 quarters of farmland east river in SD. I grew up in SD and enjoy coming back home whenever I can. I feel that a season or program should be in place to afford the opportunity to people like myself or my children to be able to come home and spend time deer hunting. Living in another state, the only deer tag I can secure to hunt on my own land is limited to archery hunting. This being the only opportunity is unfortunate (as leftover rifle tags are virtually impossible for non-residents east river) and limits possibilities to create additional hunting memories for myself or my children on land that I cherish. I would like to convey my support for the establishment of the non-resident east river special deer tag. This would give non-residents the opportunity to hunt on east river private land. It would also not add to congestion on public land, as the tag would require the sponsorship of a private land owner whom has given permission to hunt. I believe this would be a positive step to bring home some South Dakotans even for a few days to spend quality time in the field with family. It would also allow a few other non-residents to come discover the beauty of SD and realize that east river hunting can be more than just pheasants for non-residents. The price of the tag as well as the income that these hunters would bring to the state would be substantial as well. Thank you for reading and listening to my comments.

Mike Van Cleave

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose non resident deer hunting.

Dillon Baloun

Highmore SD

Position: support

Comment:

I strongly support the non resident east river special buck opportunities for private land. To consider that this does support land owner rights and is crucial in future wildlife management and conservation on private land.

Vicki Honerkamp

Piedmont SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

To all concerned,I am a great lover of nature and our Black Hills. I also love to hunt and fish. To implement a bounty on selected predators has a negative affect on South Dakota's natural balance. Every animal has a purpose for keeping the land healthy. One million dollars could serve a much better purpose I am sure! The most disturbing fact of this predator program is the cruel and unnecessary slow and painful death of the young still in the nest...it makes physically ill to think of it! The other fact that I find disturbing is the thought of thousands of tail-less animal bodies laying all over the land rotting and creating an explosion of disease and germ carrying flies. Can not a better way be found to spend a million dollars?

Cordially,

Vicki L. Honerkamp

Mark Trask

Wasta SD

Position: support

Comment:

I am in support of nonresident east river special buck tags.

Tom Trask

Wasta SD

Position: support

Comment:

I support east river special buck tags for nonresidents

Patty Jenkinsi

Brandon SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please convince our Governor the Bounty Trapping Program was a complete FLOP! TELL HER TO DIRECT THE MILLION\$\$\$ TO INCREASE THE STATE EDUCATORS SALARIES!

Connie Ryan

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I absolutely oppose the predator bounty program. I believe this program is a waste of money and inhumane. I've uploaded a file with a letter from sdfacts.org regarding this program and I share their opinion.

Kerma Cox

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am writing today to give my views on Ms Noem's nest predator program, which I strongly oppose. I am worried what this will do to our ecosystem. I don't think it's 'good family fun'. It teaches our children that animals don't need our respect or appreciation. I don't see why we should be so determined to protect the pheasant population. They are not a native species, they come from China. Please do NOT support her in this horrible idea.

Lisa Jenson

Box Elder SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please do not renew the nest predator bounty program. Our money would be better spent improving habitat for game birds.

Karen Haynes

Chamberlain SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please do not continue the Nest Predator Program for another year. It shows complete ignorance or willfully ignoring ecosystems. All of the animals senselessly slaughtered are part of a much larger system than simply pheasant nests. It's a very sad reason for "children to be outside" and a huge waste of money. Let's get on the right side of things. Work with some environmentally conscious people to deal with issues and quite going so overboard to maintain a species not native to this country.

Pat West

Piedmont SD

Position: support

Comment:

I am in support of increasing the East River and West River Special Buck tags for Non Residents.

This will have no impact on any of the public ground hunting in South Dakota and will allow more out of state hunting on Private Property. This will also increase the revenue for local businesses in the state.

Thanks for your consideration.

Gail Saxonis

Hot Springs SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am unequivocally opposed to the trapping of small game that the governor has instigated in order to "preserve pheasant habitat as I believe it leads to environmental imbalances for wildlife, etc.

Cody Warne

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

East river NON-Resident special Buck.

Dear Commission , I am strongly in FAVOR of the special buck tags. As of now, we HAVE absolutely ZERO chance at a non resident rifle buck tag. Almost every farm and ranch family has kids that either move out of state or are NON residents while they attend college and cannot even come back and hunt their own family farm or ranch. As farm families, we all have NON-resident friends, family and yes, clients that we would like to be able to hunt our farms. We ARE NO different because we live on the east side of the river! The river should have NOTHING to do with NOT being able to have a small chance at a buck tag on OUR PRIVATE LAND. We deal with the slob road hunters for the whole pheasant, goose and deer seasons. This would finally be a good gesture for GF&P and landowner relations which are at an all time low. Wildlife has to have some kind of value or NOBODY will be able to plant habitat for wildlife. If a deer has value, people will take care of them instead of wanting them all killed off to protect their crops and stored livestock feed. 500 tags spread across the whole eastern side of the state is minimal. The people who complain about not having a place to hunt is because they don't take the time to foster a relationship with a landowner. Some people think just because they are a resident, they are just OWED a quality place to hunt in the name of "tradition" without contributing anything to actual habitat or helping PRODUCE wildlife. Thanks for your consideration.

Cody Warne

Amy Poole

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I was born and raised in SD.

I am not anti hunting but I greatly oppose the NPBP program.

It is wrong to trap live bearing animals in the spring.

Their fur is no good and they are pregnant or raising their young.

This decision has many SD residents upset.

We are disgusted it is happening again.

Cody Warne

Pierre SD

Position: support

Comment:

Please change my last post To SUPPORT. It accidentally hit oppose
Thanks
Cody Warne

Bill Koupal

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am opposed to the addition of any non-resident deer licenses.

Dan Thayer

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

It's my understanding that the topic of adding 500 additional east river deer tags for non-residents will be discussed. I am not opposed to non-resident landowners applying for tags but not additional tags. The numbers of tags available need to be left to the biologists and the non-resident landowners need to be included in the draw, no additional tags above and beyond this.

Alexander Russo

Hecla SD

Position: support

Comment:

I support the idea of adding special east river deer tags for a couple reasons. I feel that the increase in Non-Resident opportunity to come to this state is always a positive for more reasons than one. It helps the department with funding, helps rural communities, and helps people want to come to our state. I think that there is an abundance of opportunities west river for big game, but we lack that same opportunity for non residents east river. The odds of shooting a whitetail deer are much larger east river than west river in most scenarios. I think this would help people wanting to run business off of this idea as well. Yes people will say it will ruin their deer hunting and will be selfish because they don't want to lose any opportunity themselves. The reality is they are private land tags and permission is up to the landowners. If people don't want them to hunt they don't have to let them, if a farmer allows them to hunt then thats the farmers choice and no one else.

Darrel Reinke

Ft. Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please deny the petition to add 500 special buck tags EastRiver for non-residents. It is no more than another step to commercialize hunting. Any such move drives resident hunters to quit hunting which increases the problem of decreasing resident hunters. Thank you

Darrel Reinke

Ft. Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please deny the petition to add 500 Special Buck rags for Non Residents in East River. This is no more than yet another attempt to commercialize hunting in our state. Each step we take in that directions further reduces the number of residents that hunt. We are losing resident hunters at an alarming rate. This is Avery slippery slope. Thank you.

Anthony Carpino

Gainesville VA

Position: support

Comment:

I strongly support the East River Special Buck proposal. As a nonresident with friends/family in South Dakota it is about time that nonresidents had a small chance to come and hunt on friends and families properties with a gun.

Hunting has always been a family tradition that needs to be encouraged, and the East River Special Buck proposal is one was to help encourage and support that tradition.

Please support that proposal.

Respectfully,
Anthony Carpino

Bruce Aughtry

Greenville Sc SC

Position: support

Comment:

I strongly SUPPORT The East River Special Buck Proposal

Jesse Ekeren

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

On the topic of 500 additional non resident landowner tags.

If non-resident landowners need or want tags lets address that directly instead of opening the door to commercialization of East River Deer tags to non-residents.

Thank you

Cally Galloway

Greenville SC

Position: support

Comment:

Support the east river special buck proposal and would love to have a chance to hunt my friends property during gun season.

John Duffy

Oldham SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am in strong opposition to adding 500 East River special buck deer licenses to the 2020 season for nonresidents. I do NOT want to see the further commercialization of deer hunting in South Dakota. The demand for buck tags East River is already much too high as many residents have to wait several years to get a buck tag in the area they live. Not to mention the deer population is generally MUCH lower than it used to be, so we don't need to be adding more tags, even if it is "only 500". Rifle deer hunting has already degraded so much most of eastern South Dakota the last decade anyway.

Nonresidents should not get preference over residents even if they are willing to pay more for a special buck tag and to pay to hunt with an outfitter or a landowner that is leasing their land. This will take away existing private land hunting access to our current residents and force them to find new places to hunt, which is nearly impossible now and with the limited East River public land already being way too overpopulated.

If this were to pass then it would be very likely that a nonresident could get a buck tag EVERY year in the same area that it takes two or three years for a resident to get a buck tag. That is not right! South Dakota does not need this. Nonresidents have never been able to rifle hunt bucks East River to my knowledge and now is not the time to start. Please vote no on this petition!

Thank you!

Cody Warne

Pierre SD

Position: support

Comment:

I just wanted to voice my SUPPORT for the nest predator bounty program. Finally the department is spending money on something that actually makes a difference. It's simple MATH, when predators are gone, nests and birds will survive. My dad had more fun and trapped countless skunks and coons last summer with his traps. We never even turned any in for the bounty which I'm sure hundreds of others were also trapped and never turned in which is great. I don't know of a single reason to have skunks around. The only thing I would do is add coyotes to the list. Absolutely no reason not to have them included. I'll promise as out of control they have become over the last decade, they do more damage and cover more ground than all of the others combined. Your outdated "biologists" studies that were done back in the 70's the claiming that coyotes don't eat pheasant nests are simply wrong. They will smell out and eat the hen AND the nest. My 12 year old fat Labrador will grab one a walk in the cattails during the fall. I'm positive a coyote is a way more efficient hunter. I hope you continue this program, it's also a great way to get kids outdoors. Thanks Cody Warne

Mary Hawkins

Pierre SD

Position: support

Comment:

Dear commissioners, I strongly urge you support the east river special buck tags. It's finally time to be able to have friends, family members and our kids who have out of state residency for school to be able to hunt OUR FARM. It's simply NOT RIGHT that our kids work on the farm all summer and then go out of state to college and can't have any chance to deer hunt while back for thanksgiving. We feed this wildlife year round and should have some say if we want a non resident to hunt our farm. Thank you for listening and hopefully supporting this proposal.
Mary Hawkins

Danny Limmer

Lake Norden SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

East River nonresident deer. Please protect resident opportunity first. SD is not a shooting preserve.

Tanner Bothwell

Pierre SD

Position: support

Comment:

I completely agree with the idea of issuing Non-Resident Special Buck tags East River. We have friends and family that are never able to come hunt the family farm, since they are Non Residents.

Lon Sharp

Hot Springs SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please vote no on the request for additional 500 East River deer licenses for 2020 as requested by the outfitter group. The commercialization of hunting is the slow death of family, friends and local community social hunting.

Quintin Biermann

Groton SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am writing in to strong oppose the 500 additional NR ER special buck licenses. I fear with this South Dakota will soon develop into what Texas has become, where the wildlife belong to the individual person or landowner and not the public. Walk in area recruitment will go down with the upswing in guided deer hunts. This will further separate those who have from those who have not, and will ultimately put South Dakota sportsman at the back of the line.

Kathy Keys

Pierre SD

Position: other

Comment:

I am opposed to the Nest Predator Bounty Program. It is a waste of money. You are killing innocent animals and it hasn't proven to help. The animals being killed are keeping ticks, insects and other rodents in check. You are causing more of a problem than you are solving. Then there isn't any money for education, but you can give it away to trappers! If you are going to spend the money, repair the existing habitat for pheasants.

Jim Scull

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The revised deer season draw process seemed to accomplish nothing. I talk to a lot of deer hunters and no one represented they thought it accomplished what it intended to and no one is in favor of continuing this deer season drawing method.

William Graves

Belle Fourche SD

Position: other

Comment:

Fish limits, especially slots, in the black hills and all over the state. Need to be enforced more properly. I hear stories daily if people keeping a limit of slot fish from orman in the morning, going out l, and keeping another limit of all or mostly slot fish in the afternoon. I constantly hear of people taking rainbows from unauthorized places in Spearfish canyon, and so many other issues across the state. Yes we can turn in poachers, and it's something that I as an angler in this state take very seriously, but when they eat the evidence or keep it in their freezer at home it's impossible to have the evidence to prove it. In 4 or 5 months worth of fishing I may run into a game warden once, and if so they check my license and that's it. If we want to keep fisheries alive and well there needs to be punishments for those who are damaging them.

Joy Fricke

Greenfield WI

Position: oppose

Comment:

Predator tail bounty is totally inhumane!

Eric Bartels

Orange City IA

Position: other

Comment:

I just heard on the radio that sales of hunting licenses are down. A recommendation to increase revenue would be to allow Non Residents to have the full season to hunt pheasants instead of two 5 day periods. The people that come for opener usually will not be back, but this would allow border state hunters more time to hunt and would then justify more of them purchasing small game licenses.

Markie Scholz

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please take a much closer look at reinstating the bounty program for another year. Your mission statement states that you are stewards of the natural lands of South Dakota and that you are protecting ecosystems. Slaughter of "predators" in the most inhuman way imaginable does not do that. Please.

Todd Magnuson

Trent SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose the bounty program

Brayden Bingham

Brookings SD

Position: support

Comment:

I think it should be close to the same as last year

Tom Frier

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Reasonable conditions for travel to Bushes Landing from Sunset Lodge down to the ramp

Steve Cherkas

Edgemont SD

Position: support

Comment:

I would like to see Lion Season open to trapping (at minimum on private ground) so that a lion trapped = a lion shot. Lion activity way up here on my land in southern Hills. Released 2 from coyote traps this season.

Steve Cherkas

Edgemont SD

Position: support

Comment:

I would like bobcat season extended (set back to what it was before it was shortened) so that it starts when cats fur is prime in early December. IMO any concern on cat population is unfounded as their numbers have more to do with rabbits than harvest.

Alysha Goldsmith

Sate College PA

Position: other

Comment:

I am writing as a South Dakota resident and a supporter of Born Free USA to express my opposition to the South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks Agency's decision to allow the killing of 60 mountain lions (or 40 female mountain lions) in the 2020 hunting season. Mountain lions are primarily hunted for sport and trophy hunting is a cruel and ineffective method of wildlife management, whether it happens overseas or here at home.

Mountain lions play a vital role in ecosystem management, which benefits humans and other animals alike. They primarily prey on deer and elk, which helps manage ungulate populations and deter the spread of illnesses such as chronic wasting disease. The species also preys on other animals, like rodents and rabbits, helping to keep "pest" populations under control, too.

Mountain lions are already under pressure from human population growth and habitat encroachment and trophy hunting will just be one more deadly pressure on this important species.

What is more, a growing number of Americans, including many South Dakotans like myself, are speaking out in opposition to trophy hunting and want laws and policies to reflect these anti-trophy hunting sentiments. In the U.S. House of Representatives, a recently reintroduced bill, the ProTECT Act (H.R. 4804), would amend the Endangered Species Act (ESA) to prohibit taking endangered or threatened species in the United States as a trophy and the importation of any endangered or threatened species as a trophy into the country.

I urge the Agency to reverse this harmful decision and to instead investigate compassionate means of wildlife management, such as translocating mountain lions from areas where their presence is problematic to other, more suitable locations.

Aaron Lefever

Bartlett IL

Position: other

Comment:

I am writing as a South Dakota resident and a supporter of Born Free USA to express my opposition to the South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks Agency's decision to allow the killing of 60 mountain lions (or 40 female mountain lions) in the 2020 hunting season. Mountain lions are primarily hunted for sport and trophy hunting is a cruel and ineffective method of wildlife management, whether it happens overseas or here at home.

Mountain lions play a vital role in ecosystem management, which benefits humans and other animals alike. They primarily prey on deer and elk, which helps manage ungulate populations and deter the spread of illnesses such as chronic wasting disease. The species also preys on other animals, like rodents and rabbits, helping to keep "pest" populations under control, too.

Mountain lions are already under pressure from human population growth and habitat encroachment and trophy hunting will just be one more deadly pressure on this important species.

What is more, a growing number of Americans, including many South Dakotans like myself, are speaking out in opposition to trophy hunting and want laws and policies to reflect these anti-trophy hunting sentiments. In the U.S. House of Representatives, a recently reintroduced bill, the ProTECT Act (H.R. 4804), would amend the Endangered Species Act (ESA) to prohibit taking endangered or threatened species in the United States as a trophy and the importation of any endangered or threatened species as a trophy into the country.

I urge the Agency to reverse this harmful decision and to instead investigate compassionate means of wildlife management, such as translocating mountain lions from areas where their presence is problematic to other, more suitable locations.

Bob Miller

Hot Springs SD

Position: other

Comment:

The allowing rifles for spring turkey season only on private land as safe. Thinking that your are the only hunter within rifle distance, is only an assumption.

Assumptions in the hunting world hardly ever to never work out well. While the Rancher did gave you permission to hunt, doesn't mean that he gave only YOU permission ! Or someone got lost and wondered in on this land. It could even be a member of your own hunt that got turned around and walked into you.

In the last Spring Turkey / Rifle fatal incident in 1999. That hunter too, assumed that what they saw though their scoped .223 rifle was a turkey that had a beard. And this at 48 yards.

While also on the subject. What is said about a rifle caliber being too small , or too large? A .22 rim fire is inadequate. While a high velocity center fire may damage too much of the bird to make for good table fare.

I can not support this rule change. The attached spreadsheet shows while there maybe have not been that many of incidents. All five turkey/rifle incidents have occurred during the Spring season ,and have been fatal.

Public Waters

Scott Zieske

Rapid City SD

Position: support

Comment:

I would very much like to see more specific emphasis on promoting, sustaining and improving populations of WILD trout on Black Hills streams. That effort should include special regulations where suitable to increase average fish size and reproduction. Depending on the scope of proposed stream improvements, perhaps more than two watersheds/tributaries should be considered and conducted annually. Finally, if funding is a continuing problem for such projects, perhaps a "Trout Stamp" program should be re-considered. Thanks you for GF&P's hard work and continuing commitment to the best quality fishing in the Black Hills.

Sarah Stout

Hill City SD

Position: other

Comment:

No gold or uranium mining.

Rules Review Chapters 41:06-41:07

Jacob Herrick

Eagan MN

Position: oppose

Comment:

The proposal in front of the game commission this week to have non resident, east river private land special buck deer tags. My Family lives and ranches in Britton, Langford, and Bristol SD. I work in the two cities to support my family. I have a son that is 7 and passionate about the outdoors. I also have another son due March 7. The family ranch is something we all cherish. We as a family find it frustrating that we can provide the love for the outdoors and food on our table at our own family ranch. Due to the fact we cannot rifle hunt deer. If passed it would give a nonresident the ability to possibly come home and hunt on the family farm. Currently there are zero non resident rifle deer tags east river, these would be the same as our special buck tags, landowner permission required, and good on private land only. My family has ranched in South Dakota for over a century. Traditions are important to keep the community strong. Even though we live out of town. We're apart of the South Dakota community and I feel that this rule or regulations are taking away from the South Dakota experience for my family.

Jordan Nothdurft

Brandon SD

Position: support

Comment:

All for allowing non-residents to apply for licenses in east river. This would allow my brother and I to hunt together again on our family land

Mark Peterson

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

We cannot provide enough opportunity for our residents so we came up with a new application system, that in my conversations with at least 50 hunters was unwanted and disliked, but now we are going to open east river deer to special nonresident tags. This is just another affront to pay hunting and guide services. Please start listening to your constituents and stop the assault on resident hunting and fishing opportunities.

Mark Kisely

Volga SD

Position: other

Comment:

Department of Game, Fish and Parks: Amend rules to eliminate unnecessary language; amend form and style; update authorities; amend language for the purposes of consistency; repeal 41:06:04:16, 41:06:11:02, 41:06:14:05, 41:06:15:04, 41:06:17:02, 41:06:34:02, 41:06:35:02, 41:06:39:02, 41:06:40:02, 41:06:41:05, 41:06:42:03, 41:06:47:05, 41:06:49:02, 41:06:60:03, and 41:07:02:05; consolidate rules; eliminate a public swimming area on Mina Lake; eliminate the no wake zone on Lake Norden; modify the endemic area by adding additional deer and elk hunting units; allow for the use of rifles to hunt turkeys in West River on private land; move the rifle restriction to ARSD 41:06:04:12; alter the start date for the low plains middle and north zones duck hunting season; decrease the daily bag limit of scaup ducks from three to one; create a nonresident East River special "any whitetail deer" license; increase the total "any elk" and "antlerless elk" in the Black Hills hunting season; modify the total number of "any elk" licenses for the Custer State Park elk hunting season and early archery elk hunting season; modify the total number of "any elk" and "antlerless elk" licenses available for the archery elk hunting season; modify the start date for the youth waterfowl hunting season; create two additional bighorn sheep units; modify the number of "any elk" and "antlerless elk" licenses issued during the prairie elk hunting season; add a new prairie elk unit and establish hunting dates; and restrict the

I would like to see this same rule for East River private land turkey Hunting.

Waterfowl Hunting Season-Duck

Tyler Richardson

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I strongly oppose any changes to the number of non resident waterfowl hunters in the state. With the current system there is already left over licenses and near a 100% draw rate for the 10 day licenses so there is not a need for increasing the tags. GFP has continuously catered to everyone but the resident outdoorsmen from nonmeandered water issue to screwing up the deer hunting opportunities in the state. You want to increase sportsman I. The field with the duck limit proposals and the apprentice deer but continually you choose to drive people away by catering to big money and out of state hunters. It's really a shame what is happening to the state that I grew up in.

Robert Sayles

Beresford SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am not in favor of any of the new options to increase non-resident licenses for waterfowl. South Dakota does not need to commercialize hunting any more than it already is. The options presented cater to a select few and do not represent most SD residents.

Chad Lade

Madison SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please keep south dakota a non commercialized waterdowl hunting state. I have children and will have grand children and i appreciate how this topic stands. We do not NEED the money we are doing just fine with the way we are right now. I trust the gfp and have never been given a reason to turn on them. Let the pheasant hunters bring us our money...

Jerrod Looft

Fort Thompson SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I do not wish that our state's waterfowl resources be sold off to guides and out of state hunters like pheasants have. If you want to recruit and keep more in state hunters you can't make the resource worse and expect a positive result. I would vote no on all the proposed changes to non resident waterfowl license options.

Zachary Sellin

Brookings SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am a rather new resident of South Dakota, moved from Nebraska to go to college in Brookings. After being able to hunt ducks in South Dakota for the past two seasons I have had great success, the duck hunting is much better than Nebraska due to more water in this state. Recently, I saw the proposition to move the season back a couple more days. Rather than starting the big duck season September 26th, I propose moving the start date for the Low Plains North & Middle Zones to October 3rd, first Saturday in October and closing the season the 14th-16th of December. This would still give the central flyway season average of 74 days. Also I propose the thought of an early teal season running for one week starting September 7th the same day as Canada goose season would open up, and make the bag limit 6 teal. Plus moving the big duck season back a week would give the northern mallards and other big ducks a greater chance to make it into South Dakota in larger numbers. Nebraska's Zone 2 duck season closes the 16-20th of December every year and the ducks are all still in South Dakota. No big duck season in the central flyway besides in Canada needs to start in September. Traditionally it was always the first or third weekend in October. Also bag limits should remain at 6 total daily. There is no need to increase to 8 birds for the whole season as I heard a rumor about that happening, this isn't Canada. Being able to shoot two bonus teal for the first two weeks is fine.

Randy Thaler

Lake Andes SD

Position: other

Comment:

Request the southern duck unit have the early blue wing teal season instead of the 2 extra teal per day for first 16 days of season. Reason season opens late and all local blue wing have migrated out of the unit. Last year did not shoot or see a blue wing once the season opened but there were plenty in the unit until the end of Sep. and 1st couple weeks into Oct.

Jim Kirk

Springfield SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The 3 year experiment of opening the low plains south zone in late October to first week of January has proven to be a huge error and I urge you to reconsider and move opening date back to where it was for years- 2 weeks after the rest of the low plains zones.. All the change accomplished has been to cut our hunting by two weeks. We hunt primarily on . Lewis & Clark Lake between Niobrara NE and down river from Springfield SD. There are few if any ducks left by Christmas let alone into January. By then, Lake is mostly froze in,, USACE reduces discharges & GF&P pulls boat landing docs first week of De cember Our ponds freeze over by mid November or earlier, My grand kids have little opportunity now to hunt those ponds, when the hunt is easier & still relatively warm mid October. We had only 11 days in 2018 & 9 days in 2019 to hunt pot holes below SD highway 50, as they froze over for the season. I have talked to dozens of other hunters who hunt south zone and have not found a one who likes the current later opening.

My sources indicate that the lobby for the delayed south zone season change came primarily from a hand full of folks who field hunt close to lower Frances Case, where apparently ducks must stage longer & into late December. Why don't you just redefine the high plains zone to include that portion of the south zone north of the dam at Pickstown?? You would continue to support those with field hunting interests around lower Francis Case and also satisfy those of us that hunt farther down river in the Springfield marsh area. Please reconsider. Thank you

Waterfowl Hunting Season-Goose

Bruce Brittain

New Effington SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The regulations are perfect as they are. No need to change non-resident waterfowl hunting. Please think for your resident hunters. The hunting will be harmed by enacting changes.

Test Test

Test SD

Position: other

Comment:

test

West River Spring Turkey-Use of Rifles

Paul Roghair

Kadoka SD

Position: support

Comment:

I want to thank Scott, who is not longer on the commission for all for his help with this rule change, and hope that you as the commission will support and finish what was started here as a group effort to promote more people getting into the field, holding to what has traditionally been allowed in South Dakota and still takes into account the safety of the general hunting public. I view this proposal as an excellent example of protecting the rights of the few and still providing for the safety of the many. To give landowners a say, provides for their rights, to take the rifle away from the public lands provides for the fears of the general public who may not have a choice of where to go and keeps them in what is viewed to be a safer place, and still provides the maximum opportunity to get more people into the field and hunting. Thank you Scott for all you have done and I would ask the commission to approve and finalize this proposal. Thank you

Don Doty

Divide CO

Position: support

Comment:

I would like to express my support of the use of rifle during the spring turkey hunting season. I get the NWTF as other public hunting concerns. But it is my opinion that rifle hunting should be allowed on Private lands should the landowner permit it. This would offer a solution to each party's concerns. I would like others to voice their support of the use of rifles during the spring turkey hunting season. I hope the commission will hear our voices.
DON

Dr Charles Anderson

Pierre SD

Position: support

Comment:

I have been hunting turkeys WR for 40 yrs and never had or heard of a person being mistaking for a turkey. For us seniors, it's nice to still be able to go out and not hike 20 miles.

Russ Hohn

Pierre SD

Position: support

Comment:

I support the use of rifles for spring turkey hunting on private land ONLY! I have enjoyed this season for decades with my children and youth from the Pierre area. The first 2 or 3 years of hunting are the most important with regards to keeping our youth interested. A bad experience at this age can discourage them from hunting again. One such experience is "sharp recoil" stemmed by a high performance shotshell. Even adults are discouraged from this recoil. The use of "small caliber rifles" eliminates the recoil. Hunters on private land have a much better idea of fellow hunter location which greatly reduces the chance of "stray bullet" accidents. I DO NOT support the use of rifles for turkey hunting on property that is open to public hunting.

Paul Anderson

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Much too dangerous to allow rifles in any turkey season West or East. Hunting turkeys is a challenging endeavor; keep it that way. Allowing rifles would led to road hunting and ruin the experience.

Brian Irvine

Clarkfield MN

Position: support

Comment:

If I remember right the reason they were banned was because decoys are getting so realistic. This should not be an issue on private property.

Ron Schara

Ramsey MN

Position: oppose

Comment:

Rifles for turkey hunting?
Unsafe.
Unsportsmanlike
No fair chase
Not hunting; just shooting.
Disgraceful image for hunters
I've been hunting SD turkeys for 50 years; shotgun and bow.
Whoever suggested rifles ought to be ashamed.

James Dahlberg

Hot Springs SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Having been in situations where bullets were flying over my head during turkey season, I strongly oppose ANY use of rifles during a turkey season.

Jason Mathews

Sioux Falls SD

Position: support

Comment:

The rifle season should go back to how it was. It is not right to punish responsible hunters because of morons, who negligently fire a gun at a decoy and hunter. I'm in a wheelchair, and the spring rifle turkey hunt in Charles Mix has been my favorite hunt. The ability to use a rifle allows me to be able to spot a turkey and be able to maneuver my wheelchair within a decent range to get a shot on them. My friends can see a Tom, in the bottom of river valley draw 150 yards straight down, and they can stalk it, whereas I can't. The rifle allows me to make up for my wheelchair.

Stephen Dussinger

Windsor CO

Position: support

Comment:

I fully support the use of rifles for Turkey hunting the West River season on private land. I am from out of state, and have limited time to hunt - usually just one weekend. Depending on the situation, using a rifle can increase my chances of harvesting a Turkey. In my past hunts, I have used a rifle to hunt about half of the time. I would love to have the option to use a rifle. On private land, I don't see any safety issues or other downsides of having the option. Thanks.

Bruce Porisch

Flandreau SD

Position: support

Comment:

I am getting old (72 years old) and mobility issues are just around the corner. I would like to continue to be able to hunt turkeys. I hunt in an area that has many, many rolling hills and turkeys abound. I use walking sticks more and more. I shot my turkey last year with a shotgun and I thoroughly enjoyed the experience, but I have friends that simply cannot walk the hills and get into a position to shoot a bird with the shotgun. They can ride the ridges in a truck and take a position overlooking two or three draws. They can shoot using a bipod. So, in order to keep older hunters afield and to provide a safer mobility experience for them, I approve of the Firearms on Private Land Proposal.

Larry Fickel

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose this proposal for the following reasons: 1. South Dakota made a great step forward in banning the use of rifles in Spring Turkey Hunting . The safety issue of using rifles on private or public is a huge concern. A rifle can injure or kill someone in camo on adjacent public or private land that is not seen at a very long distance. 2. The issue of fair chase is my other concern. Spring turkey isnt supposed to be about just killing a turkey. Its a hunting sport. In my opinion , shooting a turkey with a rifle at a long distance is not sport in addition to usually destroying a good deal of the bird. If the argument for rifle hunting is depredation, then allow a hunt for that. If the argument is that it tests accuracy, then go target shooting in a safe area. Thank you for soliciting input on this issue. I trust that the most responsible decisions will be made.

Bob Miller

Hot Springs SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Private land or not. Spring Turkey hunting has a high danger factor in itself . First off, everyone is in full camo or a como tent blind.

Second, everyone is doing their best to sound like a turkey . Not a good situation.

Add in the rifle and there will be trouble. There will be longer shots taken than when a bird is called in to a shotgun baring hunter.

Spring turkey season also means thicker cover. Where seeing what is beyond your target even tougher.

The Springs rules that a "bearded" turkey is the only legal bird to harvest. Add in the thicker cover, and you need the bird close to be assured that there is a "beard" present or not.. If you try to guess, you are going to be wrong 50% of the time.

Douglas Traub

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I think the lack of logic in the proposal to allow fully camouflaged hunters (some in blinds or with life like decoys) to hunt turkeys with rifles is obvious. The part of this proposed change to allow rifle turkey hunting "only on private ground "simply aides the ambulance in finding the wounded (or dead) hunter.

I have been shot at on private ground by a hunter on a neighboring parcel before. It is a stress test I don't wish to repeat His excuse was " he thought my decoys were real turkeys".

I had a close friend shot in the side of his head with a 30-06 accelerator round due to a deflection on private ground in the past. He lived, but was probably the luckiest man in the world.

I strongly oppose the use of rifles for turkey hunting and urge the commission to defeat this proposal

Bob Miller

Hot Springs SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The allowing rifles for spring turkey season only on private land as safe. thinking that your are the only hunter within rifle distance, is only an assumption.

Assumptions in the hunting world hardly ever to never work out well. While the Rancher did gave you permission to hunt, doesn't mean that he gave only YOU permission ! Or someone got lost and wondered in on this land. It could even be a member of your own hunt that got turned around and walked into you.

In the last Spring Turkey / Rifle fatal incident in 1999. That hunter too, assumed that what they saw though their scoped .223 rifle was a turkey that had a beard. And this at 48 yards.

While also on the subject. What is said about a rifle caliber being too small , or too large? A .22 rim fire is inadequate. While a high velocity center fire may damage too much of the bird to make for good table fare.

I can not support this rule change. While there maybe have not been that many of incidents. All five turkey/rifle incidents have occurred during the Spring season ,and have been fatal.

1/13/20

My name is Ken Carter and I am recommending SD Game Fish & Parks allow non-resident landowners to purchase deer tags under a similar set of criteria as resident landowners.

Our family has owned land in South Dakota for over 30 years. 2019 marks the 28th consecutive season we've hunted our ranch. I returned last week from an archery hunt, and will be there for the opening of west river deer season. My partners will be there for the first two weekends of pheasant season, totaling 10 days.

This year, we will host over 30 family and friends from California, Nevada, Louisiana and Colorado. In addition we allow over 10 of our local South Dakota friends to enjoy hunting deer, pheasant and predators. Allowing such a large group of people to hunt is directly proportional to our conservation and farming practices. I do not know any landowners near our ranch that invests in habitat as we do. While county numbers of deer and pheasants may be down, ours remain strong.

Annually, we invest in food plots and/or leave portions of crops unharvested to provide winter food and cover for wildlife. All of our dams have been repaired over the last decade. We currently have over 250 acres of lakes and reservoirs to support waterfowl and other wildlife. We are also starting to see the benefits of our tree planting program.

Half of our ranch is farmed by a 3rd generation (soon to be 4th) South Dakota farming family, while the balance is in the Conservation Reserve Program. For over a decade we allocated approximately 1,500 acres to the Walk-in-Program to allow locals hunting access. We recently sold that acreage to a local farmer.

We invest in habitat because hunting is part of our culture. This year three generations of our family will enjoy hunting in South Dakota. Hopefully, our efforts to conserve and expand habitat will allow future generations to enjoy our land as well.

Unfortunately, our family cannot enjoy our deer hunting traditions together due to the inability to draw tags. We should have the same opportunity to enjoy our hunting traditions as local landowners. Non-resident landowners pay the same amount of property taxes as resident landowners and have little to no impact on the local services such as schools and roads.

Criteria:

- Own a minimum of 500 acres
- Only 1 tag per landowner
- Tags can only be used by landowner on his/her private land
- No SD hunting or fishing violations in last 5 years

Respectfully submitted,



Ken W. Carter
Woodland, CA

DO BOUNTIES WORK? 2-16-2020

By Larry Fredrickson, former Pheasant Research Biologist and State Furbearer Biologist (1960-1996).
Chamberlain, SD

People think you can kill one predator and get one more pheasant. Sorry, but it does not work that way. You have to understand predator/furbearer population dynamics.

Do bounties work? I refer you to "Extermination of Noxious Animal by Bounties" written by T. S. Pauvier in 1896. This was an analysis of bounties for two and one half centuries in the United States, so bounties are not anything new. Indeed, bounties were put on wolves in Mass. in 1630 and in Virginia in 1632. Most states did not do research on these programs but only experimented by themselves.

1. South Dakota bountied coyotes from 1971-1976 and some other years. I believe we have as many coyotes in South Dakota as we ever had and they apparently control their populations themselves some by range and by territorial interactions. Many coyotes were turned in for bounty money on or near state lines. Coyotes can double their litter size when under harvest pressure and increase pregnancy rates and I believe survival as well. (I could not find data on survival). Our studies indicated nature abhors blank territories and predators soon fill in spaces where they are removed.

2. Pauvier concluded that bounties may have worked on coyotes, wolves and mountain lions only to stop the increases in their populations.

3. Bounties did not control rabbits, ground squirrels and gophers and the funds were soon exhausted from county treasuries.

I believe the general public promotes bounties because they do not know anything about furbearer biology or their population dynamics. We did not have opossums when we did our studies and few people realize they can have three litters per year (10 to 20 per litter). Badger can maintain their populations easy since they can breed any month of the year because they have delayed implantation. Red fox and coyotes can double their litter size when under harvest pressure (fox-our data). People know little about compensating factors in furbearer populations.

Our predator prey studies (1965-early 70's) indicated that by intensive predator control on three 100 square mile study areas (using poison drop baits, den litter control, trapping, shooting, aerial gunning and other methods) that you had to remove 80 to 90 percent of the predator populations to even effect the brood stock (reproductive part) of the predator population. So it would be impossible to have much effect by only trapping them. I went on to do another study on trapping effect on furbearers and found some pheasant increase but was this not significantly different (so was probably only a random event).

Let's look at the 2019 SD tail bounty program. There are 51,156 square miles in the SD pheasant range (Trautman, 1982). SDGFP paid for 54,470 total predator tails. This is only 1.07 total predators taken per square mile (all species) range wide, which would not be even one of each species taken. Raccoons: 43,779 or 0.86 animals per square mile. Striped skunk 6001 or 0.12 per square mile, Opossum 3,706 or 0.07, Red fox 494 or .0097, and badger 490

or .0096. I do not believe that this would make any difference on predation in the pheasant population.

Another thing we noted in our Predator pheasant studies was that nature abhors a predator vacuum. After many predators were killed in the interior of the predator control areas, the control agents spent most of their time killing predators coming into the study area from the outside. They then spent most of their time working on the outside two square miles on the edges of the study areas.

The other thing to consider is the unknown effect of feral cats, hawks and owls on pheasant predation. You remove the other ones and these can still have some effect. Another subject that needs a research study.

South Dakota GF&P has not done pheasant research for several years. Many of our facts no longer apply because so many things have changed (farming practices, use of chemicals, etc.). We have no idea of the effects of releasing genetically and behavior inferior game farm released pheasants, and the effect of using Roundup on habitat and birds.

Another thing that needs to be considered is what people want. After we found that you could better than quadruple the pheasant population by very intensive predator control using poison and all other means on very small study areas we had public hearings and the general public did not want us to kill other predator species (even skunks) to benefit pheasants. The most important tool we had was the use of poison and this was banned in 1972.

It was economically not feasible to spend the money we did on these areas to benefit pheasants on the whole pheasant range.

When Governor Deugaard's pheasant group met they ruled against using bounties because it was impossible to tell where the animals came from (Pierre Capitol Journal). Tails can come from road kills as well as from out of state, and we think they do.

The state should have set up study areas to evaluate their program and it's effect on pheasants to prevent continuing to waste thousands of the sportsmen's dollars on this program.

Game, Fish and Parks did not document the loss of jackrabbits, Hungarian Partridge and Quail in South Dakota because of lack of funds. Without more research on Pheasants, they also will not document the loss of our pheasant resource. Without more research we will never know what happened if they disappear

We concluded that from all research available considering predator population dynamics and compensating factors that there is no way to now feasibly kill enough predators to even cut into the brood stock (the producers) and we are positive that trapping and shooting can never remove enough predators to increase pheasant populations and this program would not even remove the population reproductive surplus. Therefore the only management tool left is to use soil bank or CRP cover to increase pheasant [populations. The idea is that such large masses of cover will provide protection to some nests (they cannot find them all) and provide protection for broods as well (Predators cannot get them all).

Please spend the sportsmen's money on habitat instead. This is proven by SD results during the Soil Bank program (1.8 million acres peak) and in 2008

with 1.4 million acres in the CRP program in 2007. SD had 8.6 pheasants per square mile in 2008 and we had only 2.04 pheasant per mile in 2019.

Several states get the federal funds from CRP and sometimes they cut the CRP budget so to get our 1.4 million acres we need a Game, Fish and Parks program of CRP to supplement the federal program to get to the 1.4 million acres. There were only 484,366 acres in CRP in South Dakota in 2019(USDA)so we are now about a million acres short.



February 14, 2020

TO: South Dakota Game Fish & Parks Commission

FROM: South Dakotans Fighting Animal Cruelty Together (SD FACT)

RE: OPPOSE Nest Predator Bounty Program

Dear Sec. Hepler, Director Kirschenmann, Chairman Jensen, and Members of the Commission;

South Dakotans Fighting Animal Cruelty Together (SD FACT) again writes strongly in opposition to continuing the Nest Predator Bounty Program into the future and to any potential department sponsored legislation for 2020. With support from almost 5,000 members, we provide the following:

We remain vehemently opposed to the inhumane Nest Predator Bounty Program (NPBP). The long check-times, the lengthened season, and the unlimited numbers allowed all contribute to the inevitability of suffering for target animals and those that are indiscriminately trapped by happenstance.

There does not appear to be any scientific review of predator numbers and the effect of the bounty program upon these species. As a public resource, it is vital that accurate and unbiased information concerning predator numbers be researched. Also, given the vital role provided by these native species and their control of ticks and other disease-carrying varmints, a review of potential negative effects on human health is required.

We are requesting the Commission reverse their position to forego an environmental impact assessment under SDCL 34A-9-4 on the bounty program given these serious concerns. Failure to gather information and conduct assessments concerning the continuation of this radical program would be knowingly negligent and a clearly unwarranted abuse of your discretion as a public entity in charge of preserving a public resource and maintaining public health.

Destruction of these species does not appear to have resulted in any pheasant population increase, according to the Commission's own 2019 pheasant population survey conducted during the end of last year's bounty program period.

https://gfp.sd.gov/userdocs/docs/PBR_2019FINAL.pdf. This indication that the program is

unsuccessful matches the scientific consensus concerning these mass slaughter programs.

- 54,460 killed [not including maternally dependent offspring]
- \$1,732,264 taxpayer monies expended
- \$10/tail

We once again remind you that every animal has its role to play in an ecosystem & contributes to human health & quality of life. Here's why these varmints are so important to all of us:

Raccoon

Raccoons are scavengers and therefore are an important part of cleaning up carrion. They also dine on many other species we consider pests when numbers get out of control, including snakes, frogs, lizards, wasps and rats.

Striped skunk

Skunks do an amazing job at helping to keep insect populations in check, insects like grasshoppers, beetles, crickets and wasps. Skunks are one of the best examples of how an animal we really want to avoid is actually one we want to keep around.

Badger

Scientists call the badger a sentinel species, one that provides clues about the health of its ecosystem. They are excellent hunters of earth-dwelling prey including rabbits, groundhogs, ground squirrels, mice and snakes.

Opossum

The reality is, opossums are incredibly useful, and typically misunderstood. Ticks, particularly the black-legged ticks like deer ticks that are responsible for the spread of Lyme disease, appear to be a top item on the opossum's menu. Just one opossum eats, on average, 5,000 ticks each year.

Red fox

These varmints have a helpful side for farmers and ranchers. Like their larger canid cousin the coyote, red foxes are wonderful at keeping rodent populations down. They hunt chipmunks, rats, mice, voles and all sorts of other small rodents that can become more of a pest to humans than the fox themselves. They also eat carrion and like other supposed varmints on this list, are part of an important cleanup crew for their ecosystem.

Trapped animals can languish and die slowly from shock, dehydration, starvation and exposure to the elements. In addition, because the NPBP was initiated when these animals were rearing their young, those babies were left to die a cruel death when their mothers were killed...for their tail. Each year, traps in the United States injure and kill millions of "non-target" animals including companion animals and endangered species. Because of this cruel and unnecessary practice and the importance of the animals

involved, SD FACT strongly opposes the Nest Predator Bounty Program and urges the commission to consider all aspects of the ecosystem.

Finally, as tax paying citizens we vehemently object to the needless expenditure of state funds on this exercise. It is also your duty to spend public monies wisely and preserve our way of life for the “next century” by meeting our constitutional budgetary obligations of which this unscientific, ideological giveaway runs far afield.

Respectfully submitted,

SD FACT Board of Directors

Shari Kosel, Lead, SD

Sara Parker, Sioux Falls

Joe Kosel, Lead

sdfact.org

Patrick Hybertson
Sioux Falls, SD

I am all for the Bounty Program again and thought that it was a great way to get the youth in SD involved in trapping. My only question is if there was truly consideration for a second year of a bounty program would halving everything from the first year still pull in the public's interest? I am asking from a trapping mindset where trappers are influenced by the fur prices of various species where one may be higher than the other and that's what is targeted for the year.

I myself got really into trapping when there was an average of ten to fifteen dollars for raccoon on carcass and sometimes a high of twenty five for a really nice raccoon. Then back in the fur boom of the seventies and eighties everybody was trapping and all sorts of people were getting involved because of the high prices that sparked interest in the activity. But once the fur market crashed plenty of people hung up their steel and never really looked back. Even in present day it's hard to find people trapping a whole lot since the only thing currently worth money is coyotes. But for the youth those are a tricky species to trap especially with footholds. Currently a raccoon on carcass is averaging probably around five dollars or less which doesn't pay for the traps, gas, and equipment invested in the process. Because of that kind of pricing for fur, people have lost interest and don't even consider bothering with the time put in the trap line knowing full well that not only are they not going to break even, but they are definitely going to lose money.

I believe that the listed nest predator species of raccoon, fox, badger, opossum, and skunk are excellent species to get our youth hooked into trapping. Raccoon, opossum, and skunk are some of the easiest species for kids to start trapping and gradually work their way up in the furbearers list. This leads to improving on the variety of sets, and being able to read sign and setting on it.

My main point from the previous paragraphs is that I believe to truly peak the public's interest especially the youth I would like to make a counter proposal of offering ten dollars a tail again like the previous year. If that is unreasonable then meet me in the middle at seven dollars and fifty cents. People are already not trapping like they used to due to fur prices. If you were to offer the same prices that fur buyers are offering, what would cause the public to start trapping all of a sudden? I believe if you would want a successful goal of outreaching to our youth and even getting their parents interested, you would need to offer better prices to spark that interest and excitement we have all felt when first selling fur with the possibility of making decent money from something that you worked hard for.

Overall I think the program is great on getting more people involved with trapping and helping with an increased localized game population. Educating the public on habitat and wildlife management is really commendable for increased support and the learning aspect as a whole.

I fully support the GF&P and just wanted to voice my opinions and concerns on making a successful outreach. If \$250,000 is for sure the cap then so be it. I am also for the possibility of increasing the sales of licenses within the state as mentioned in your proposal. The only thing I would like reconsidered is the price per tail, offer better prices than the fur buyers and maybe the public would fully consider investing time and money into a fading tradition that has run deep in our history.