



Resident/Nonresident Opportunity Allocation Stakeholder Group

The SD Game, Fish and Parks (GFP) Commission and Department formed a "Resident/Nonresident Opportunity Allocation Stakeholder Group." This diverse group of citizen stakeholders and other government agencies were asked to assist the Commission in having an informed, thoughtful public discussion on an increasingly sensitive subject of allocating hunting and fishing opportunities for residents and nonresidents. The stakeholder group worked to develop suggestions on criteria for making fair, reasoned, and balanced decisions when the Commission allocates this opportunity. The Stakeholder Group offers these insights, ideas, and alternatives for consideration by the Commission in developing their criteria for allocation decisions.

Main Themes

1. **Species Abundance**
2. **Demand for Licenses**
3. **R3 – Recruitment, Retention and Reactivation**
4. **Demand for Access**
5. **Social Carrying Capacity of Residents and Nonresidents**
6. **Economics**

1. **Species Abundance**

- a. Fewer restrictions should be placed on nonresidents when populations are abundant or above population objectives found in specific species management plans.
- b. Opportunities for species of limited abundance (i.e. elk, bighorn sheep, mountain goat) will allow for little or no nonresident participation.
- c. Opportunities for abundant species (i.e. walleyes, pheasants) will allow for liberal, and in some cases, unlimited nonresident participation.
- d. Current and future populations of species should be taken into consideration.
- e. Habitat (aquatic and terrestrial) is the driving force in the population of many species. GFP commission should consider quantity and quality of habitat when allocating opportunity to residents and nonresidents.

2. **Demand for Licenses**

- a. The commission should consider demand by residents for limited licenses when allocating nonresident opportunities.
- b. Increased participation in activities where licenses are unlimited may require future limitations on both residents and nonresidents.

3. R3 – Recruitment, Retention and Reactivation

- a. The commission should look to continue to expand both youth and new participants regardless of age.
- b. When possible, regulations should be simplified and streamlined.
- c. Expansion of resident outdoor activities should be encouraged.

4. Demand for Access

- a. When limiting access for one opportunity or user group, limiting access for all opportunities and user groups should be considered.
- b. As competition for public land access becomes greater, limitations on resident and/or nonresidents may be needed.
- c. Some specific geographic locations may require limited access due to hunting pressure or management objectives.
- d. Temporal/Spacial distribution of hunters and anglers may ease public access concerns.
- e. Crowding can have a negative impact on resident hunting experience.

5. Social Carrying Capacity of Residents and Nonresidents

- a. There is a point where the conflict between residents and nonresidents causes a decline in resident participation.

6. Economics

- a. Economics should not trump management decisions.
- b. Impact to GFP budget should be considered when allocating opportunity.
- c. GFP Commission should recognize the economic impact to local communities, landowners (farmers/ranchers), outfitters and the state of SD.
- d. Economic impact to landowners (farmers/ranchers).

Additional conversation topics that were considered but not included at this time:

- The status/abundance of habitat and how it impacts opportunity.
- Landownership. Amount of public vs. private land and the demand for use of each by hunters.
- Who are nonresidents and does it matter (family, business associates, one time users, etc.).
- If restrictions are put on number of individuals who can use a certain piece of public land, where do they go? Do they create another crowding issue someplace else? Quit hunting?