

# GAME, FISH AND PARKS COMMISSION ACTION PROPOSAL

## Chapter Name Chapters 41:06:02:03 and 41:10:01:03.01

<b>Commission Meeting Dates:</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>July 16-17</b>	<b>Pierre, SD</b>
	<b>Public Hearing</b>	<b>Sept 2-3</b>	<b>Rapid City, SD</b>
	<b>Finalization</b>	<b>Sept 2-3</b>	<b>Rapid City, SD</b>

### DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION (S)

#### Recommended changes:

1. Create two new small game permit types and establish fee:
  - a. Resident small game unrestricted permit (Unrestricted – Valid on private shooting preserves only).
  - b. Nonresident shooting preserve unrestricted permit (Unrestricted).
2. Amend bag limits on for individuals hunting private shooting preserves to reflect no bag limit when hunting with an unrestricted small game license or an unrestricted shooting preserve license.
3. Licenses would only be valid if used in conjunction with an already existing license that authorizes a hunter to hunt on PSP properties. For example: a nonresident would have to purchase either a nonresident small game license or 1 day, 5 day or annual PSP license first, and then could purchase an unrestricted nonresident shooting preserve license on top of their existing license and hunt unrestricted on PSPs that offer the option.
4. Amend language that would only allow an individual to exercise the unrestricted portion of their license in party hunting if all parties to the hunt have the same license.
5. Depending on method of sale, may have to amend reporting requirements by PSP operators to include tracking of unrestricted license sales.

### SUPPORTIVE INFORMATION

The Department has been in contact with private shooting preserve operators and other stake holders to determine whether there is support for the opportunity for hunters to shoot an unrestricted bag limit on private shooting preserves. There was support among the groups so long as the additional cost was on the hunter and not the preserve operators.

### RESIDENT/NONRESIDENT CRITERIA

1. The Issue
  - Why make the change, what are the change alternatives, how will public/stakeholder input be solicited, and how will the change be evaluated if implemented?
    - i. Answer: The change was requested by several preserve operators. After group discussions with preserve operators across the state, there was support for an unlimited opportunity as long as the cost did not impact those preserves that did not wish to provide this opportunity.
2. Historical Considerations
  - What are the current and projected trends in resident and nonresident license sales, documented and/or perceived hunter densities and the ramifications of these densities?
    - i. Answer: No significant changes in license sales or hunter densities.

<b>APPROVE</b> _____	<b>MODIFY</b> _____	<b>REJECT</b> _____	<b>NO ACTION</b> _____
----------------------	---------------------	---------------------	------------------------

- How do neighboring states address the identified issue?
    - i. Answer: Many states allow for an unrestricted take of birds on private shooting preserves. These modifications would
3. Biological Considerations
    - What is the current and projected status of the population and habitat conditions for these populations?
      - i. Answer: Shooting preserves harvest is primarily made up of released birds and therefore have little to no impact on the wild population of pheasants.
  4. Social Considerations
    - How would the change affect resident and nonresident: current and future generations of families, opportunities to expand outdoor recreation participation and patterns of land ownership.
      - i. Answer: Offering an additional opportunity to purchase an unrestricted license could attract additional hunters who are looking for this opportunity. Furthermore, it does not restrict or change how people have traditionally hunted on private shooting preserves.
  5. Financial considerations
    - What are the financial implications of the change for current and future: revenue for GFP; the proportional contributions of revenue from residents and nonresidents to support species and habitat management programs, and the ability of GFP to support species and habitat management programs, program income for landowners to manage habitat, sales tax collections in SD, and personal income of business owners and their employees.
      - i. Answer: Allocating license dollars from these new licenses specifically for habitat could create a new source of revenue helping build better and more habitat.

### RECRUITMENT, RETENTION, REACTIVATION (R3) CRITERIA

1. Does the regulation or fee inhibit a user's ability to participate?
  - a. No
2. Does the regulation increase the opportunity for new and existing users?
  - a. Yes
3. How does the regulation impact the next generation of hunters, anglers, trappers and outdoor recreationists?
  - a. The new regulation would allow an opportunity that does not currently exist.
4. Does the regulation enhance the quality of life for current and future generations by getting families outdoors?
  - a. Yes – the additional opportunity could attract a unique subset of hunters

APPROVE _____	MODIFY _____	REJECT _____	NO ACTION _____
---------------	--------------	--------------	-----------------