

Public Comments

Antelope (Firearm and Archery)

Brian Ermer

Aberdeen SD

Position: support

Comment:

I would like to see SD residents have opportunities at more quality than quantity. This is a step in the right direction.

I also pay high tag fees to hunt out of state as well. There is no reason why our state should be different if out of state hunters want to hunt I. Our state.

Joel Murano

Aberdeen SD

Position: support

Comment:

I support the petition increasing license fees for non resident archery antelope. Our state has by far and away the most liberalized license fees for non residents. Increasing the fees to fall in line with the petition still makes them extremely affordable when compared to many western states. I also support a cap on archery antelope licenses for non residents. I have bowhunted archery antelope for 15 years and the last two the amount of pressure in the areas with high historic antelope populations is excessive. I do not oppose non residents, I frequently hunt out of state myself, but the reality is with many other states becoming more challenging to get licenses, and the ease of information online, the secret is out. South Dakota's resources are vast, and if we don't make reasonable reforms now, harder decisions that will affect resident hunters will become topics of discussion later. These reforms are necessary and reasonable.

Charles Pugsley

Mina SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jeremy Iverson

Groton SD

Position: other

Comment:

I support the sd bow hunters proposal for decreasing the quantity of non-resident tags.

4 years ago, I had double doe antelope tags and there weren't enough antelope then to warrant double doe tags. I feel restricting license now to grow the population for years to come is long overdue.

I oppose youth/mentor tags being moved to private land only, but allowed to hunt public land as well. This group should not be limited to people who only know land owners.

Thanks you,
Jeremy

Anthony Filholm

Brookings SD

Position: support

Comment:

I am in full agreement of Petition 138 that makes NR antelope archers draw for a limited amount of tags and raises the fees. Its time to support residents.

Archery and Muzzleloader Season

Brian Ermer

Aberdeen SD

Position: support

Comment:

High prices and limits for out of state provides better opportunities for our state hunters. I would like to see quality over quantity

Joel Murano

Aberdeen SD

Position: support

Comment:

I support the petitions to increase license fees for non resident archery licenses. It's a reasonable increase compared to many other states. I support limiting the amount of licenses a non resident can have to one any deer license. These are reasonable requests that make sense. Non residents comprise a large statistical aggregate of the total antelope and deer harvest in the state with archery equipment. Some areas their harvest numbers for deer and antelope are at similar levels to firearm harvest for residents. The increase in tag purchases the last few years for non residents and subsequently their harvest share is not sustainable nor fair to residents. I do not oppose non residents, rather feel that reform is needed.

Charles Pugsley

Mina SD

Position: support

Comment:

Petition to rule 41:06:22:01 should be considered. The data sure looks compelling as laid out by SD Bowhunters.

Jeremy Iverson

Groton SD

Position: support

Comment:

I support the sd bow hunters proposal for decreasing the quantity of non-resident tags.

Residents should come first in our support of wildlife in sd.

Thanks you,
Jeremy

Anthony Filholm

Brookings SD

Position: support

Comment:

I am in favor of adopting petition 139 which limits NR archery deer hunters by draw quotas. Why are we trying to raise the quality of our mule deer to then have them harvested by out of state hunters. Does not seem fair to the people of South Dakota. The cost of the license needs to increase as well for them.

Greg Stoebner

Webster SD

Position: other

Comment:

This comment is pertaining to a petition submitted by SD Bow hunter Association for Non Resident archery tags and pricing. I would be in favor of having a reasonable limit on NR Archery tags. It would make sense to follow firearm season caps at this time. I am not in favor of raising the price of the NR license. We are all Nonresidents somewhere, and I am tired of getting priced out in other states because a bordering state raised prices.

Other

Blake Kopf

Yankton SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose the changes to limiting the number of nonresident archery deer tags. We already take away one month of the year to give to residents. I hunt in South Dakota as a resident but, also go to other states to hunt and the trend seems to be trying to make it more difficult for nonresidents to come in and hunt. If you keep making it harder and harder for people to come why would they want to support any conservation or businesses in the area. Having more hunters in the field is a good thing, maybe not for the guy who wants am to never see a person while hunting, but a good thing for the sport and for conservation. A better area of change would be to move the rifle season out of the rut to preserve larger Buck numbers.

Mary Fisher

Winner SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The regulations on limiting the number of licenses is insane. With deer over population rampant across the state it is utterly ridiculous. The new website is difficult if not impossible to navigate and I am good with technology. Hire a decent firm to redo it.

Nancy Hilding

Black Hawk, SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I strongly oppose the Nest Predator Bounty program and have testified or written against this program repeatedly. It is a waste of government money. It is ineffective and cruel. SD has a 3 and a partial day trap check time west River and a 2 and a partial trap check time east River. SDGFP desperately needs reform of our trapping rules. Trapping is not recreation as you have to bribe people to do it -- they trap for money. It is a commercial activity

Nancy Hilding

Black Hawk SD

Position: other

Comment:

SD Law requires a biennial review of threatened & endangered species:

"34A-8-4. Biennial review of lists of endangered and threatened species--Amendments.

The Game, Fish and Parks Commission shall conduct a review of the state list of endangered and threatened species within the period ending July 3, 1979, and every two years thereafter and may amend the list by appropriate additions or deletions.

Source: SL 1977, ch 335, § 3."

To list or delist requires rule making. I see nothing on the agenda about the biennial review for summer 2022. When will it happen?

What has SD GFP done about the Lake Chub in the last two years? I petitioned to have it listed as endangered at September meeting 2 years ago & you all said you needed more time to study the fish & search for it.

So what did you discover? When is the biennial review where this can be discussed?

Nancy Hilding

Black Hawk SD

Position: other

Comment:

Nancy Hilding to SDGFP

I am writing a note at 11:16 pm MT. This is before midnight MT. The public hearing is held in Spearfish which is in MT. Thus the 72 hours before the day of the hearing, should be decided in MT.

In the past, when the hearing was in western SD, held in MT, you rejected messages posted before midnight MT but after midnight CT and moved them into next month's comment pile. This is illegal and a violation of law, and I objected to it.

I am not checking to see which month's public comment set this letter ends up in. I hope July but I am predicting September.

I suspect you just have a AI doing the comment letter sorting/division and it is on automatic pilot and it is set for CT and you don't reprogram it when the hearing moves to MT.