

Public Comments

Bighorn Sheep

Ron Schauer

Crooks SD

Position: other

Comment:

This is just a suggestion, If the commission finalizes the Big Horn Sheep proposal for CSP (4 licenses), I believe the 4th tag should go to Applicants with 20 or more years of preference. This would help give those hunters with the most years of preference a better chance to draw. I also realize with the phenomena outbreak 4 tags may not end up being finalized. Thanks you for your consideration. Ron Schauer

Elk

Ron Schauer

Crooks SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am opposed to the CSP Elk proposal. I believe there is no biological reason why the CSP elk proposal could not include a FEW (5-10) cow elk tags. As a retired wildlife manager with over 37 years of experience and a person that spends a fair amount of time in the park, I see many elk and to let a few hunters harvest 5-10 cows would not harm the population. Also, there are hundreds of hunters sitting on many years of preference that could possibly draw a tag. This might even free up another elk tag in another unit that another hunter might be able to draw. Thank you for your consideration. Ron Schauer

Ryan Duffy

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

no additional tags needed especially no land owner preferences that can be re sold to non residents for profit.

Nonresident Waterfowl

David Ode

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Additional non-resident waterfowl licenses are simply not needed at this time.

William Koupal

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The proposal for an additional increase in nonresident licenses is universally opposed by resident waterfowlers, and for good reason. The proposal increases already intense competition for access, particularly in the eastern part of the state. Passage, in spite of overwhelming opposition, will add to the feeling that the commission is indifferent to the interests of of South Dakota's sportsmen and women.

William Koupal

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The proposal for an additional increase in nonresident licenses is universally opposed by resident waterfowlers, and for good reason. The proposal increases already intense competition for access, particularly in the eastern part of the state. Passage, in spite of overwhelming opposition, will add to the feeling that the commission is indifferent to the interests of of South Dakota's sportsmen and women.

Jeffrey Olson

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Duck survey numbers show a decline in numbers the last two years and the GFP raises the non-resident numbers two year in a row. Please start looking at the science and listen to the sportsmen of our great state.

Charles Dieter

Brookings SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The residents of South Dakota are tired of being bombarded with nonresident waterfowl hunters. Last year, I had 4 separate incidents where non-residents ruined a hunting trip. The Commission is supposed to protect hunting and fishing for residents of the state. We live here, pay taxes here, buy our things here and raise our kids here. Please do not support the increase in nonresident hunting licenses. If you want to add licenses, add them all to Fall River county rather to where residents hunt. Northeast SD is covered with NR hunters from November 1- Thanksgiving. They all come to a 5-county area during the same time frame. I am asking you to support the residents of the state by voting against the increase. For every NR license added, we will lose at least one resident waterfowl hunter. The SD Waterfowl Association has 500 members and all are opposed to the increase. The SD Wildlife Federation has 4,000 members all opposed to an increase in NR waterfowl licenses. That represents 4,500 people against the increase. How many letters of support have you received?

Alan Thomas

Huron SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

GF&P COMMISSION MEMBERS: am not sure if my first message was sent so I am sending another.

Please do not increase the Nonresident Waterfowl Licenses by 5% or any percent.

Thank you,
Alan Thomas
Huron

Jon Olson

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I strongly urge the commission to vote no on increasing NR waterfowl licenses. The reason fewer residents duck hunt is due to the overwhelming influence NR have on the sport. The land-leasing , the guiding and outfitting leaves nothing for the blue-collar resident. And when the public ground , which now is mostly dry, we just give up. Your bad decisions in policy is destroying the very culture you love to promote to the high rollers.

Jake Sheffield

Brandon SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

As a resident Waterfowl hunter I oppose this proposition. After calling and speaking to several Commissioners, their main argument for this proposal is that they are allowed to increase it by 5% and haven't done so in a while so they should now. Just because you can, doesn't mean you should, especially if the majority of the resident waterfowl community is against it. By his own admission, the commissioner who put forward this proposal doesn't waterfowl hunt and doesn't plan on starting. There are more than enough opportunities for non-residents as it is and efforts towards habitat improvement and hunter recruitment would be far more justified. Just to be clear if this is passed, the Commission will be doing so based on nothing other than previous legislation that allows them to do so and it will be in direct contradiction of what their fellow sportsman and constituents want.

Paul Lepisto

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

See Attachment #12301

Tye Kjeldgaard

Wagner SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Marc Hamiel

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

It's hard enough getting on land to hunt. With more non resident tags that would only make it harder for us residents. Land owners would start leasing more land than they already do for paid hunting.

Tim Smith

Bowdle SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

My name is Tim Smith and I have been a resident of South Dakota for over 20 years.

I am heavily invested in resident waterfowl hunting in the state of South Dakota. I am opposed to increasing the numbers of nonresident waterfowl licenses.

Primary concern is increased hunting pressure will have a significant impact on the well-being of the flyway for the state of South Dakota. I have observed the negative impact of non-resident hunters in the state of North Dakota. Nonresident, hunters, create conflict situations with local landowners owners And decrease the quality of hunting opportunities for our youth programs.

The increase of non-resident hunters will be a vital blow to the youth mentorship opportunities that we offer to Young hunters in our area.

We have experienced significant hunting pressure and reduced participation of locals pheasant hunting due to the popular industry of pheasant and deer hunting.

Waterfowl hunting is a natural right for South Dakota citizens that should be defended.

I will actively oppose any lawmaker and committee member that advocates for the increase of nonresident hunting permits.

Adam Spies

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Tom Viet

Renner SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

James Kirk

Springfield SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Tom Curran

Yankton SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please oppose any increase in nonresident waterfowl permits for the sake of quality hunts for our residents, nonresidents, and our youth. As the number of nonresident permits increase, overall pressure on the resources increase which decreases the quality for all. I have witnessed this first hand on the South Dakota waters I hunt. Waterfowl gets so pressured that nothing stays around. Another outcome of increased nonresident licenses is that the number of guides increases and subsequently puts more pressure on the limited availability of hunting and diminishing the quality. It is also unfortunate for our residents that guides are able to purchase and tie up access to private property further decreasing opportunity for residents and other nonresidents that then must find new private or public areas to hunt. This increases pressure on what's left of the private resource (often less desirable) and limited public resources. I respectfully request that you respect and do what's best for your South Dakota resident hunters that you represent. Please vote to oppose any increase in nonresident licenses. Thank you for the great job you do in managing our state's resources.

Michael Moe

Brandon SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I strongly oppose this Proposal. There are already left over licenses after the first draw which tells me that not all the licenses are sold. Why add more? On another note, I feel like adding additional licenses is a step towards the commercialization of waterfowl hunting just like deer and pheasant hunting in this state.

Justin Allen

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Dear Commission,

Please oppose the increase to NR waterfowl licenses and hunting opportunities in South Dakota. Resident waterfowl hunters numbers have not decreased over the last several years. GFP likes to use data ranges to prove a point. Over 25 years yes waterfowl hunters have decreased but certainly they haven't over the last 5-7 years, GFP numbers show a steady number of SD resident waterfowl hunters. The vast majority of the sportsman the commission are supposed to represent do not suppose increased NR hunters hunting opportunities in SD. Waterfowl hunting is no different. Between leasing of land, guides/outfitters, NR hunters, social media there has not been a time over the last few decades that it is harder to have quality waterfowl hunting in SD. Pouring gas on the fire is irresponsible to the resource and the residents of SD. Please vote no on increasing non-resident waterfowl licenses in SD.

Thank you for your time,

Justin Allen
Pierre, SD

Ed Spies

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

we need more roost lakes like Reed Lake in Clark County.

Jim Mose

Brandon SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I have already been rejected by out of state leased land I would like to have hunted

Joshua Gabbert

Brandon SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I don't see a need. Currently, I travel more than an hour to get to a location with water. If I do find a location that isn't already occupied by several groups, it is only a matter of time before they overrun me. Hunting ethics are fading as fast as the habitat. I think time would be spent more effectively preserving what South Dakota has.

Peter Koupal

Rapid Citu SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Nick Suss

Brandon SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jeremy South

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Kathy Ford

Denver CO

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Samuel Sheffield

Huron SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Boyd Schulz

Brookings SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I have been hunting waterfowl for 40 years as a SD resident. There has been a marked reduction in waterfowl habitat over time. Access to private land for hunting is ever more challenging. Commercialization of waterfowl hunting for non-resident hunters is having a major impact on access to private land. Please do not increase non-resident waterfowl licenses.

John Cooper

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I firmly oppose this proposal. If passed, the Commission will just continue to add to the hunting pressure on waterfowl and increase the places where waterfowl hunting is leased by commercial outfitters.

Monte Vande Kop

No SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Austin Fritz

Hartford SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Ducks are not an "unlimited resource"

Jake Sohns

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose a increase to any NR waterfowl hunting licenses. It is hard enough to get permission on private land as is. It has gotten way worse over the last 10 years from guys with money and non residents leasing land or using guides that lease land. SD is being over ran with non residents hunters and fisherman, especially in NE SD. Please oppose any increase to Non resident hunting opportunities.

Joseph Barnett

Sioux Falls Sd SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Joseph Barnett

Sioux Falls Sd SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jeffrey Olson

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please do not increase non-resident waterfowlers coming to our state. Every state around us and Canada are reducing tags for non-resident to provide their residents with a better opportunity. Please vote for South Dakotans.....

Stephen Knoble

Gettysburg SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Sam Butterfield

Marshall MN

Position: oppose

Comment:

I have become aware that SD GFP is trying to raise license numbers for Non-resident duck hunters in South Dakota. As a Non resident that enjoys your great state most years waterfowl hunting, I hope you do not pass these additional licenses. SD has a good thing going by restricting out of state pressure on waterfowl. It is the reason why we have come to South Dakota for the last 25 years. In 25 years we have only not drawn a license 4 times. But it is well worth the wait. Take it from someone that has watch the hunting resources & the quality of hunting in Minnesota diminish over the last 40 years to tell the GFP & GFP Commissioners that you need to protect what South Dakota has from the commercialization of hunting (guides/outfitters/Non-resident). Coming from a out of state hunter please do not pass additional waterfowl licenses in South Dakota. -Sam

Craig Margulies

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Eric Paulson

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Darrel Reinke

Ft. Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Access to hunting for resident waterfowl hunters is increasingly under pressure. I strongly believe this is because of the increased number of non resident permits allowed. With that increase in non resident hunters comes the increase in the number of outfitters. That increase leads to way more waterfowl areas off limits because they are leased up. I strongly oppose the decision to add even more non resident licenses. Thank you

William Schwarz

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose the increase in NR waterfowl licenses. These increases will not slow or reverse the decline in resident hunter numbers, it will only continue to decrease resident hunter "access and opportunity". The loss of access and opportunity is the documented #1 reason residents and all hunters quit waterfowl hunting. Thank you.

Chris Gukeisen

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I believe this will prevent new resident hunters from waterfowl hunting. There is too much competition. We need more residents to participate, not nonresidents with guides, pushing the residents out.

Tim Brown

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I believe allowing more non resident waterfowl licenses would degrade the hunting access and opportunity that residents have. Please do not pass this bill for the sake of all resident hunters now and yet to get into the sport. Thank You for considering.

Thomas Steele

Lake Preston SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Scott Claus

Chesterfield VA

Position: support

Comment:

Please consider opening South Dakota waterfowl hunting to all out of state hunters willing to buy a license and obey SD game laws. I have been hunting private land for pheasants in SD for over 20 years, but for some reason SD has they ultra restrictive laws on out of state waterfowl hunters that I don't find in the other states I hunt (TX, KS, NE, VA, NC, and AR). Please stop allowing the narrative that out of state hunters are the reason why access is getting harder. That is BS!

Joe Swenson

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Out of state duck hunters "burn off" the local ducks from our public waters so that we see very few birds past opening day.

Ryan Roehr

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

My dad and I have been taking a youth hunting for 2 years now and this year that kid asked 5 landowners that he previously year had permission to hunt waterfowl on, and last year those landowners leased out 15 quarters to a guide in NE SD (flatland flyway) according to the one landowner. The guide never hunted that one quarter according to neighbors. The kid we took hunting has stated he is NOT getting a waterfowl tag again(3 of his friends said the same thing)! We blame this 100% on the GFP and the greed of guides. Some guides want to take away land from kids and adults and force them to pay the guide. The one landowner had a 80 that was in CREP, the guide told him that people left a mess out there and he wouldn't, so the landowner took it out of CREP(no known mess was left out there). We are losing youth hunters and adults at a alarming rate, and this is making it WAY worse. This makes no sense money wise either for the GFP, in the long run you will lose hunters/money by having less resident hunters that spend more money in small towns than guides and non res do(numbers prove this.) So if you want to continue to lose youth hunters, approve this, but if you want to keep youth hunters Oppose this. Its that simple.

Todd Andrews

Brookings SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

These increases will not halt or reverse the decline in resident hunter numbers; instead, they will perpetuate the reduction in resident hunters 'access and opportunity. The documented primary reason for South Dakota residents and all hunters to discontinue waterfowl hunting is due to the loss of access and opportunity! Stop giving it away!

The challenges faced by hunters and the impact on their ability to engage in waterfowl hunting are crucial considerations for conservation efforts and sustainable practices of this state. Too many times hunters compete for access and opportunities. FACT!

Mark Heck

Mitchell SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Frank Alvine

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Life long waterfowl supporter and hunter. Massive loss of wetlands has limited us residents to far fewer hunting sites. We live here and should not to face increasing competition Thank You FGA

Mike Van Cleave

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose this increase in non-resident waterfowl license. I have watched greed ruin the pheasant hunting in south dakota ,now i am seeing it ruin duck and goose hunting in south dakota.

Troy Spitzer

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Joe Arbach

Hoven SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jeff Rud

Madison SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Competition for hunting spots is already intense, adding more non-residents will only make it worse. The commercialization of a migratory, non-stockable, public resource will only hurt waterfowl hunting in SD. Don't follow the pheasant hunting path, they can and are stocked to mimic wild birds, waterfowl cannot.

Alan Thomas

Huron SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Good Afternoon Commission Members.

As an 81 year now "part time" waterfowl hunter. I am very much opposed to any increase in non-resident waterfowl licenses.

We residents live here and spend most our money here. We buy ALL of our hunting and groceries in South Dakota and hit the South Dakota restaurants.

We fought this game on the Missouri River and the "political system" continues to beat on the resident hunters.

Commission Members, give one for the RESIDENTS, including our children and grandchildren, and do not increase the number of non-resident waterfowl licenses.

Thank you.

Alan Thomas

Huron

Aaron Olson

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

These increases will further limit "access and opportunity". The loss of access and opportunity is the #1 reason residents and all hunters quit waterfowl hunting.

Donald Edman

Clearwater FL

Position: support

Comment:

As a former resident of 30 years in SD who had to leave for employment reasons, I support the increase in nonresident licenses. As a side note I am tired of the nonresidents fees that keep increasing while residents aren't. The license numbers show that there are more nonresident hunters than resident so give us a break instead of asking us to foot the bill that residents are not stepping up to do.

Wyatt Vantol

Tea SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Dominique Arpan

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I strongly oppose the proposed increase of Non Resident waterfowl licenses.

Waterfowl is one of the only sporting options left that you can easily access private land without the need to pay landowners.

We as a state cater to Non resident hunters in all things big game and especially pheasants.

Can we resident hunters not have just one option to hunt that doesn't cost us big money to get on prime private land.

With the increase of Young South Dakotans interested in and starting to waterfowl hunt this will only hurt that opportunity even more. Isn't one of Game fish and Parks missions currently to increase the amount of resident waterfowl's, especially with the federal help with the 3 duck license.

Passing this would only be a step back from the direction we are going.

Thank you

Chris Hitzeman

Lake Andes SD

Position: support

Comment:

South Dakota raises an incredible amount of waterfowl and to limit tags so other states can shoot all our ducks is unreasonable.

Colin Pugsley

Yankton SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

More non resident licenses will mean less hunting opportunities for residents. There are a lot of people coming to our state because of it's great habitats and diverse animals and birds. Non residents want to experience that and I don't blame them. But if we start giving out record number of licenses, what will that do for residents? Yes give them a chance which is what they have now and should be thankful for but I oppose increasing non resident licenses. Leave some birds for those of us that work and live in our great state.

Roger Thue

Colman SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I believe that increasing non-resident waterfowl licenses reduces opportunity for resident waterfowl hunters. When non-residents come in, they are often willing and able to pay for access to high quality hunting grounds, which makes it much more likely that ground will be removed from the residents that can't afford or are not willing to pay for access. Wildlife resources in SD should be available with first priority to resident hunters, even if they are not financially capable of paying for access. Hunting should be a sport for the everyday person, even those of low means, not just for those with deep pockets.

Janessa Moe

Brandon SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I feel like this is one step closer to commercializing waterfowl and hunting.

Charles Rokusek

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

By continuing to add 5% to the number of non-resident waterfowl hunters you are continuing to compound the number which accelerates the number that would be allowed in the state to hunt. Then adding the conversion of grasslands to row crops also decreases areas which are suitable for waterfowl hunting. Then the additional loss of wetlands due to tiling and drainage also impacts the places that are available for individuals to hunt. Then add into the mix the lack of small grains being grown in Southeast South Dakota also adds to fewer places that would be available for waterfowl hunting. Therefore, I am opposed to any additional non-resident waterfowl hunters and would support a change to 8% of the number of resident waterfowl hunters from the previous year.

Lance Wollmann

Hartford SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I started duck hunting at 12 and now 65. Never missed a season. Duck numbers are not even close now when I started. We could pick 10 point ducks for a limit. Now you need to shoot what comes by. We do not need MORE pressure on the ducks. If the game dept wants to raise more money raise the non res. Licences.

Andrew J Jackson

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Enough already! Can't find a place to hunt without paying. Lived in South Dakota my entire 75 years! Been buying a SD hunting and fishing license, plus big game and waterfowl longer than most of you've been alive. Quit selling out to commercial hunting!

Andy Vandel

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose the increase of non-resident waterfowl licenses in SD. This was not identified as a need by the department and the public is yet to be told a reason for the increase. Resident waterfowl hunters are concerned with the trend of increasing NR licenses by 5% every year without an end number in mind the commission is striving to achieve. There needs to be measurable metrics in place that trigger an increase, decrease, or no change.

There have been many changes to NR waterfowl licenses in the recent past that continue to put more pressure on the limited resources available. These include the shift of 1250 unused 3-day permits away from the Missouri River unit to other areas of the state, converting the statewide 1-10 day licenses to 2-5 day licenses, and last year's 5% increase in NR licenses. Other uncontrolled changes include a change in the Missouri River corridor Canada goose migration, a reduction in duck populations, and drought conditions reducing the number and size of huntable wetlands. All of these changes have combined to reduce access and opportunity which was identified as the #1 reason resident hunters quit waterfowl hunting. Adding even more NR waterfowl licenses will continue to tip this trend in the wrong direction.

Jordan Edwards

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Merrill Nelson

Lake Preston SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I'm a landowner, and get tired of folks always asking to hunt, especially the professional ones from out of state. The locals need to have the opportunity, they can't compete with a 1,000+ decoy spreads.

Timothy Weber

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Timothy Reynolds

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Let focus on expanding hunting opportunities for people that choose to live in south dakota not non residents that are here for 5 days.

Bob Peterson

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Charles Lebeda

Humboldt SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Gabe Steinborn

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Our own commission lobbying against the people of South Dakota doesn't make sense.

Logan Kolb

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

As the state loses more and more resident waterfowlers, the last thing we need to do is allow more nonresidents. The single greatest thing causing a decline in resident hunters is a complete loss of access to private ground. The guide services that are able to lease tens of thousands of acres for hunting are pushing the freelance guys out. And will continue to push out the resident hunters. Flatland Flyways is a big example of a guide service that is able to lease out thousands of acres. You ask permission on any land with birds on it around Sand Lake and the only answer you ever get is talk to Flatland Flyways, they have it leased. By allowing for more nonresidents, we will enable these guide services to lease more and more land and we will see and even bigger drop in resident waterfowl hunter decline.

Jaron Anderson

Brookings SD

Position: support

Comment:

Brings added revenue to state and to many small towns most importantly.

Allan Pudwill

Brandon SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Actually this state needs to decrease nonresident licenses.

Jim Mose

Brandon SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Robert Eddy

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Residents hunters first! Not outfitters or non-residents.

Gabe Veurink

Lennox SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Aj Martinec

Beresford SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Patrick Skipper

Volga SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Matk Martinson

Eagan MN

Position: support

Comment:

If the residents of SD do not want non resident hunters and all the revenue we bring to businesses and to GF&P, then maybe their fees and licenses should be raised to at least match what us NR 's pay. MN does not limit how many SD folks get to fish or hunt in MN. Everybody who buys a Federal duck stamp contributes to the purchase of Federal wetlands in SD but we are limited in our access to those lands for waterfowl hunting. Not very fair that I can't hunt land that my money helped buy.

Jason Rumpca

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

David Larson

Groton SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Larry Lewis

Hecla SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a classic example of continued privatizing a public resource. Leasing of the best waterfowl hunting lands continues to expand with each increase in non-resident permits available. True "family farms" and small towns continue to decline and larger operations tend to view "hunting recreation" as another commodity to "sell"! Somehow we need to reverse this trend and providing opportunities to wealthy non-residents is not a step in the right direction. Average residents need opportunities and places to hunt.

David Larson

Groton SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Joseph Harrison

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Nik Lipp

See Attachment #12382

De Smet SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The continued increase of non-res. waterfowl hunting pressure is synonymous with less access for residents. This is a sad fact. The most painful aspect of this trend is that my representatives continue choosing the few over the many. I am not a landowner, I'm not a business owner, but I am a patron of these very businesses and a tax paying SD resident supporting landowners by paying taxes 365 days of the year. If you don't have my back, then no one does. I oppose increasing nonresident waterfowl licenses, again!

Doug Wanttie

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

You will be ending all waterfowl hunting for resident South Dakotans. The pheasant guides will lease up all the land possible and lock out the residents once again. You started laying the tracks when you changed the one ten day to two five days licenses to align with pheasant licenses. Don't tell us you have South Dakotans best interest in mind. I oppose this increase.

Edward Keller

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The only thing South Dakota has to offer our young people is the outdoors. Why sell it to non South Dakotans?

Jeffrey Clow

Harrisburg SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Thomas Novak

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

We cannot afford to make this state like North Dakota. Not good for residents or non residents alike. Keep the quality in a South Dakota non resident hunt. Raise the price for licenses if you must. Do not appease to the few resident guide services.

Reed Schade

Chester SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Rick Pudwill

Brandon SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Juergen Schroeder

Hartford SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Douglas Traub

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

We have little access and limited waterfowl and habitat now. Selling more nonresident licenses just for the money that goes to GFP is a bad idea and a sellout to the out of staters. If you continue this trend, you will have to rename it the non-resident GFP!

Keaton Whitcomb

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Ben Brown

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

If passed we would have a new, post 1940's record of 6,615 nonresident waterfowl hunting licenses. These increases will not slow or reverse the decline in resident hunter numbers, it will only continue to decrease resident hunter "access and opportunity". The loss of access and opportunity is the documented #1 reason residents and all hunters quit waterfowl hunting. Please OPPOSE this proposal!

Douglas Moe

Brandon SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I have been hunting from 12 years old to 64 years old . They keep changing what kind of birds you can. And now you want us to compete with more out of state hunters it is hard enough to find water and places to hunt without competing with out of state hunters . They already have a chance to go hunting here. Let them wait their turn like South Dakota residents have to wait for their deer tags Please done pass this

David Finn

Brandon SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose because it is hard to find good hunting for myself and my family.

Riley Haag

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Steve Bonkrude

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I used to hunt waterfowl, stopped when it became an issue finding access to hunting areas. I would like to get back into it, but this increase in NR lic. will cause a situation of even less hunting access for residents. Shouldn't you be thinking about SD residents instead of how to make more money? Figure out how to give a better experience for resident waterfowl hunters and it will increase the number of resident hunters. Even generate more revenue.

Charlie Stephenson

Yankton SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

SD should not allow additional out of state waterfowl hunting. We need to preserve our opportunities for residents and not pad the pockets of guides.

Chris Weber

Tea SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Patrick Gross

Vermillion SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

It's time to roll back the number of non resident waterfowl hunters. On one day alone in the past season we counted over 50 rigs at a river access area in SE South Dakota. All non resident hunters competing with locals for very limited places to hunt. We also need to eliminate the year long licenses for non residents. Non resident waterfowl hunters who hunt water do it all day long. They hunt the roosts and the birds cannot rest. The birds simply leave after two days of hunting pressure. Combining uses of natural resource opportunities, that residents enjoy and support with tax dollars, and tourism is a fairness issue for residents and their families. Make those opportunities an incentive to move to SD and build our economies in a more permanent way.

Strongly opposed to increasing non resident licenses regardless of the legislative authority gfp has been given. Quality of life for local hunters and their kids is far more important than retail sales.

Mark Peterson

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Waterfowl doesn't need commercialized hunting, which is exactly what this push is for. Keep waterfowl hunting the way it is, something that can still be a family, non-paid outdoors event without guides pushing everyone else out or locking up all the private land.

Dana Rogers

Hill City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Commissioners,

If you look and listen to the history of public comment and in person testimony, there is overwhelming opposition and little if any support for further NR expansion in S.D. Resident sportsmen have been pushed out and to the side constantly. Be it the commercialization of our public trust resources for profit or the drive to sell these resources to generate tourism by local chambers of commerce.

Who benefits and who suffers? Consistently, the top reason given by people who stop hunting is lack of access. Now we want to bring in more NRs to compete for access and further stress our public lands?

The resident sportsmen do not want this. We S.D. residents live here year round, spend our money here every day and would very much appreciate being considered as priority #2. Only behind what should be the #1 priority of managing healthy abundant wildlife populations.

Please VOTE NO

Thank you for your consideration

Don Fjerstad

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose any increase in nonresident waterfowl license !

Jessica Bruins

Mitchell SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I do not support changes to non-resident waterfowl licenses. Support the residents of South Dakota

Daniel Barthel

Saint Michael MN

Position: oppose

Comment:

Dear; SD Game Fish Parks commissioners, as a non-resident waterfowl hunter, I would prefer not to see an increase in more non-resident waterfowl hunting licenses. I like it the way it is because it's world class waterfowl hunting largely due to the lack of hunting pressure. More hunters will decrease the quality of hunting.

Thanks for taking the time to read my request.

Dan Barthel

Andy Vandel

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose the increase of non-resident waterfowl licenses in SD. This was not identified as a need by the department and the public is yet to be told a reason for the increase. Resident waterfowl hunters are concerned with the trend of increasing NR licenses by 5% every year without an end number in mind the commission is striving to achieve. There needs to be measurable metrics in place that trigger an increase, decrease, or no change.

There have been many changes to NR waterfowl licenses in the recent past that continue to put more pressure on the limited resources available. These include the shift of 1250 unused 3-day permits away from the Missouri River unit to other areas of the state, converting the statewide 1-10 day licenses to 2-5 day licenses, and last year's 5% increase in NR licenses. Other uncontrolled changes include a change in the Missouri River corridor Canada goose migration, a reduction in duck populations, and drought conditions reducing the number and size of huntable wetlands. All of these changes have combined to reduce access and opportunity which was identified as the #1 reason resident hunters quit waterfowl hunting. Adding even more NR waterfowl licenses will continue to tip this trend in the wrong direction.

Josh Hagemann

Mission Hill SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The only reason there is a call for increasing NR licenses is to increase revenue. There are real-world limiting factors that come into play. It's not simply that the population can handle increases pressure. The landscape may not support an increase in hunting pressure. There are only so many places where people can hunt.

I'm not against NR hunters but I am against increasing NR opportunity at the detriment of resident opportunity.

If you bring in more non-residents they need a place to hunt which means more pressure on public land or more pay-to-hunt situations. The more pay-to-hunt the less opportunities are available to residents that may not have the money to compete. This could make the resident hunting participation even worse. Then the department will use those numbers to increase NR licenses even more.

At the end of the day the State is supposed to hold wildlife in trust for the residents of South Dakota. State residents are your stakeholders and beneficiaries, not Non-residents.

It's a trend the commission has been following for the past few years, starting with the deer draw changes in 2019. Every time the commission disagrees with the majority of public input, it uses the statement that these decisions "are not a vote." It's a convenient way to disregard the stakeholders and beneficiaries of the trust.

Ignoring the input from your resident sportsmen and women, simply to pull in more license money, is a MISMANAGEMENT OF THE TRUST.

James Lohrman

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

As we continue to move towards more non-resident waterfowl hunters than resident hunters like we have in the pheasant season it is no wonder our youth continue to go away from hunting as the guides in this state lease up all the good duck areas and the non-residents move in on all our great public areas to hunt waterfowl. It's all about the money and not about what is good for the citizens of this great state. Put your politics aside and do the right thing. Thank you

Nancy Hilding

Black Hawk, SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose increasing the amount of non-resident waterfowl licenses sold each year. When discussing this rule proposal during finalization, you should review the impact of increasing waterfowl hunting on the non-hunting public's use of public waters, non-hunting public's wildlife and nature viewing and also impacts to the populations of water fowl. You should discuss the statistics on how many people in USA engage in wildlife watching vs. hunting and economic benefits from expenditures of wildlife watchers.

Renee Allen

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

As a lifelong rural SD resident I do not support any increase in Waterfowl Licenses for out of state hunters. Opportunities for all things hunting and outdoors for residents has been on steady decline for the last 20 years in my opinion to cater to Non-resident interest and their money. Commercialization of the outdoors in SD right now is a run away freight train. South Dakota is being flooded by NRs and it has pushed out residents or lessened the quality of the experience. I ask you to deny the proposal/finalization to increase any Non resident waterfowl hunting opportunities.

Renee Allen, Pierre

Kenny Fielder

Webster SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Northeast South Dakota is completely over ran with Non-resident hunters and fisherman. We don't need more. The amount of land access I have lost in the last 10 year to out of state hunters and guide business is disheartening. No wonder some residents are quitting waterfowl hunting. They are being pushed aside by GFP and GFP commission as they pass more NR licenses

Isaac Haugen

Rineyville KY

Position: oppose

Comment:

All though my information attached to this message says I am in KY, it is only because I am active duty Army and I am still a SD resident.

As for the proposal that non resident waterfowl license, I am in opposition. I feel like the opportunity for non resident to waterfowl hunt is sufficient. I have family that come to SD to enjoy our great resources and the frequency they get a license is fine. As someone who hunts multiple states for multiple species I greatly understand and appreciate the opportunity and I think limited number leads to responsible stewardship of the resources. I think that we are at a good balance now, and the frequency of non resident hunters drawing a waterfowl license is helps keep our public resources safe for SD residents to enjoy. Thank you for you time and the opportunity to provide my input.

Joe Critser

Webster SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jerry Zabel

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

More nr hunters only takes from residents that live here year around. Why is game, fish, and parks in a race to fill this state full of nr hunters? No vote on more duck licenses.

William Meyers

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Rob Fjerstad

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

To many hunters affect the quality of the hunting

Justin Pliska

Hartford SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Cody Warner

Webster SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

During the March Commission meeting, there was some great discussion after the testimony regarding the NR waterfowl issue. Especially, the discussion about the pressure in certain areas. I believe there could be some great dialogue between the GFP, the Commission, and the public if given a chance. I urge you to vote no this year and perhaps see what could be figured out in the future. The GFP has all sorts of "working groups" but for some reason doesn't have one for waterfowl related issues. I believe an open dialogue could lead to a compromise in the future. However, if issues like this continue to be passed with very little public support how do you expect the public to have faith in the Commission?

Phil Hudson

Huron SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Andy Warner

Wabasso MN

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jesse Weeks

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Nick Connor

Winfred SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Paul Bezdicek

Grenville SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Michael Davis

Trent Woods NC

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Robert Naylor

Chapel Hill NC

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Dylan Buckingham

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The pressure is already too much. There is only so many good areas and they are already overrun with guides and no residents. Too many people ruins it for everyone.

Tom Whiteing

Gretna NE

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Terry Wendler

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Chad Fisher

Redfield SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose any increase to NR waterfowl licenses or hunting opportunities in South Dakota. Lets protect the resources for those who choose to stay in SD and raise a family. SD GFP and commission need to start restoring faith to SD resident sportsman. It seems both have done never little for residents over the last several years. You are supposed to represent the sportsman of SD not the governs office and office of tourism.

Chad

Blake Pistulka

Waconia MN

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Arturdo Diaz

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Matt Merschdorf

Stacy MN

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Payton Jahnke

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Rebecca King

Salem SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Phillip Ronke

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Already too much pressure. It's hard enough for us residents to get permission to hunt

Tim Foerster

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Daniel Cleland

Big Lake MN

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jake Pettot

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The Northeast corner of the state in un touchable for weeks with all the hunting pressure

Andrew Gusso

Brandon SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Nonresident hunters are destructive towards the instate hunters

John Souter

Madison SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

It's gotten to be to much. The licenses going out has gotten to me a little much "I'm not opposed to out of state hunting" but it needs to be more selective.

Shane Cunningham

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Rick Frisch

Waubay SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Daniel Cleland

Big Lake MN

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jason Andrew Gusso

Brandon SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Out-of-state hunters can have negative impacts on in-state hunters in South Dakota for several reasons. Firstly, they can increase competition for limited hunting resources, such as prime hunting spots and game populations, potentially reducing the opportunities available to local hunters. Additionally, out-of-state hunters may be less familiar with local regulations and etiquette, leading to conflicts and misunderstandings with local hunters. Moreover, the influx of out-of-state hunters can put pressure on local ecosystems and wildlife populations, disrupting natural balances and habitats. Overall, while tourism revenue from out-of-state hunters can benefit the state economy, there are valid concerns about the potential negative consequences for in-state hunters and the environment.

Mitchell Nehlich

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Chad Lade

Madison SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

David Neubauer

Chanhassen MN

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Eric Bazyn

Huron SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

We have enough non residents hunters allowed as it is.

Martin Hesby

Brookings SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Respectfully, for the past 20 years this has been a contentious issue and GFP has flat out ignored the will and opinions of the resident hunter and continued to increase nonresident tags. History shows that you are only trading resident opportunity for nonresident opportunity with these moves, as residents, like myself, drop out of waterfowl hunting due to the over pressure of the resource, the drama, and congestion of hunters. The waterfowl move through our state very fast now or completely fly over it to get to areas with less pressure. It is honestly a shame what GFP has done with this resource and resident opportunity. Very sad.

Melissa Lade

Madison SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Luke Miles

Colman SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Marcus Quam

Webster SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Chad Williams

Colman SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jack Ziemer

Webster SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Area is over hunted by nonresidents limiting opportunities for residents already

Hunter Mitchell

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Scott Karlson

Lennox SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please keep waterfowl hunting the way it is so my kids can enjoy it.

Jeremy Torkelson

Howard SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jared Clark

Howard SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jake Prins

Eden SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Brad Fontaine

Hermosa SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Sam Seppanen

Castlewood SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Dylan Reuer

Hayti SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Nathan Popham

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jerry Kastein

Hayti SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Guide services will lease up all the ground. Hunting will become a rich person only sport. There is nothing that will kill off the next generation of hunters than this.

Ty Beyer

Howard SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Dan Eich

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am in opposition to increasing the non-resident waterfowl lisc. As it sits today my family has a difficult time finding good consistent public access without driving 2 - 3 hours. Access to private ground without a 'pay to play' option is becoming more a more a reality.

Kyler Swenson

Hayti SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Charles Hamre

Canton SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Being a outfitter in this state for 20 years I have seen first hand the pressure that non resident waterfowl hunting has done to many areas in North East sd. I have seen certain area get leased up and many locals kicked out of areas and just gave up waterfowl hunting all together. This is a terrible idea. I stopped guiding in the fall due to the extra pressure. The kids in high school and college don't have a chance when non resident come over and start throwing money around to farmers.

Tanner Miller

Fedora SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Kyle Monteith

Wallace SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Sue Tucker

Mitchell SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Mitchell Reuss

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This commission's duty should be to serve the resident sportsmen and women first and foremost. This proposal to increase non resident waterfowl licenses appears to be yet another instance of holding revenue and commercial interests above resident interests. It should be the commission's goal to support GFP staff efforts to retain existing resident hunters and recruit new resident hunters. Ongoing drought has had a noticeable, obvious, and documented impact on both Central Flyway waterfowl populations and accessible hunting areas, both public and private. Many state and federal public hunting areas are bone dry or have water levels so low they are not feasible for waterfowl hunting. With less accessible available water to hunt, hunting pressure has only further condensed to remaining accessible property. Adding additional hunting pressure during a time of drought and decreasing waterfowl populations is counter productive and will only further decrease resident interest (and their license revenues). More and more, our SD residents are hanging up their waders, throwing their decoys up in the rafters, and choosing golf or fishing, and the main two reasons for doing so are lack of access and ever increasing competition to access private land. Adding more non residents who plan and focus their hunts on prime dates and prime areas, and are willing to pay for access to ensure their trip is a success only exacerbates those two issues. Please vote to deny this proposal.

Mike Stenson

Fort Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I do not support an increase in nonresident license numbers. It has been abundantly clear that the vast majority of both resident AND nonresident waterfowlers oppose this change. Increased nonresident licenses will lead to increased pressure, decreased accessible areas, decreased recruitment of new hunters, and ultimately will cause active hunters to stop waterfowl hunting in South Dakota. I'd urge the Commission to represent the overwhelming majority of their constituents and oppose this increase.

Josh Carda

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I highly encourage the commission to oppose increasing the non resident waterfowl licenses by yet another 5% this year. If revenue loss is why this constant increase keeps being brought up then a simple solution would be to raise the prices of both resident and non resident licenses to account for that. Increasing the amount of non residents allowed to hunt in the NE portion of the state increases hunting pressure, the likelihood of leasing, guide service expansion and landowner frustration all of which equates to lower quality hunting for both residents and non residents alike. Hunting pressure has never been higher than the last few years, regardless of what the license sales indicate. It would be extremely irresponsible to go against the public majority opinion and raise these numbers yet again.

Thanks.

Spencer Young

Fort Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Brock Young

Fort Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Kieffer Klinkhammer

Howard SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Taylor Trick

Frederick SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Mia Hannan

Webster SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jason Engels

Arlington SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Steven McClelland

Fort Lierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Davis Leiseth

Hayti SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

It's hard enough for locals to get permission let alone bring more people in to have to compete with them as well.

Mason Leiseth

Brookings SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Ryan Roehr

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Hi,

I see my comment was Not listed in the comments so I'm writing again. Please vote NO on this proposal to decrease our resident youth for waterfowl. The past couple years we have taken couple kids waterfowl and fishing. Last year one of the kids asked couple landowners in NE SD to hunt for geese/ducks and he was denied because they leased the land out to a outfitter in NESD, Hecla area to be specific. 15 quarters of land was leased up that we previously hunted on. The kids were so upset that they will not be getting waterfowl licenses and fishing licenses anymore. We tried to talk them out of it but it was their choice. Why are the GFP policies to discourage youth to enjoy the outdoors now? They say they want youth, but policies and rules says another. Please vote no on this very bad policy. over 96% of the comments are against this bad policy, please listen to the youth.

Mitchell Babcock

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Lincoln Biermann

Lake City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Ryan Duffy

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

hard enough to get access to land as it is. about ready to hang up waterfowl hunting as it is as a resident and if they passes likely give it up all together.

Mason Warner

Wabasso SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Joseph Murray

Brookings SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

South Dakota waterfowl hunting remains amazing because we protect it. Please continue to do so. Oppose nonresident waterfowl expansion.

Andrew Spiess

White Bear Lake MN

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Austin Brockhoff

Henderson MN

Position: oppose

Comment:

I do not support the increase of non resident waterfowl license numbers. I have been coming to South Dakota for the last +/- 10 years as a non resident waterfowl hunter. I come every year that I get drawn in the fall and I come snow goose hunting every spring. I believe South Dakota has the right number of non resident licenses currently and does not need to increase, also I believe the state is doing the right thing by having a lottery application process unlike its neighboring state North Dakota. If we continue to increase license numbers, hunting quality for both residents and non residents will surely decrease by adding more pressure to an already pressured state. By adding more licenses we would be increasing the pressure on accessing private property and we already see it where farmers are getting upset because they have had many texts, phone calls, and people knocking on their doors asking for permission. Farmers to get tired of it and eventually turn their phones off and even will post signs on their property that say "no hunting, don't even ask". I believe we would also see an increase in people abusing the resources and not abiding by the states regulations and even an increase on trespassing on private property.

As a non resident waterfowl hunter in the state of South Dakota, I do not support the increase of non resident waterfowl licenses but would rather support the decrease in number of non resident waterfowl licenses.

Brian Noeldner

Aurora SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Already have overpressure and lack of access to private land/ over hunting on public

Rick Boddicker

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

If GF&P continues to increase non-resident waterfowl licenses our residents and particularly our youth will continue to lose hunting opportunities. Therefore I'm opposed to the increase. Thank you.

Rick Boddicker

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

If GF&P continues to increase non-resident waterfowl licenses our residents and particularly our youth will continue to lose hunting opportunities. Therefore I'm opposed to the increase. Thank you.

Andrew Swenson

Gaylord MN

Position: oppose

Comment:

Too many non residents already hunt in South Dakota. I believe less non residents should be able to hunt in South Dakota to keep the pressure down and not make hunting harder for the residents.

Michael Krein

Rapid City SD

Position: support

Comment:

Nonresident licenses of every kind especially big game licenses should see price increases and number of allocated tags decreased.

Cory Zirbel

Webster SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jim Bjorikman

Arlington SD

Position: support

Comment:

As much as you hear about no room for a few more nonresident waterfowl hunters, don't believe it! Resident or nonresident it shouldn't matter. Duck hunting is on a strong decline and if we want to keep this tradition alive, let's let whoever wants to hunt, hunt! My son likes to come back to South Dakota to hunt and there is plenty of room on my friends land. No one else will hunt those fields except us.

Preston Fejfar

Elk Point SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Chris Latty

Fairbanks AK

Position: oppose

Comment:

As a non-resident whom has visited the state to hunt for over a decade, I would much rather see the prices increased, and not be as successful in the draw as often, rather than the number of available permits increased. South Dakota remains a unique opportunity for non-residents. In my opinion, this will decrease the value of the opportunity and decrease the interest. Right now I continue to come back to South Dakota because of the opportunity for great waterfowl hunting as well as pheasant and big game hunting. I also hunt in other states and provinces such as North Dakota and Saskatchewan. If this passes and the trend continues, I'll likely look for better opportunities elsewhere.

Rich Visker

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

As a resident Waterfowl hunter I oppose this proposition. It is already tough to get permission on land with leasing, guiding, sloughs are dried up and if they are not, they have some out of state hunter in there already, so where are residents supposed to go? And this gets even worse when pheasant season opens. If it comes to residents only having access to public ground that is over hunted/populated/pressured, residents stop hunting. Do you think residents are going to want to take their kids out and get youth involved when the success will be limited? Nope, kids won't have fun either. Yes, it is hunting but also needs to be opportunity for success now and then as well.

As another person said, your bad decisions in policy are destroying the very culture you love to promote to high rollers. It's all about the money for the state, you guys don't care about resident waterfowl hunters or what's good for the state outside of the money.

I've always said, if you want more money, forget the NR licenses and charge guiding/outfitting licenses to operate in sodak. A lot of other states have it. But nooo, that won't happen because that's the only thing you all support are guides/outfitters. That's the only reason for the increase in licenses. God forbid they have to pay for an annual license to run a business in sodak. You have had opposition from residents on increasing licenses for years, if not decades now and yet you still don't listen or think about residents in your decisions. I bet if all of us residents owned an outfitter or guide service you'd listen!

The other issue with continually increasing licenses is the increased pressure on birds which decreases quality of hunts for both residents and non-residents. Oh, but you don't care of about hunters having quality hunts anyways, it's all about the money.

Not only does this put pressure on birds but how about land owners? Do you think they want more people showing up to their front door or calling them. They also get sick of people always asking, but yet, let's make that a bigger issue to.

You know what I hear from NR? Is that they like the system, They always get drawn 2 out of 3 years anyways. They understand the system and are ok with how it works.

Maybe we should pull up the public comments and compare the oppose vs support. We all know which way it leans but yet you don't follow the needs/wants of residents. Isn't that who you are suppose to represent?

Anyways, Thanks for all you do for the State and the Residents.

Matt Paulson

Garden City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Dain Schwan

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Mathew Paulson

Garden City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Brad Vail

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Non-resident waterfowl should remain limited. Access is getting more difficult for residents. Non-resident hordes attack mallard feeds making it nearly impossible for residents to get access to dry land hunts. I oppose any lessening of restrictions for non-residents for waterfowl or pheasants.

John Bender

Leola SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I don't think adding additional non resident permits is the right choice for South Dakota. It will lead to more commercialization of hunting and less opportunity for residents. Father of three young aspiring hunters that wants them to continue to have access moving forward.

Tim Olson

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I urge you to not increase the number of licenses available to non-resident waterfowl hunters. As with similar proposals in past years, the public comments you have already received overwhelmingly oppose the increase. It's time for the commission to listen to the resident and even non-resident hunters that have shared their experiences with the declining quality of waterfowl hunting in eastern SD due to increased competition and less access in the field resulting from more non-residents, more leasing of access, and more commercial hunting.

Dan Svobodny

Brookings SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

With serious concern that the GFP Commission will continue to not listen to the resident waterfowl hunters in this state and pander to commercial interests, this is my formal objection to the rise in non-resident waterfowl licenses. Why do I object? I moved to this state in 2005 from Minnesota, a state that has had little respect for waterfowl and wetlands. When the opportunity, due to work arose and my family had an opportunity to move to Brookings, I jumped at the chance. Having the opportunity and privilege to hunt waterfowl in this state was a huge draw. Yet, between 2005 and now, here is what has happened:

-We've drained a ton of temporary wetlands, ensuring that they will never appear again.

-We've dealt with drought.

-Land access has become incredibly hard.

-Commercial waterfowl hunting has expanded, unabated.

-Non-resident waterfowl numbers continue to increase, due to pressure and negotiations from commercial interests.

All these points have taken away opportunities on resident waterfowl hunters and it is not as good as it used to be, like back in 2005 when I moved here.

And now we want to add more non-residents? Where does this end? What is the actual goal of the GFP Commission? To add 5% every single year until we are completely overrun with non-residents?

It's time to put an end of this and listen to the resident waterfowlers of this state and stop the increases.

Collin Heupel

Aberdeen SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Collin Heupel

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jeremy Hoven

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Caleb Caton

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Josh Florey

Clark SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Dan Waldman

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please vote no on the proposal to increase the NR waterfowl licenses. This will only increase the pressure residents face on our public lands and further promote the commercialization of waterfowl hunting by more guides and more land being leased up. This state has done enough to cater to the non resident hunters and outfitters. Its high time to do something that is in the best interest of the resident hunters. Please surprise us and listen to what the majority of the people that send in comments have say and vote this proposal down. I fear this proposal just like many other things that have been heavily opposed by the majority of SD sportsmen will again fall upon deaf ears. This proposal is just another money grab and average resident hunters will suffer in the end.

John Fuglsang

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

5% last year, 5% this year, when will it end? Appears the intent is to keep raising the number until no one is declined a license. I guess instead of arriving 2 hours before sunrise in hopes I'll get a decent hunting spot (public land) I can start sleeping in my truck in the parking lot. Please listen to the public comments you receive on this.

Jim Lessard

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Clint Hay

Brookings SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Oppose the increase for non resident waterfowl licenses. South Dakota freelance hunting is getting worse and worse every year due to the increase in pressure and lack of access for field hunting. Landowners don't let anyone hunt anymore. I've given up waterfowl hunting...and used to hunt 60-70 days a year.

Mark Pistulka

Nowthen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

C Paul Vinatieri

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The residence of South Dakota have very few areas in which they can waterfowl hunt. Our first priority should be to the resident hunters of South Dakota and not the outer stators.

Andrew Seymour

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Crowding has increased at my public land waterfowl hunting area

Chad Atwood

Crooks SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Doug Brage

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Residents have a hard time finding a place to hunt the way it is

Nathan Holida

Hayti SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Curt Tesch

Rosholt SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I moved to South Dakota a little over 30 years ago. One of my primary reasons for moving was to be a resident hunter especially waterfowl. I live in the northeast. This was great for the first several years. Then came the transfer of the 3 day Missouri River nonresident licenses to the northeast. Made a huge quality hunting reduction due to the increased pressure. Waterfowl respond to increased pressure by just plain leaving. Then there is also the issue of only so many quality places to hunt being taken and over used by nonresidents. Please don't increase these licenses anymore.

Leonard Spomer

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose the increase of nonresident waterfowl licenses for the following reasons.
It is imperative that the Commission act first to maintain or increase the number of resident waterfowl hunters, not nonresident.
Access and uncrowded access to public and private land is key to maintaining resident hunters.
Furthermore, we must maintain the quality of the resource and the hunt.
Adding additional nonresident licenses does none of the above.
Please oppose the increase.
Sincerely

Brian Grovijahn

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please no more non resident licenses for NE South Dakota.

Sarah Ries

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The Northeast portion of the state is already overcrowded

Travis Runia

Wolsey SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose any increase to non-resident waterfowl licenses. I commonly host non-resident waterfowl hunters and they appreciate the quality of hunting under the current structure.

Mark Smedsrud

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

As a lifelong resident that enjoys duck hunting I am opposed to the 5% addition to NR tags. Every year we have what I call mission creep with these small additional amounts. As they seems benign, over time it adds up! We have a heritage here that is more important than the commercialized hunting the GFP keeps pushing for. We have tourismized pheasant hunting, let's not do the same with duck hunting. There is a reason by grandparents lobbied in the 40s and 50s to keep the residents first. Please don't succumb to the pressure of tourism and outfitters.

Kurt Dagel

Astoria SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Quality hunting experiences will diminish in NE South Dakota by increasing the density of "intensive hunting" which is more non-resident license holders. With a license, a destination and ample technical resources, but limited time additional nonresident waterfowl hunters pressure resources that are limited. Anyone familiar with hunting understands a pressured resource will vacate habitat and move. Quality hunting cannot continue by incremental increases in hunting intensity brought about by nonresident hunters.

Other

Steve Cherkas

Edgemont SD

Position: other

Comment:

I listened into the bobcat management action plan 3/7. The plan is primarily based on juvenile harvest. IMO this is not accurate data to base the plan on. I (common among cat trappers) release all juvenile (if foot not frozen) bobcats along with any stained (from feeding kittens) adult females. This thereby makes your statistics flawed. The primary factor on cat numbers is rabbit population. I saw nothing in plan relating to rabbit population. We recently (last 10 years) went thru a major wipeout of rabbits (hemorrhagic I believe) but they are now on the comeback the last 2-3 years. And cat numbers are also coming back with them. Lots of kitten sign last 2 seasons. I also do not believe your black hills bobcat population estimates (have been told by biologist twice as many lions as bobcats in black hills). I have caught 20+ black hills bobcats each of last 2 seasons myself which would be over 15% (per season) myself in just a small portion of the hills. Females and kittens also have a small territory (1-2 sq miles) compared to the males. When I see kitten tracks in snow I try to avoid those areas. I am strongly opposed to a per trapper limit in black hills and west river. BTW ... where is the 2022 furbearer harvest? Usually online by Sept and still not on website.

John Wrede
Rapid City SD

See Attachment #12295

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Cameron Lahndorf
Fort Pierre SD

Position: support

Comment:

I strongly support the lining up of the grouse and pheasant season for closing on Jan 31.

The chance of actually taking a few more grouse at the end of the season is slim, but would be nice to have the opportunity if it does present itself in the rare opportunity.

Travis Neebling
Casper WY

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am a non-resident, but I hunt in South Dakota every couple of years. I do not support extending the quail, partridge, and grouse seasons through the end of January. The extension amounts to an ~25% increase in days. On the limited public areas to hunt, I am not sure the populations can sustain 25% more harvest. Thank you for your consideration

Jodie Provost
Valley City ND

Position: oppose

Comment:

Topic – lengthening the grouse season – I oppose it due to lack of monitoring data to show it is feasible without negatively, impacting the population in the long run. The desire to boost hunting and tourism in the state cannot come at the cost of the very wildlife populations that help support it, or they will both tank in the long run. Let's not be shortsighted. Let's be good stewards and get the data we need to make solid management decisions. In the larger picture, prairie chicken and sharp-tailed grouse are in decline due to habitat loss and other factors. South Dakota lies in the heart of their range and thus has an extraordinary stewardship responsibility and opportunity to maintain and increase their populations.

Josh Tatman

Sheridan WY

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose lengthening the grouse season through January. Hunters can't trust SDGFP's management of the public wildlife trust if they greenlight significant increases in harvest, without even having meaningful population monitoring. Increasing take and pressure through the depths of winter should only take place if SD can demonstrate that it will not adversely impact native grouse populations. These species deserve competent management.

George Vandel

Pierre SD

Position: support

Comment:

I'm in full support of linking the grouse and partridge ending date w/ the pheasant dates.

In central SD both sharp-tailed grouse and prairie chickens are abundant and frequently encountered by late season pheasant hunters - myself included. It's an annual challenge to remember the grouse closing date so as to not "shoot a game bird during a closed season" which I believe requires loss of hunting privileges. I am fortunate having access to some prime hunting land during Dec and Jan. Since the pheasant season was finally and correctly extended to the end of January, I have had ample opportunities to harvest both grouse and chickens. There is no biological justification to restrict their harvest. Please allow hunters to harvest these amazing prairie trophies during the full January season.

Thank you for your consideration.

George Vandel
Pierre, SD

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Commission:

I wish to express my strong opposition and objection to the month long extension of the quail, partridge and grouse season as proposed during your March 2024 meeting. Frankly, I continue to oppose the length of all current small game seasons only because the Department of Game, Fish and Parks has failed to show their value, economically or otherwise, to the resources themselves. Is it appropriate to ask who is asking for this change and why? I would point out that you recently curtailed the length and content of several big game seasons for blatantly obvious reasons that are not dissimilar to the instant circumstances! I would suggest that if there is an interest in consistency, then it should be broadly interpreted and succinctly applied.

What biological or socio-economic data and information is available and honestly used to justify this continuing exploitation of populations in apparent decline. The language in the current proposal suggests the only reason to "extend" these seasons is to better align them with the extended pheasant season. How does that purely administrative rationale afford benefit to either the resources this state is challenged to manage for the benefit of it's people or the general public that owns these resources? What possible resource value is added to grouse, or partridge or quail? Is there some sort of socio-economic study and data available to show that extending any season for even a few days is meritorious or beneficial to the resource; the economy, or the average South Dakota outdoorsman who's leisure is fickle at best? We can assume we can not be honestly informed! I submit, ladies and gentlemen; that if there were any scientific, statistical or stewardship merit in these types of proposals, we wouldn't do what we've done, and are doing, with sage grouse, paddlefish, pine martens, otters or any other species with a closed or highly restricted season. Is there any "consistency" between the instant proposals and those that might actually consider knowledge of resource status and trend? What this, and other measures appear to be is nothing more than administrative shuffling without any honest or beneficial purpose to either the resources or the people they belong to. I simply object to anything done with public assets that can't clearly demonstrate traditional conservation minded value!

Given the contemporary trend to consider economics over the conservation and welfare of this state's wildlife, I and many other hunter conservationists in our state are prone to think that these sorts of poorly justified proposals are aimed at further invigorating non-resident hunting tourism and the dollars it allegedly thrusts into a sluggish period in the state's economy. What it also appears to be is yet one more tactic to exploit the public trust ward for fun and profit. Is that strategy in any way beneficial to grouse, pheasants, partridge, quail, or the bulk of our citizenry that enjoys the wildlife without packing a shotgun into the field. Where do you draw the line between statutory responsibility to carefully manage the public trust and unrestrained recreation that can and does negatively impact public resources? What benefit is there to future generations of outdoorsmen and nature loving

citizens from these recommendations? I don't mean to infer an anti-hunting posture by these observations because that is not my intent. I dare say, I've been hunting in South Dakota and other states for longer than most of you and over those 60 plus years I've come to understand that part of respect for wildlife and conservation is being able to say; "enough is enough." My grand dad, from whom I acquired my outdoor values and ethics, served two terms on the Commission and I can honestly say that if he could witness the apparent careless and ill informed management of both our wildlife and the hunting heritage today, he would be appalled as well as deeply hurt as I am.

I must also ask just how this Commission or the Department of Game, Fish and Parks can propose to increase the harvest mortality on any species if it has no idea of population densities, trends, distribution, reproduction, recruitment or annual survival? I submit, ladies and gentlemen, that if there is no annual biological and demographical data collected, carefully analyzed and published for public review, for the species allegedly proposed to be managed (or in these cases, exploited) it can not be said that management or stewardship of those species is rational or even possible. We are failing to observe two of the most important principles in conservation. Compensatory and Additive mortality. Hunting mortality is historically and biologically acknowledged to be compensatory to the functions of natural mortality. Any mortality that does not perform that function is additive and unbeneficial. And the only way to distinguish the effects of either on any population is careful, extensive, repetitive and annual monitoring of that species. I submit, ladies and gentlemen, that we have none of that and as a result, numerous hunters and the general public have lost nearly all trust and confidence in the Department to say nothing about the obvious status and condition of our resources. Anecdotally, the Department has admitted long term, continuing decline in several populations yet it continues this exploitive policy promotion without a showing of concern or remedy.

Allow me to elaborate: In a recent legislative hearing, the Secretary of the Department was asked, point blank, if there was any verifiable data to confirm benefits to pheasant nesting success, chick survival and recruitment from the Nest Predator Bounty Program. He stated there was none to justify the program. He further inferred that the program could not contribute to a positive population trajectory. He further stated that it was not possible to collect relevant information or data to determine the programs effects. Not only is he wrong but his responses raise the more serious question; "Why are you spending millions conducting a program if you don't have in place, a comprehensive series of metrics to measure success or failure and cost to benefit. Isn't that what good businessmen do to assure the future of their business and protect it's assets? Why is he wrong? This state no longer measures pheasant populations. It has never measured partridge populations! It has been decades since any investigation or measurement of quail populations or even ruffed grouse populations in the Black Hills. The Department relies on a single individual to monitor a highly threatened population of Sage Grouse in two counties (one population of birds in a third county has blinked out years ago) and the severely compromised and

inadequate monitoring of Sharptail Grouse and Prairie Chickens yields virtually meaningless information due entirely to statistically inviable numbers and size of the sample frame. And within all that the Commission proposes to add season length and defacto population mortality that it cannot possibly determine to be beneficial, compensatory harvest. Is that responsible? This season proposal includes ruffed grouse in the Black Hills! I can not and will not support this proposal given the severely depleted population of ruffies, and it's austere demographics and geographics. We already have too much traffic, disturbance, stress and habitat alteration in the Black Hills without adding more. Frankly, I would favor a complete closure of the ruffed grouse, grouse and prairie chicken, partridge and quail seasons in this state until we actually know what we have, where it's located, and a responsible estimate of it's numbers, statistical viability, status and annual trend as well as a reasonably accurate estimate of the actual number of recreational man days each produces. If any such data is available to you, I submit that it is neither robust nor comprehensively informative. This business of simply having hunting seasons on species we think are present somewhere isn't responsible in my estimation.

I'm not insensitive to the argument that so few people engage in the pursuit of these species during late seasons that no harm is done. That unverifiable excuse does nothing except allow us to continue down this road of stewardship unaccountability! Not only do we not have any collateral authority to advance that notion but we also insult the professional and historic management experience once dependent on science to prove those assertions. We can assume that our neighboring states have similar duties and responsibilities to their indigenous resources. Do any of them sponsor these seemingly random measures? North Dakota, refuses to extend it's pheasant season past the first weekend in January while maintaining the same monitoring protocols they have conducted for more than 40 years. An enormous data base to inform. Neither do they extend their grouse or partridge seasons even though they have robust monitoring protocols. Even Iowa and Minnesota are towing the season length tolerance limit. Is there a reason I shouldn't think we are just trying to compete with our sister states for the non-resident hunting license dollar? Considering the circumstances in Nebraska, it would appear those thoughts aren't that distantly skewed.

So here we are; suggesting, without evidence that there can't possibly be harm to the resource by fielding an estimated, paltry 1% of total hunters during a late season. It becomes all the justification needed to answer the clamor from business to keep the cash registers ringing. And then the 1% late season hunter can join the administrative juggernaut to enjoy his new- found liberty. The tail wags the dog in my opinion. What are the average number of days the South Dakota commoner hunts small game? What sociological research or canvass is there to show that he actually wants or needs more opportunity to satisfy him? In our history, have those interests ever been a concern? In terms of our most popular game bird, the resident hunts 6.7 days during a 90+ day season and his satisfaction with that season, including it's length, averages 4.7 which hasn't

changed significantly in 10 years to include last year with the season extension. The data for grouse and partridge are not statistically different and there is no data at all to even support a quail or ruffed grouse season. I'm sad to point out, ladies and gentlemen, that we are "reaping without husbanding" and moving to satisfy a want rather than a need.

The absurd logic used previously can be applied in reverse. If there were truly only 1% of the normal hunter numbers and pressure during the late season, the economic impact to business is paltry; to say nothing of locational and economically inconsequential. Its all hollow conjecture. But nobody seems to be willing or able to produce the numbers to support those disingenuous contentions. Not only is there no biological information to show "no significant impact" to resources but there is no "socio-economic data" to show this strategy that we've been tinkering around with works either, much less that it is even relevant resource management necessity. It's the same thing as the Nest Predator Bounty program or any other recent program that is justified solely on speculation and theory. Meanwhile, a supposedly benefitting resource struggles in most places. The resource, regardless of status, is expected to shoulder the burden of cost; in an undefined cost to benefit. I can't fathom how that can be held up to be responsible management.

Lastly, what consideration has been given to the average farmer or rancher that is seemingly expected to host this additional traffic? In the near 60 years of wondering and hunting rural South Dakota, I've heard my share of complaints from property owners about the states expectation that they field all this activity and traffic without being consulted. I've been rather rudely dismissed at the door for being one too many people encroaching on the ranchers good will I can't blame any of them for failing to understand why it is essential to prolong hunting activity to achieve a fictional goal of "harvestable surplus." A lot of them see what happens to public lands and simply refuse any more access out of concern for the residual wildlife that is left. Indeed, without any sort of honest attempt to secure majority of acceptance from ranchers particularly, for added grouse hunting activity, the hunter and the Department invites more disdain and criticism and I don't fault them for that sentiment in the least. The Department fails to understand its vicarious invitation wears out it's welcome. Frankly, I know an abundance of ranchers that have had a belly full of hunting traffic by the end of the deer season. Is this commission sensitive to that? What happens when these folks say no to more access? The pressure falls on already abused and over run public lands and WIA's. These seemingly innocuous proposals have far reaching and long lasting consequences.

Last season, I hunted more days and in more areas of SD than I ever have in my lifetime and more than the average hunter, resident or non-resident. I hunted public lands and WIA's and the areas had sustained so much pressure that even the dog couldn't find much less flush a bird of any species. It was the only reason I kept going was in hopes of finding something that the dog could learn and enjoy as she was bred to do. And we're going to extend hunting seasons and exacerbate that condition? Of course there is always those

commercial operators that welcome this sort of thing but I submit that a government agency doesn't just serve the special interest. I would challenge the Commission and the Department to conduct a large scale canvass of rural landowners in this state to see if they support long, poorly monitored and managed hunting seasons. From there, we'll have a pretty good idea if what we're doing is the "right thing"; particularly since we're refusing to use the biological high ground in management.

Thank you for your consideration!

John Wrede
Rapid City.

South Dakota Division



The Izaak Walton League of America

Defenders of Soil, Air, Woods, Waters, and Wildlife

March 19, 2024

Re: Nonresident Waterfowl License Proposal

South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks Commission
523 East Capitol Avenue
Pierre, SD 57501

Dear Commissioners,

The South Dakota Division of the Izaak Walton League of America (Division) thanks you for this opportunity to comment on the proposed increase in nonresident waterfowl licenses. The proposal would add 315 licenses:

- 210 10-day statewide licenses to NRW-00B
- 50 3-day licenses to NRW-00V
- 55 3-day licenses to NRW-00Z

The proposal was again introduced without any input from the state's waterfowl or outdoor organizations, or from South Dakota's waterfowl hunters.

The South Dakota Division respectfully asks you to reject this proposal. Instead, we ask you to initiate a new effort to turn the decline of resident waterfowl hunters around.

We believe these factors have contributed to the drop in resident waterfowl hunters:

- An aging population is getting too old to participate
- The perception there's no place to hunt
- The knowledge of what is needed to successfully hunt waterfowl
- A lack of the equipment and gear needed

Rather than adopting this increase in nonresident licenses, the Division urges you to support a new, innovative, statewide effort under the R3 Initiative (Recruit, Retain, and Reactivate) that we believe will get more residents, especially our young people, to hunt waterfowl.

We urge the GFP to work with the state's waterfowl and sportsmen's organizations to establish, and then widely promote, free waterfowl hunting classes. The classes could be held at the Outdoor Campuses and the GFP regional offices and include, but not be limited to:

- Waterfowl identification
- Waterfowl hunting methods
 - Over water
 - On small wetlands
 - On larger lakes
 - Field hunting tactics
- Decoy setups – water and field
- How to scout
- How to secure permission to hunt waterfowl on private land

- Equipment and clothing needed
- Cleaning waterfowl
- Cooking waterfowl

The Division believes the decline in resident waterfowl hunters can be reversed through new education and outreach. We believe this new recruitment, outreach, and educational effort will get people of all ages back hunting waterfowl in the state's fields and wetlands.

Getting more resident hunters to enjoy waterfowl hunting will ring cash registers across the state 365 days a year. Adding more nonresident hunters to the already heavily pressured areas in the state will only further decrease hunter success and customer satisfaction. We believe increasing resident hunters will disperse waterfowl hunting pressure across the state. This will help lessen pressure on waterfowl and improve the quality of the hunting experience for all hunters across South Dakota.

The Division believes approving this proposed increase in nonresident waterfowl licenses will only reinforce the perception that many residents have that there's no place for the average person to hunt waterfowl. If this license increase is approved, we believe more resident hunters will stay on their couch.

The proposed additional licenses are within the 5% annual increases allowed in statute. But just because they are allowed doesn't mean they should be approved. There is an exponential function of all "percentage" increases. As with compounding interest, a percentage increase adds more licenses every year. The increases, if approved, will further exacerbate the already tense situation between waterfowl hunters in South Dakota.

We ask you to please reject this license increase. Let's work together to reinvigorate South Dakotans' passion for waterfowl and waterfowl hunting.

The South Dakota Division of the Izaak Walton League of America thanks you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. We appreciate your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul Lepisto
Regional Conservation Coordinator
Izaak Walton League of America
1115 South Cleveland Avenue
Pierre, SD 57501-4456
plepisto@iwla.org
605-220-1219

Commissioners,

The continued increase of non-res. waterfowl hunting pressure is synonymous with less access for residents. This is a sad fact. The most painful aspect of this trend is that my representatives continue choosing the few over the many. I am not a landowner, I'm not a business owner, but I am a patron of these very businesses and a tax paying SD resident supporting landowners by paying taxes 365 days of the year. If you don't have my back, then no one does. I oppose increasing nonresident waterfowl licenses, again!

Nik Lipp