



DEPARTMENT OF GAME, FISH, AND PARKS

Foss Building
523 East Capitol
Pierre, South Dakota 57501-3182

DRAFT

Resident Non-resident Stakeholder Group Meeting Notes
Dec 17, 2018
Matthews Training Center, Pierre

Members Present

Commissioner Gary Jensen
Commissioner John Loeken
Natasha Bothun – SD Tourism
Jim Faulstich - Daybreak Ranch
Rocky Niewenhuis – SD Walleyes Unlimited
Chris Hesla – SD Wildlife Federation
Mike Vehle – Former legislator
George Vandell - Sportsman
Sean Fulton - Sportsman
Rosie Smith – Glacial Lakes and Prairies Association
Scott Simpson-SD GFP
Dana Rogers - sportsman
Matt Morlock – Pheasants Forever
Nathan Sanderson – SD Retailers
GFP Secretary Kelly Hepler
Tom Kirschenman - GFP
Kevin Robling - GFP

On Phone

Michele Thomson – Black Hills Badlands and Lakes
Nick Fosness – Sportsman

Also in Attendance

Paul Lepisto – SD Isaak Walton League
Mike Shaw – representing Flatland Flyways
Alex Russo – Flatland Flyways
Matt Eldridge – 2 Rivers Outfitters-Midland

GOAL

The goal is to have an informed, thoughtful public discussion on an increasingly sensitive subject to assist the Commission in developing current criteria for a social and biological framework to move forward fairly and reasonably for South Dakotans and nonresident sportsmen and women.

This group's roll is to provide suggestions and sideboards and be a guiding force for the Commission to consider when making their decisions on nonresident license allocations. Ultimately, these decisions will be made by the Commission, but it is the wish of this Commission to take input on factors that should, or shouldn't be considered.

Some of the questions that this group will try to answer are:

1. What is a resident, a nonresident?
2. Who are nonresidents – family, friends, customers, “strangers”? Can we identify them, does it matter who they are? Why?
3. What are the reasons some propose restrictions for nonresidents?

4. What factors should the Commission consider? Would we have nonresident goals? Decrease, increase – based on what?
5. Is there a legal basis for a distinction – why are nonresidents treated differently – has that been challenged in court?
6. What is the true nonresident fiscal impact – fees, federal funds, other.
7. When SD residents become nonresidents – do nonresident policies impact SD residents when we are in other states?
8. What are fair criteria the Commission should use for determining rules. What should those criteria be based on – philosophy, science (biological and social), public opinion, other?
9. How best can the Commission engage the public in this discussion.

The Commission will discuss this group's findings at their May 2018 meeting in Custer State Park. This will be the first of many steps for the Commission to adopt official criteria when making nonresident license decisions. The discussion will continue at future Commission meetings where stakeholders will be encouraged to offer their input to assist the Commission in reaching its goal.

Economic Impact

The group discussed economic impacts of hunting and fishing in South Dakota, which produces approximately \$1.3 billion in spending. The group discussion focused on whether the Commission should consider economic impact to both the GFP and the state's economy.

The group discussed the possibility of having different criteria for different species. Does a one size fits all set of guidelines fit for the diversity of species we have in this state.

License Allocation History

Group was given background of where our small game hunters come from.

Group then discussed where the current 8% allocation of nonresidents licenses for certain big game seasons. George Vandel explained this number was applied because it was a safe number to not hurt animal populations and would still be acceptable by our resident hunters.

The discussion then turned to commercial hunting and the birth of the west river special buck license. Ultimately, this number is set by the Commission.

The discussion then turned to GFP species management plans and if license allocations are tied to these management plans. Tom Kirchenmann informed the group that the only plan that has license allocations tied to it is the antelope management plan.

Discussion on Decision Making Criteria

The group's mission is to provide major themes for the Commission to consider when making these license decisions.

The group came up with these themes for criteria:

- Demand for licenses – if high demand...what then?**
- R3 – Recruitment, Retention and Reactivation**
- Species abundance**
- Demand for access**
- Nonresident allocation meets resident acceptance**
- Economics**
- Habitat and status of habitat**

The group was then charged with coming up with a guiding statement for each of these criteria and decided to begin with the Species abundance theme.

The discussion turned to having differing criteria for different species. The discussion centered around the idea of having separate “buckets” that all species could fit into.

1. Species of limited abundance (elk, bighorn sheep, mountain goats, etc.) - **The Commission should manage these species with discussions of the species constituencies and the department management plans.** Opportunities for Species of limited abundance should remain with residents and allow for little or no nonresident participation.
2. Species with greater abundance (deer, antelope, turkeys, waterfowl) - **Fewer restrictions should be placed on nonresidents when populations are abundant or above population objectives found in specific species management plans.** Opportunities for abundant species will allow for liberal and in some cases unlimited nonresident participation as species populations allow.
3. Abundant species (walleyes, pheasants) - **Any statement related to resident /nonresident shouldn't apply to these.**