

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - fish limits - Mike Schortzmann

-----Original Message-----

**From:** JLCOOP11@aol.com [mailto:JLCOOP11@aol.com]

**Sent:** Monday, October 29, 2012 9:27 AM

**To:** rap.midco.net, mjsdas; GFP Wild Info; Spies, Jim; [beatis@aol.com](mailto:beatis@aol.com); Knippling, Susie (GFP); [barryj@gwtc.net](mailto:barryj@gwtc.net); Peterson, Cathy; [bpcerny@gwtc.net](mailto:bpcerny@gwtc.net); [duane.salthers@state.sd.us](mailto:duane.salthers@state.sd.us)

**Subject:** Re: Chnages in Lake Oahe Fishing Proposal

Thank You Mike - appreciate you taking the time to let us know your thoughts....John Cooper

In a message dated 10/28/2012 7:16:49 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, [mjsdas@rap.midco.net](mailto:mjsdas@rap.midco.net) writes:

I support the GF&P's proposal on raising the limit to 8 walleye with possession limit of 24 and removing the one fish over 20" on Lake Oahe. I reviewed the information the GF&P provided through their research, went to the meeting in Rapid City, and think they have a good plan to let people take more fish. Thank you.

Mike Schortzmann

1022 Rockhill Road

Rapid City, SD 57703

605-342-6829

**From:** [Schlueter, Chuck](#)  
**To:** [Ascher, Debra](#)  
**Cc:** [Adams, Geno](#)  
**Subject:** FW: New Walleye Fishing Limits  
**Date:** Monday, October 29, 2012 9:34:30 AM

---

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Ginny and Bob [<mailto:vgreer@abe.midco.net>]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 29, 2012 9:05 AM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** New Walleye Fishing Limits

As I cannot be at the meeting in November, I am e-mailing my comments...

I **totally agree** with raising the fishing limit to eight per day with a possession limit of 24. I do understand the reasoning for that.

However; I do **not** agree that the rule allowing only one walleye over 20 inches be eliminated.

My recommendation would be leaving the 1 over 20 inches or possibly increasing to it to 2 over 20 inches per fisherman with the daily limit of 8 fish.

Thank you.

Bob Zimmerman, Aberdeen SD

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Monday, October 29, 2012 8:35 AM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Cc:** Adams, Geno  
**Subject:** FW: CHANGES PROPOSED FOR LAKE OAHE WALLEYE REGULATIONS

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Kirk D. Steege [<mailto:ksteege@itctel.com>]  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 28, 2012 3:32 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** CHANGES PROPOSED FOR LAKE OAHE WALLEYE REGULATIONS

GFP Commission,

In regards to the proposed changes for Lake Oahe walleye regulations I would like to offer the following observations. These observations are based on approximately 30-35 fishing days on Lake Oahe between 1 July and 30 September.

The numerous number of small (under 15") undernourished fish caught and released absolutely warrants your proposed change as it pertains to fish under 15".

Based on the number of fish caught over 20" and their condition I would not recommend allowing 4 fish per day over 20" and subsequently a possession limit of 12 fish over 20". Granted, some of these fish may be malnourished and may perish before being caught, but allowing that many fish over 20" will only seriously degrade the population of our bigger fish.

Our statewide one fish over 20" has worked extremely well and provides opportunities to catch some really nice fish. If the statistics warrant changing this I would like to know what they are and if so why jump to four fish over 20"? Why not two fish over 20"? It seems logical to me that if we target the fish 19 ¾" and below there will be an increase in food sources that should sustain our larger fish. By allowing all those fish over 20" to be caught I believe we'll find ourselves in a place where it will take multiple years before we see anglers catching and releasing those nice fat over 20" fish.....let's leave them alone and let them grow!!!!

Thank you for your time and consideration.

V/r

Kirk D. Steege  
21150 461<sup>st</sup> Avenue  
Volga, SD 57071  
H: 605-826-4233  
C: 605-691-3110  
[ksteege@itctel.com](mailto:ksteege@itctel.com)

May 5, D  
Oct 26, 2012.

GFP Commission  
523 East Capital Avenue  
Pierre, S.D. 57501

RECEIVED

OCT 29 2012

Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks  
Pierre, SD 57501

Dear GFP Commission

I am against doubling the walleye limit on Lake Oahe. Especially the part about eliminating the one-over-20" rule.

This would eliminate many of the breeding fish over 20" and hurt walleye reproduction years to come.

Please leave the limit as is.

I would like to see all lakes in S.D. have same 15" minimum size & 4 limit

Thank you.

Sincerely  
Lyndon Linsberg

**From:** [Schlueter, Chuck](#)  
**To:** [Ascher, Debra](#)  
**Cc:** [Adams, Gene](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Comments on the Proposed Changes in Oahe Walleye Regulations  
**Date:** Monday, October 29, 2012 10:31:17 AM

---

**To:** SD Game, Fish and Parks Commission  
**Re:** Proposed Oahe Walleye Regulations

The South Dakota Division of the Izaak Walton League of America supports the proposed walleye regulation changes for Lake Oahe.

League members, many who fish Oahe regularly, want to see this fishery recover as quickly as possible. We believe the path outlined by the Department's biologists in this proposal will help get us there.

The Missouri River as well as the other lakes, rivers and ponds across the state are an important component to the quality of life in South Dakota. Fishing is also very important to the state's economy. Angling contributes 200 million dollars a year to the state - 100 million of that is spent by anglers on the Missouri River - much of that on Lake Oahe.

Lake Oahe's recovery will bring the reservoir back to its status as one of the best walleye fisheries in the nation. A quick forage recovery will continue the huge economic impact and support the thousands of jobs in the businesses that derive a large share of their revenues from the great fishing Lake Oahe can provide.

The League appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed regulations and we strongly urge the Commission's support of them.

Sincerely,

Gerald Schlekeway  
SD Division President  
Izaak Walton League of America  
1008 North Huron Avenue  
Pierre, SD 57501  
[gschlek@pie.midco.net](mailto:gschlek@pie.midco.net)

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - fish limits - Larry Talley

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Larry Talley [<mailto:larrytalley@rushmore.com>]

**Sent:** Friday, October 26, 2012 10:54 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Oahe daily, possession, and length limit restrictions

I support the following modifications:

In Lake Oahe, the daily limit for walleye, sauger, walleye-sauger hybrids, or combination thereof is 5 and of the walleye taken daily, with no restriction on size, possession limit is 15;

Larry Talley  
2327 Huntington PL  
Rapid City, SD 57702

[larrytalley@rushmore.com](mailto:larrytalley@rushmore.com)

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Monday, October 29, 2012 3:16 PM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Cc:** Adams, Geno  
**Subject:** FW: Commission proposal comments

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Mark Swenson [<mailto:iamswen@pie.midco.net>]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 29, 2012 3:01 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Commission proposal comments

Why don't we net, seine, or shock walleye and stock sharpe or other areas that they could survive.

Mark Swenson, Pierre SD

Sent from my iPhone

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Monday, October 29, 2012 3:32 PM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Cc:** Adams, Geno  
**Subject:** FW: Commission proposal comments

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [mlueb96@aol.com](mailto:mlueb96@aol.com) [<mailto:mlueb96@aol.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 29, 2012 3:29 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Commission proposal comments

I really think that in the long run, we may be hurting our walleye population by increasing the number and size limits. Just look around at what MN and CA do.

I realize the MO System has some unique problems with recent flood and smelt but fear my kids and grandkids won't have the quality fishing in time to come.

Martin Luebke  
Garretson, SD

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Monday, October 29, 2012 3:17 PM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Cc:** Adams, Geno  
**Subject:** FW: Commission proposal comments

**From:** Dan Henderson [<mailto:dan.moneycentral@midconetwork.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 29, 2012 2:55 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Commission proposal comments

I feel your proposal to raise the walleye limit is a little too drastic and far too late. If you anticipate large walleyes to die off this winter, Why would you raise the limit for next summer. You should have placed an emergency increase for a few months this fall. From what I've been told, The larger walleyes being caught recently, are very healthy. If you keep going down the road your going you will turn Oahe into Lake Francis Case. You should leave a good thing alone for a year or two to see what mother nature has in store. Why don't you consider a "season" for walleye fishing on lake Francis case since? You can use a boat almost year round there which has decimated the walleyes.

Dan Henderson  
601 W. Blvd  
Rapid City, SD 57701  
Ph (605) 348 0600 ext 11  
Fax (605) 348-7900

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 9:51 AM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Cc:** Adams, Geno  
**Subject:** FW: Commission proposal comments

**From:** Jim Larson [<mailto:jpkalarson@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 7:00 AM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Commission proposal comments

I applaud for the staff and commission for being proactive on fish management throughout the state, not just in the river or lakes. I am concerned, however, about letting a person keep four walleye over 20 inches from Oahe. Would two work as well? I think so when combined with an eight-fish limit.

It's proven fishing pressure can impact even a body of water as large as Oahe (the 14 fish limit of a decade or more ago) and I think just raising the limit to 8 per day will bring a substantial increase in pressure yielding the desired results while allowing more people to catch the larger fish.

--

Jim Larson  
3413 S Jesse James Circle  
Sioux Falls SD 57103-7163  
Ph: 605-371-4538

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 9:51 AM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Cc:** Adams, Geno  
**Subject:** FW: Commission proposal comments

**From:** Colonel Jeffrey Lerud [[mailto:coloradojeff\\_2000@yahoo.com](mailto:coloradojeff_2000@yahoo.com)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 1:32 AM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Commission proposal comments

I have no background in fisheries, except I was Regional Director of Trout Unlimited for the South Rocky Mountain Region. That was only because I am an excellent fund raiser for not-for-profit organizations.

That aside, I think raising the walleye limit to 8 with triple possession is perhaps to much. I fish many days each year and I agree many of the larger fish are thin and look underfed. But, many so not show those signs.

As a trout fisherman, I did catch and release many walleyes over 20"s this last season. Those that looked healthy for spawning went back unless injured..

Maybe keep the triple possession, but put limit at 6 with 3 over some arbitrary inch limit.

But, you are the professionals and I will accept your judgment and support you. I just find myself thinking only a little different and I am willing to express that.

Jeffrey Lerud  
Mobridge, SD

[coloradojeff\\_2000@yahoo.com](mailto:coloradojeff_2000@yahoo.com)

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 8:54 AM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Cc:** Adams, Geno  
**Subject:** FW: Commission proposal comments

**From:** Christopher Brown [<mailto:chrisbrown46s@live.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 29, 2012 5:04 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Commission proposal comments

SD Game Fish and Parks Commission,

I don't agree with the proposed new limits and regulations on Lake Oahe. The new limits do not address the over abundance of smallmouth bass, and northern pike. Most of the fishermen want the walleye. We have a healthy population. I think the increase of the possession limit to 24 would negatively impact the fishery. I do agree that continued gizzard shad stockings is needed on Oahe, and I applaud the efforts of the GF&P to add this food source.

Sincerely ,

Christopher M. Brown, Rapid City SD

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 9:51 AM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Cc:** Adams, Geno  
**Subject:** FW: Commission proposal comments

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Brad Bargmann [<mailto:rcstinkbait@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 7:32 AM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Commission proposal comments

Page walleye limit:

Keep the possession limit to 2 days, increase daily limit as proposed.

Thanks,  
Brad Bargmann  
5015 SKYVIEW Drive  
Rapid City, SD 57702  
Sent from my iPad

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 8:16 AM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Cc:** Adams, Geno  
**Subject:** FW: Commission proposal comments

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Bryan Roth [<mailto:bkroth@triotel.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 29, 2012 5:11 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Commission proposal comments

I don't have a problem with the proposed plan, it probably makes the most sense to harvest those fish before they're lost to starvation.

My biggest concern is with the reproduction of bait fish. What can we do to assure the Corp with work with GFP to hold the reservoir at an ideal level for reproduction?

Sorry for a question instead of an answer.

Bryan Roth  
Salem

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 8:20 AM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Cc:** Adams, Geno  
**Subject:** FW: Commission proposal comments

**From:** Wilkins, Brad  
**Sent:** Monday, October 29, 2012 3:54 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Commission proposal comments

For the proposed Lake Oahe walleye limits, I see it has 8 walleye/Sauger Daily with 4 of them over 15". What about listing 1 over 20"? The proposal sounds like you could have 4 large fish as it just says over 15"? Did I read it wrong? Is that not a concern to protect are larger egg producing female Walleye?

Thanks

Brad Wilkins  
Network Administrator  
McCook Central Schools  
200 E. Essex Ave. PO Box 310  
Salem, SD 57058

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 12:05 PM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Cc:** Adams, Geno  
**Subject:** FW: Commission proposal comments

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [gjyonkovich1@mmm.com](mailto:gjyonkovich1@mmm.com) [<mailto:gjyonkovich1@mmm.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 11:30 AM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Commission proposal comments

I strongly support the proposed revision to the walleye limits on Lake Oahe (8 fish). From what I saw fishing the Akaska area this summer & fall, many of the fish are starving. I have caught numerous fish over 20 inches that yielded fillets comparable to a strip of bacon.

When similar changes were made a few years ago, it had a dramatic effect on the fishery. I haven't heard if the proposal includes increasing the possession limit, but it would be helpful to increase this to at least 3 days, to keep fisherman at 'the river' for long weekends.

Gregg Yonkovich  
2421 SE 14th Ave  
Aberdeen, SD 57401

[gjyonkovich1@mmm.com](mailto:gjyonkovich1@mmm.com)

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - fish limits - Michael Brenda Johnson

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Michael and Brenda Johnson [<mailto:mjandb@hotmail.com>]

**Sent:** Thursday, October 25, 2012 10:13 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Opposition to proposed regulation changes for Oahe Reservoir

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed regulation changes for Oahe presented by the fisheries staff at your last meeting. I interpret the data they used to support the proposed regulation changes differently than it was presented. I am focusing on the period of 2003 – 2006. It appears to me that when walleye condition meets the acceptable standards as measured by biologists it is because prey fish are equal to or exceed the long term average. However during this same period the catch and harvest rates went down, along with angler satisfaction. It stands to reason that fish that have plenty to eat are harder to catch, and anglers that were not able to catch and/or harvest fish during this period were less satisfied because they measure the success of their outing against the limit imposed upon them. But part of this equation is that the relative abundance of walleye between 2003 and 2006 is at best moderate, and well below the levels before or since.

So I ask this question: Did we catch and harvest fewer fish between 2003 and 2006 because they had plenty to eat and weren't anxious to bite whatever we put in front of them, or because there were fewer of them there following the record harvest of 2001?

My point is that we just experienced one of the highest harvests on record for 2 consecutive years, and we did it with a 4 fish daily / 2 day possession limit. Creel surveys conducted during 10 of the past 24 months show that we have eliminated over 600,000 walleye by angler harvest. Biologists contend that we still have one of the highest relative abundance of walleye less than 15 inches ever, and they need to be reduced. The other way to look at that is that we have one of the lowest numbers of larger fish ever, and their condition is deteriorating. I argue that those fish under 15 inches will grow provided they have enough to eat, and they are the future of fishing in Oahe for 2013 - 2016. If you accelerate the removal of them beyond the rate we experienced in 2011 and 2012, you are going to see a repeat of the low catch, low harvest, and low satisfaction documented in 2003 – 2006.

They also propose to eliminate the "One over 20" rule to allow these larger fish to be harvested before they die. I believe the majority of fish over 20 inches are already gone, so liberalizing the limits on what is left is a mistake. These fish will already be dead before this proposal can take effect, and the fish you will be targeting for harvest will not be the skinny or weak, but the few remaining survivors left in the system after Mother Nature does what she is going to do.

Therefore, the best thing you can do is nothing - leave the limits where they are. Anglers will take what they can catch, and during the last 2 years when large fish were abundant they were selective in their harvest. They took as many fish between 15-20 inches and the "over 20's" that they legally could. If those fish are truly gone, anglers will adapt and begin to harvest some of the smaller fish biologists believe dominate the system. What aren't harvested and don't die of natural mortality will continue to grow. The higher abundance of fish less than 15 inches will correct itself provided they have prey fish to consume to stimulate growth, and they aren't prematurely removed.

It is too soon to make the kind of radical changes proposed this year. We need to leave things as they are for one more season before we can assess the damage. I wonder if it might be best to consider a modest increase in the daily limit to help stabilize the predator/prey imbalance we seem to experience every 10 years on Oahe. Perhaps we should consider standardizing the limits with our neighbors in North Dakota to simplify the regulation throughout the entire reservoir. This also may help to mitigate the extreme peaks and valleys we have to endure during periods of drought, flood, wind and winter. But drastic changes to the regulation now are only going to confuse the data, and I predict it will have a more devastating effect on the fishing for several years than if we just leave it alone.

Respectfully,

Michael and Brenda Johnson

PO Box 9472

Rapid City, SD 57709

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - fish limits - Fred Carl

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Carl [<mailto:fkcarl@rap.midco.net>]

**Sent:** Thursday, October 25, 2012 10:38 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** lake oahe limit changes

I am writing in opposition to the removal of the upper size restriction portion of the recent proposal. This will end up in anglers keeping 4 over 20 inch fish and forgetting about the smaller fish. I remember very well the days when there was no size restriction and sadly watching as guide boats came to the fish cleaning station with limits for 4-5 people and nothing under 4 lbs in their boat-- and we saw the long term results. Please remember history and don't return to those days.

Thanks for your consideration

Fred Carl

3301 Kerry Drive

Rapid City, SD

**Subject:** Comment - fish limits - Marti Rathert

**From:** Marti Rathert [<mailto:rathertelec@nvc.net>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 16, 2012 6:22 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** limit changes

I would just like to comment on the proposed changes as I see them. Bad Idea! Do not increase the number of larger fish taken from Oahe. The numbers of smaller fish up to 17 inches could be reduced but over 17 should stay as it is. You will only make Oahe a lake of fourteen inch fish if you let everyone take a higher number of large fish. There is a very high level of "highgrading" now and increasing the limits of larger fish will only make it worse. I say increase the limits of walleye on fish up to seventeen inch fish and leave the over twenty inch limit as it is. As a sidenote, I really think the limits should be left alone. Nature will run its course. Changing the limits will not affect the placement of the intakes at Oahe Dam, and that is the real issue here.

Marti Rathert, Aberdeen SD

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - fish limits - Mark Douglas

**From:** Douglas, Mark

**Sent:** Thursday, October 11, 2012 9:43 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** my two cents on increasing Oahe Limits

I heard you're accepting public comments on increasing the walleye limits going into next year.

As a lifelong Pierre resident and avid fisherman on Lake Oahe, I think they should have done something like this last year. The lake is obviously out of balance again – not enough food or prey fish for the amount of predator fish. Just compare the fish from last year to this. The fish weight are substantially less on average. The Gizzard shad introduced this past spring were a nice quick fix try but not really more than a drop in the bucket were they?

I'm not sure how much the increased limits help but they had a 20 fish limit for a while after the last draw down in the late 90's and it still took at least three years for the lake to come out of it a decade ago as I recall. It also took rising water levels and the weed growth along the shore lines for bait and prey fish to thrive. When the smelt and other prey fish come back, it'll get better. As I remember, they also stopped putting salmon fry into the lake for a while and perhaps stopped the walleye restocking program for a while too. Anyway, I personally don't have a problem with them raising the limits – I'd even suggest doing more like a 12 fish limit for a year. The sooner the Lake Oahe is able to support itself, the better for everybody.

**Mark Douglas**

28678 Honeylocust

Pierre SD, 577501

[Mddouglas464@msn.com](mailto:Mddouglas464@msn.com)

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - fish limits - Chuck Byrum

**From:** chuck [mailto:[cbhobbies@venturecomm.net](mailto:cbhobbies@venturecomm.net)]

**Sent:** Thursday, October 11, 2012 9:58 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Commission Proposals

Hello;

Since your ( line ), page about the changes being made for Walleye fishing on Oahe Reservoir cannot be obtained, one can only guess what has been accomplished?

I think, you are planning to increase the limit to 8 per day. 4 must be less than 15 in. and the remaining, ( 4 ), can be any length? From under 15 in. to the remaining 4 being any length. ?

Possession limit to be changed to 3 times the new limit?

Thank you for doing this. I did think the GFP had introduced a couple of other species of ( prey fish ), for Walleyes and other predator fish to supplement the forage base.

How are the Perch doing, are they increasing in quantity and size?

Thank you.

Sincerely, Chuck Byrum, Onida

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - fish limits - Justin Larson

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Larson, Justin

**Sent:** Thursday, October 11, 2012 11:17 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Lake Oahe Limits

I must express my deep concern on removing the "over" restriction moving forward. I understand the test/studies show these fish are at risk of dying with little bait fish BUT with the amount of anglers dropping dramatically until after a possible smelt spawn and walleye spawn why make this move now?

These bigger walleyes have zero chance of survival if they are on a filet table but have a fighting chance if we keep them in the reservoir and hope for a smelt spawn. These bigger fish are our future and their eggs are extremely important, as you understand too I am sure.

I am 100% against removing the "over" restriction, I understand upping the limit to remove some of those younger class fish but I am really worried of allowing anglers to take out so many bigger fish. If we would have a decent smelt spawn I have to believe a lot of these can be saved. If they die over the winter they die over the winter, we don't have enough anglers during the winter months to make a huge difference. PLEASE RE-THINK THIS PART OF THE PROPOSAL.

Regards,

**Justin Larson**  
**816 Currant Drive**  
**Pierre, SD 57501**

20375 Woodridge Drive  
Gretna, NE 68028  
September 25, 2012

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

To Whom It May Concern:

I Nathan Schulte say that you should put a different size limits on the walleye. I believe that some people should have the privilege of having to keep smaller fish. Also some people will keep 13" fish because they have some meat on them. A 13" fish will give a nice fillet, but the limit of 14" or longer prevents this. I also believe that you should bring up the walleye limit to five. Please send me a 2012 hunting and fishing handbook.

Sincerely,

*Nathan Schulte*

Nathan Schulte

October 11, 2012

To Commission Members:

As a fishing guide on Lake Oahe for over thirty years, we hate to see change, but not this time. Fishing over 130 trips on the lake made me think that something needed to be done. I saw 31 inch walleyes weighing 9 pounds and a lot of skinny big fish. The smaller Fish look better, but I questioned for how long? So with that said, I support the limit increase for 4 over and 4 under 15 inches. Let's hope Oahe gets runoff in the spring and bait fish return.

Chuck Krause  
Chuck Krause Guide Service  
29504 US Hwy 212  
Gettysburg, SD 57442

605-765-9765

**Subject:** Comment - fish limits - Loren J Kauske

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Loren Kauske [<mailto:loren@ktconnections.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 24, 2012 4:54 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Comments on proposals for Lake Oahe.

I would like to comment on the current proposal to the fishing seasons/limits regarding Lake Oahe and walleye. In my opinion this could possibly be one of the worst things you could do to the walleye resource we have in Lake Oahe. In my opinion the GFP has done a great job managing the walleye resource in Lake Oahe. All of increases in walleye population and size have come about because of size restrictions and realistic possession limits. Please see my reasons listed below:

1. The state has been trying to decrease the number of regulations for hunting and fishing in the state. The proposal is doing exactly the opposite.
2. There are populations of walleye in Oahe that are not skinny and are healthy. It appears that there are areas on the lake that the bait fish are doing ok and the fish are in better shape than others. Anglers know this and are going to target the healthy fish first and so the healthy fish will be the first to be depleted. Still leaving the skinny fish to possibly die.
3. Regulation changes are too wide, why change size restrictions and increase possession limits. I could see if we needed to remove a certain age class of fish then allow 2 fish over 20" instead of 1 or none at all. I think changing both is going to add too many unknowns to the future harvest.
4. Why increase the removal of fish under 15". The smaller fish are the ones that are in better shape than the larger ones, so why remove them as well. If you increase the number of larger fish that are harvested then I think 2 things will happen. There will be more food for the smaller fish that are in good shape and there will be more fish to grow up and spawn hopefully not leaving a hole in the age class of fish.
5. Why change the possession limit? In my opinion for a person to have 24 walleye in their possession is more than you can consume without being wasteful. Especially if 12 of them have the potential of being over 20".
6. According to recent harvest numbers from the state, more walleyes were harvested last year than any other year. What is to say this trend is not going to continue to increase in future years.
7. Why not add bait fish to the lake instead of decreasing the number of fish.
8. What kind of affect is the daily and possession limit for Oahe going to have on other lakes, resorts, bait shops, that don't have the liberal limits.
9. Can the boat launches on Oahe handle the possible added boat traffic with the liberal limits. Especially if water conditions continue to be low.
10. How is the increase in daily and possession limits going affect angler satisfaction if they aren't able to harvest their limits. I think the increase is too large so you are going to see fewer limits taken. Since some anglers base their success on harvesting a full limit then I think the satisfaction is going to go down.
11. If this change is only going to be for a year, then how is angler satisfaction going to be affected next year when the limits get changed back.

I think if the biologists feel the larger fish are not going to make it then a possible one year increase in the daily limit of fish over 20" for Oahe would be acceptable, allowing 2 fish of 20 or more" and 3 under would be good. In my opinion it would not be acceptable to increase the possession limit to 3 days or to encourage anglers to harvest fish less than 15" by changing the size limits.

Thank you,

Loren J Kauske

2481 Sweetbriar Street, Rapid City SD 57703 605-381-5300

**Subject:** Comment - fish limits - Jim Carpenter

-----Original Message-----

**From:** JC Carpenter [mailto:jcchar83@mncomm.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 24, 2012 9:06 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Comments on Lake Oahe

October 24, 2012

Dear G, F & P Commission:

I'd like to address two items with you, both concern fishing, and in particular fishing on Lake Oahe.

My first fishing item concerns the proposed limit change to Lake Oahe walleye. The proposal of 4 fish less than 15 inches and 4 fish over 15 inches without concern for the number over 20 inches originally caused me concern. After attending the meeting in Ft. Pierre last night (10/23/12), I am confident and secure in my belief that this is the right thing to do. I would encourage the Commission to adopt the recommendation as proposed and not succumb to the emotional pleas of the uninformed. Through the studies conducted, you have long term scientific data available upon which to base your decision. Understanding the difficulty associated with public opinion verses scientific evidence, I encourage you to follow the science and not let run emotion rule. Should public opinion be contrary to the recommendation of the biologists, consider at a minimum a compromise rather than completely abandoning the scientific data.

My second item is in regard to tournaments. I am a recreational fisherman and spend the majority of my fishing on Lake Oahe. I, like many people am also working full time at a job Monday through Friday. Therefore, my fishing, similar to many folks, is limited to the weekend, Saturday and Sunday. So imagine my consternation when I learned that during the month of July, there is fishing tournaments scheduled for every weekend launching out of Spring Creek, Cow Creek or both.

According to your event calendar, beginning on July 7th, what Saturday or Sunday might a local person use either boat ramp?

Dates(s)	Tournament	Launch Location	Participant
07/07/2012	17th Memorial Walleye Classic	Spring Creek	60
07/08/2012	SD BASS Federation Trail Tournament - July	Lake Oahe, Cow Creek	18
07/08/2012	4th State Team Championships	Spring Creek	50
07/12/2012-07/14/2012	National Guard Walleye Tour	Lake Oahe out of Spring Creek	150
07/21/2012-07/22/2012	SD Governors Cup	Spring Creek Resort & Cow Creek	160

Before you point out to me the fact that I can fish any other day of the week beside a weekend, let me remind you of a not so uncommon practice of 'pre-fishing' these events.

I fully understand the economic impact to South Dakota and the local communities. That is an undisputable benefit. But can you imagine the disappointment on the faces of those from out of town or worse yet out of state folks that unwittingly pull up to either of these boat ramps hoping to catch a few "Oahe" walleye?

I'm not opposed to tournaments, let me make that clear. What I am asking is that you consider the scheduling impact of back to back to back tournaments. Beside the weekend scheduling, has there been consideration that the tournament cannot occupy both the Saturday and Sunday of weekend? Leave an open day for local folks and other visitors to enjoy our wonderful fishery.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jim Carpenter  
607 Stewart Place  
Pierre, South Dakota

RECEIVED

OCT 25 2012

Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks  
Pierre, SD 57501

October 21, 2012

Dear Commission,

I recently seen the slide show and listened to the biologist information on the proposed walleye limits on Oahe Reservoir. I do appreciate the fisheries personnel taking efforts that benefit the angler. I however do not support the proposed limits. Nobody likes to see what is happening to our walleye fishery, but our first concern should be what our walleye population will look like after the famine. We should be doing what we can to salvage the survivors, not on how many can we salvage for the freezer.

Mother Nature will cull the sick and starving and will reduce our population to the right level. I believe the fish in trouble will be long gone before the anglers arrive next summer. This regulation will allow anglers to target the healthy survivors. The anglers will find the preferred healthier fish. We know the under 15" fish can survive without the smelt. I feel these fish are our future fishery and tapping that reserve now is a gamble. These fish have a better chance of surviving in the reservoir rather than in the freezer.

We know annual smelt spawn success isn't reliable. We also know that Oahe only discharges are cold water discharges, complicating cold water forage management. Over the years we have experienced this type of event much too often. We have lost our cold water forage during high water, low water, poor spawn, natural decline, bad weather, fluctuating water levels, and all have a devastating effect on our walleye fishery.

We also experienced an unusual 2012. Our smelt spawn was a bust, we had an unusually hot and dry summer, and Oahe reservoir sits at 81%. If 2012 was the first year of another drought period we already have a water deficit and unwanted challenges may lie ahead.

This is the time to leave the regulation as is, and let Mother Nature handle it. She will get it right.

We do however have choices and would suggest these considerations:

- \* Leave Oahe regulation as is
- \* Collect data at our spring walleye spawn sites
- \* Identify smelt spawn success as soon as possible
- \* All out effort to enhance the shad stocking program
- \* Commission should direct, support, and fund an annual shad stocking program for Oahe

It is possible with early spring data that we could minimize our losses instead of maximizing what we can salvage. We have seen the dramatic influence the shad forage can have on a fishery and that is the one factor where we have some control. Stocking shad on an annual basis may be our only control to reduce the periodic devastation our Oahe walleye fishery encounters.

I encourage this commission to stay the course; we do not have to pass this regulation now. Spring data may be more encouraging than we expect and if we feel the need, we have the emergency regulation rule we can implement accordingly.

Thank You for the opportunity to comment.

*Ken Edel*  
Ken Edel  
20 Anaconda Road  
Rapid City, SD 57701  
605 348-1470

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - fish limits - Hiene Junge

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Hienej [<mailto:hienej@midco.net>]

**Sent:** Friday, October 19, 2012 1:11 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Lake Oahe Walleye

I support increasing the daily walleye limit to eight, with no more than four, 15 inches or greater in length.

Hiene Junge  
3249 Johnston Lane  
Rapid City, SD 57703

**Subject:** Comment - fish limits - Dennis Bohls

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Denny Bohls [<mailto:dbohls@abweld.org>]

**Sent:** Friday, October 19, 2012 11:54 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** New Oahe Walleye Limits

Gentlemen.

I attended a meeting at the Rapid City Outdoor Campus on the new regulations for Lake Oahe of 8 per day with a 3 day possession. If the Dept of Fisheries feel we need to make a change in the limit for 1 year, i'm in partial agreement. What bothers me is the 8 per day with a total of 24 in possession. If Lake Oahe had a high fish take last year with the 4 limit, i'm afraid the new limit will take an excessive amount of fish out of the lake. I would feel more comfortable with lowering it to 6 per day with a 2 day possession. Leave the 4 of 15" or larger with a 2 under 15". When your taking fish there is always a few 14 3/4" healthy walleye's that is caught, that took the hook deep and you have bleeding from the hook set or removal, under the current rules they need to be returned to the lake. If there was a place in the live well for those 14 3/4" to be taken, that also would help with the current problem. Please take my suggestion into consideration. Thank you.

Dennis Bohls  
2035 Sheridan Lake Road  
Rapid City, SD 57702

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - fish limits - Tom Wanttie

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Tom Wanttie [mailto:[TWanttie@aberdeencfu.org](mailto:TWanttie@aberdeencfu.org)]

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 17, 2012 10:28 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Proposed walleye limit increase for Oahe

While I applaud your proposal to increase the daily limit, I think you would be doing an injustice by allowing anglers to take 4 fish over 20". Your slot limit has done a great job for the fishery in growing some really nice sized fish. If you allow 4 over 20" to be taken, I believe you will be defeating any gains you have made in making Oahe a great fishery.

Tom Wanttie  
410 19<sup>th</sup> Ave NE  
Aberdeen SD 57401  
605-216-0695

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - fish limits - Clayton Larson

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Clayton Larson [<mailto:clarson@webwater.org>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 17, 2012 8:14 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** fishing limit

There should only be one or two over 20". The limit of eight is fine and 4 over and under 15" is fine.

Clayton Larson, Selby

**Subject:** Comment - fish limits - Greg Hasel

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Greg Hasel [<mailto:GHASSEL@firstpremier.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, October 15, 2012 9:39 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

While I do trust the management ability of the Fisheries staff and the GF&P, I do not agree with removing the proposed 1 over 20 inch limit. At times it can be relatively easy to catch fish over 20 inches and too many anglers will take as many big fish as they are allowed, often times catching/culling smaller fish until larger are caught. Increase the limit but keep the 1 over 20 inches in place.

Thanks

Greg Hasel  
Sioux Falls, SD

**NOTICE:** This e-mail and any attachment is private and meant for the sole use of the intended recipient. It may contain personally identifiable financial information protected by law. No confidentiality or other legal protection is waived by virtue of this information having been sent by e-mail. Any disclosure, use, dissemination, or copying of the information is strictly prohibited by anyone except the intended recipient or their agent. If you received this e-mail in error please notify us immediately by returning it to the sender, calling (605)357-3168 and immediately deleting this e-mail and any attachments.

First PREMIER Bank  
601 S Minnesota Ave  
Sioux Falls, SD 57104  
(605) 357-3001  
[www.firstpremier.com](http://www.firstpremier.com)

PREMIER Bankcard  
3820 N Louise Ave  
Sioux Falls, SD 57107  
(605) 357-3440  
[www.premierbankcard.com](http://www.premierbankcard.com)

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - fish limits - Richard Trapp

**From:** DJTrapp [<mailto:djtrapp@rushmore.com>]

**Sent:** Sunday, October 14, 2012 12:08 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Commission Proposals

I really don't feel the limit should be over six fish and also only one over twenty. I feel the one over twenty is very important. Also 24 possession limit is too many. A two day limit is plenty. I feel we are sacrificing our waters and good fishing. All we are doing is encouraging out of state tourism fishing and small license fees for them. Buy a license in the surrounding states also and they are much higher. Let's charge more for out of state licenses

Richard Trapp, 4810 West Chicago St. Rapid City, SD

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - fish limits - Barry Higginbotham

**From:** Higginbotham, Barry

**Sent:** Monday, October 15, 2012 2:04 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Oahe walley limit

I read the comments about the limit increases for Oahe, I think the increase the daily limit to 8 is ok but to reduce the size over 20" to 15" is a mistake. This limit for over 20" should be increased to 2 to preserve the natural reproduction.

Thank you,  
Barry Higginbotham, Fort Pierre

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comments - fish limits - Larry Anderson

**From:** butch anderson [<mailto:lbutchanderson@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Thursday, October 11, 2012 9:52 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** oahe fishing limits

I live on lake Oahe and agree with your assessment and limit changes except dropping the one over 20 inches. I believe you need to keep that rule in effect, by allowing an angler to keep four fish over 20 inches you will deplete the opportunity for weekend anglers, family outings etc the opportunity to possible catch a trophy fish in the years to come. As you know it takes a walleye several years to reach a proud angle status, or trophy fish, and with the number of sophisticated fisherman increasing, the guides services increasing, the over 20 inch fish will basically get cleaned out in a season and then what will be left for the next several years?

Years ago when the smelt population was so good and you could have 8 fish limits and sort fish I was watching limits of 4 lb plus fish coming into the boat ramps and became very concerned to the point I wrote Jack Merwin a letter pleading with him to encourage the department to put a slot limit in. he wrote back stating we'll never see a problem in our lifetime. Well that lifetime lasted a couple of years and the trophy fish were basically gone (with a few exceptions) for several years until the department implemented the slot limit. Everyone is used to it, so why mess with that part of it? you don't thin the buffalo herd out to have bigger and better herds for the future by killing all the bulls and that's what you're going to do here by eliminating the over 20 slot.

Larry Anderson  
16461 294<sup>th</sup> ave  
Gettysburg, SD 57442

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comments - fish limits - William Blickendenfer

-----Original Message-----

**From:** William Blickensderfer [mailto:drblick@aol.com]

**Sent:** Thursday, October 11, 2012 10:47 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Commission Proposals

I suggest no change on Oahe. The bays are full of bait fish. If you fish the main channel fish are skinny, you fish the bays the fish are healthy. Most fisherman took the 17 to 20 inch year class out last year they are harder to find so they are greatly reduced. Just look at the posts on sdinsider every day he says we were able to fill the clients limits with nice under's after catching 50 fish a day. Now you take the small fish and the over fish, oh boy. If you do change to that many fish, be prepared for more maintenance on fish cleaning stations and ramps. I believe the efforts by game fish are starting to take effect, I am seeing a bounce back of the health of the fish, we just needed to give it time. If you do change it I will go to Oahe more.

good luck

William Blickenderfer  
Rapid City

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comments - fish limits - Mark Abrams

-----Original Message-----

**From:** mark abrams [mailto:mark@affiliatedsd.com]

**Sent:** Friday, October 12, 2012 2:41 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Proposed Fishing changes for lake Ohae

I heard that they are looking to increase the daily limit to 8, which would be great but eliminate the only 1 fish over 20". Why eliminate that? If you are allowed to keep 8 fish why does anyone need to keep more than one fish over 20"? Makes no sense to me as most boats have 3-4 people, so technically they can already keep 3-4 fish over 20"- seems like plenty of big fish to me. Plus the smaller fish make much better fillets.

--

Mark Abrams, Mortgage Specialist

LendSmart Mortgage LLC,

DBA Affiliated Mortgage

NMLS #178795

2920 W Main #2

Rapid City SD 57702

Office 605.718.9820

Cell 605.391.3895

Fax 605.718.9822

**EQUAL OPPORTUNITY LENDER**

*The information contained in this electronic communication, as well as in any attachments, is privileged and confidential and intended solely for use by the addressee(s). Any other use, dissemination, or copying of this electronic communication is strictly prohibited and is an interference with LendSmart Mortgage, LLC. If you received this communication in error, please notify me immediately and permanently delete the original and any electronic or printed copies of this electronic communication. LendSmart Mortgage, LLC. makes no representation regarding the absence of any virus in any attachment and expressly disclaims any responsibility for any damage suffered from the presence of a virus.*

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comments - fish limits - Chris Nelson

**From:** Chris Nelson [<mailto:chrisbinsd@yahoo.com>]

**Sent:** Saturday, October 13, 2012 1:34 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Oahe Proposal Comments

Dear Commissioners,

I would like to express my support of the current proposal on the daily/possession limit changes proposed for Lake Oahe. The fisheries and wildlife staff have done an excellent job over the years of managing our resources through incredibly difficult (and unpredictable) situations that mother nature, the public, and politicians have handed them.

Although I fully appreciate the viability of public testimony in this process, I urge you to trust the opinions of the professional staff and their science-based recommendations.

Thank you,  
Chris Nelson  
517 N Huron  
Pierre SD 57501

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - fish limits - Mike Behm

**From:** michael behm [mailto:behmermike@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Sunday, October 14, 2012 12:29 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Commission Proposals

This is an extremely unfortunate even for Lake Oahe and appreciate the work by GF&P to manage the resource. It's also unfortunate these rules, if adopted, were not adopted during the summer 2012 angling season. We lost a great opportunity to impact the population while allowing anglers/spearfishers the chance to harvest quality fish.

The emergency management philosophy must be modified and instead look to a long term adequate forage base for the reservoir. We were nearing the precipice of a trophy size and catch rate class facility. Now it appears we'll be in another 10 year + (barring no additional significant release from Oahe) before it rebounds.

Please continue to support your staff and implement a long term approach to management.

Mike Behm, Pierre SD

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - Fish limits - David Erickson

-----Original Message-----

**From:** David Erickson, MD [<mailto:David.Erickson@avera.org>]

**Sent:** Monday, October 22, 2012 2:12 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Walleye limits

I support the increased daily limit of 8 fish. I'm concerned with removing the 1 fish over 20 inch regulation might impact the trophy quality of fishing and hope you will retain the one daily over 20. Thank you for your hard work to support fishing. Dave Erickson.

David Erickson, 3900 West Avera Drive

Sioux Falls, SD 57108

605.322.4700 (office)

605.322.4673(fax)

[david.erickson@avera.org](mailto:david.erickson@avera.org)

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - fish limits - Eric Anderson

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Eric Anderson [mailto:[ericanthonyanderson@gmail.com](mailto:ericanthonyanderson@gmail.com)]

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 24, 2012 9:09 AM

**To:** Adams, Geno; Fincel, Mark (GFP)

**Subject:** Lake Oahe Regulation Change

Geno & Mark-

Thanks for your presentation on the Lake Oahe regulation changes in Rapid City last Thursday. I thought you guys did a very good job outlining the reasons for the changes. The big picture approach taken regarding biology, social issues, and economic interest all were put together nicely. I appreciate the GFP being proactive and trying to provide anglers opportunity when it arises. I didn't understand the regulation and the needs before the meeting. Now, I support the regulation as presented.

All the meetings I have attended, either with you or the west river fisheries staff, have been outstanding. Very, very informative. Please continue having these meetings.

Thanks,  
Eric Anderson  
Rapid City, SD

RECEIVED

OCT 24 2012

10/20/12

DEAR SIRs:

Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks  
P.O. Box 77501

Thank you for allowing me to  
give you my comments concerning  
the Commission PROPOSAL 41:07:03:03  
PANA (d).

I have reviewed the Commission  
Update and attended the meeting  
10/11/12 in Radio City. MARK FINCEL  
and GENO DID A GOOD JOB PRESENTING  
INFORMATION.

I had concerns with raising the limit/  
and 1 over 20" Requirement. With  
increased fishing pressure I thought  
that taking more larger fish > 20"  
would hurt the larger fish population.  
I learned that angler pressure is  
less than fish natural mortality.

I support your proposal and only ask  
that you monitor it carefully.

Thanks, GREG BOTTLIS

8 PIONEER Lane, SPEARFISH, WY 82783

**From:** [Schlueter, Chuck](#)  
**To:** [Ascher, Debra](#)  
**Cc:** [Saylor, Will](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Commission proposal comments  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 1:33:41 PM

---

-----Original Message-----

**From:** chuck [<mailto:cbhobbies@venturecomm.net>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 12:53 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Commission proposal comments

Good morning, SD Game & Fish Commissioners and Staff:

Frankly, I am totally opposed to the ( Spearing of any GAME fish ). And I have always felt this way since the first time this was allowed at the Power House below the Oahe Dam.

Spearing ROUGH fish is just fine. There cannot be any SPORT in swimming up to a game fish and SPEARING them at very close range. IT is a definite way to KILL the TROPHY fish of any GAME fish species. Please correct me, are there other areas allowed in the state, for spearing game fish?

The increase in quantity and possession limit of Qahe Walleyes is a definite approach caused by the excessive loss of the majority of their food prey species .

This seems to happen every time the EMERGENCY spill ways are used to deplete an over-fill of the Oahe Dam.

I may have miss-understood the stocking of other species of prey food for game fish, besides, depending on the SMELT population? Maybe Shad?

Thank you for your time.

Respectively,  
Chuck Byrum  
PO Box 12  
405 Blaine ST. SW  
Highmore, SD. 57345  
CBHOBBIES.COM

[cbhobbies@venturecomm.net](mailto:cbhobbies@venturecomm.net)

**Subject:** Comment - spearing - Troy Dinger

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Troy Dinger [mailto:troyding@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Friday, October 26, 2012 11:03 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Expanded pike, catfish spearing

Hi my name is Troy Dinger I am 38 years old and currently live at Richmond Lake.

I would like to voice my support for the proposed changes to pike and catfish spearing. I just read the article in the paper and told my 15 year old if this goes through it would be huge. He already knows how I feel because I tell him all the time. I grew up in Hecla and started dark house spearing at a young age with my grandfather on the Jim River. I have so many childhood memories that I want to have with my son. We open a hole every year on the Jim to check water clarity have yet to find a year the water isn't murky because of current. He has yet to spear a northern and has had to settle for watching it on you tube videos.

We are very thankful for all of the hunting and fishing opportunities currently available. I love it all but for me nothing has compared to sitting in that dark house and having a northern come into view. Maybe I am partial but I cannot think of a single negative to this proposal.

You guys as a commission are doing so many positive things. I am very thankful for the 10 year old mentoring program. I have no doubts you have caused a number of kids to be addicted to hunting rather than electronics. I didn't ask him to but my son is also sending a support email. I would appreciate a response after the meeting on Nov 1 since I am unable to attend. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Troy Dinger  
379625 N Shore Dr  
Aberdeen, SD 57401  
Home (605)2250071  
Cell (605)2287542

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Friday, October 26, 2012 12:14 PM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Cc:** Sayler, Will; Adams, Geno  
**Subject:** FW: Spearing and Archery Expansion

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Kyler Dinger [<mailto:kylerdinger@hotmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 26, 2012 10:31 AM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Spearing and Archery Expansion

I am e-mailing in regard to the spearing expansion allowing dark house, archery, and underwater spearing to be a legal form of fishing in all inland waters of SD. I have heard stories from my Dad from the days of spearing on the James River near Hecla where he grew up. Now because of water clarity dark house spearing is no longer an option. This expansion would allow more people to experience what used to be in dark house spearing and help control the catfish and pike population. Thank you for your time and efforts to make this possible.

Kyler Dinger, Aberdeen SD

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 9:52 AM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Cc:** Saylor, Will  
**Subject:** FW: Modify Fish Spearing Restrictions

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Curt Tesch [<mailto:curtaps@venturecomm.net>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 7:33 AM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Modify Fish Spearing Restrictions

Dear Commissioners,

I applaud you for taking this initiative. I remember talking about this with GF&P personnel about two years ago at one of the local get together meetings. We thought it was a good idea then. I am not certain, but do hope the darkhouse spearing is for residents only. If not I think you will be surprised at the influx of nonresidents from western Minnesota. I grew up in Minnesota and dearly love darkhouse spearing for northern pike. In Minnesota darkhouse spearing is for residents only. It is the only thing I missed when I left Minnesota. I think our darkhouse spearing should be for residents only unless our largest neighbor is willing to revise their regulations.

Thank you for considering my comments,  
Curt Tesch  
Associated Production Services  
10527 469TH AV  
Rosholt, SD 57260  
605-537-4565  
Fax - 605-537-4564  
[curtaps@venturecomm.net](mailto:curtaps@venturecomm.net)

**Subject:** Comment - spearing - Jim Gruber

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Jim Gruber [mailto:jrg@itctel.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 13, 2012 9:37 AM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** spearing on inland waters

My first comment to the proposed regulation to allow spearing of northerns is why?

A few points come to mind... minnesota has had spearing on many inland lakes for years, and has been trying to eliminate the practice completely...

One, people who spear target specifcily large northern, not the one to three pound fish... i live on lake poinsett, with a water clarity of 20 feet.. believe me it would not take long for a few people to eliminate the large fish from this 8000 ac. lake in the winter... these fish feed heavily on silver bass and other rough fish... why would you want to eliminate this major predator from the lake... we currently have lake mary, john, albert, and norderm open for spearing every winter... these lakes are full of the 1 to 3 lb. northern, yet, in 6 years i have yet to see anyone spearing on these lakes.. mainly because the northern are too small.. but open up poinsett where northern grow to 20 lbs. and you will have a heavy influx of out of state spearkers decimate the pike in no time at all... this is what happens when you let arm chair biologists try and do the managing of the lakes rather than the fish biologists we currently have. in other words if it is not broke, do not break it... we do not need this practice allowed..

Look at mille lacs lake in mn.... spearing was outlawed for many yrs... and the northern pop. grew in size to trophy class... they opened it for spearing and in few yrs. all that was left were the 1 to 3 lb. fish...they again closed it and has remained close for many yrs...

every winter i observe people keeping over their limit, and not obeying the 15 inch limit.. and the lake littered with northern... i would really like to know just how many citations are written just here.... the problem is not the northern pop. but the people who use the lake... we do not need another enforcement issue that cannot be enforced. we have enough laws, maybe a few more con. officers would help instead of more rules that go unenforced.. believe me, it is pretty hard for a spearer to resist spearing that 8 lb. waleye, especially when he knows the odds of being checked are slim....i think hamlin county is still short an officer to this day... thank you

jim gruber 320 249 8466cell 148 sunset park drive estelline. s.d. 57234 [jrg@itctel.com](mailto:jrg@itctel.com)

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comments - spearing - Derek Schiefelbein

**From:** Schiefelbein, Derek

**Sent:** Thursday, October 11, 2012 9:38 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Commission Proposals

Darkhouse spearing date.

Moving the date all the way back to March 15 will lead to many more houses melting through the ice and ending up on the bottom of the lake. On an average year by March 15 the majority of the ice is weakened around the edges and folks will not be able to access the better ice to remove houses. The houses are an eye sore on the bank and bottom.

Derek Schiefelbein, Pierre

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - spearing - Jay Bellinger

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Fish [<mailto:fish@tnics.com>]

**Sent:** Friday, October 19, 2012 8:17 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Northern Pike Spearing Regulations

I have lived in several states that allow pike to be speared in all lakes and have taken advantage of this sport most of my life. I presently live on Big Stone Lake but have to drive to Rush Lake to spear pike. This change in regulation would allow me to spear right at home and I am sure would result in being able to enjoy much more time at one of my favorite sports. I definitely support this change in the regulations!

Jay R. Bellinger  
47920 Rocky Point Road  
Corona, SD 57227

Phone Number 605-432-7872  
e-mail [fish@tnics.com](mailto:fish@tnics.com)

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 31, 2012 7:47 AM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Cc:** Saylor, Will  
**Subject:** FW: Spearing

**From:** Mitch Reker [<mailto:mitch.reker@live.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 9:07 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Spearing

I have been a dark house spearer my entire life. During my time at SDSU I speared often on Mary, Albert and John. I now live in Brandon and still made the trip every weekend last winter. However, this is becoming very expensive. I do not want to stop spearing but the fuel prices are making it hard. I also have taken trips to Pactola to spear (not with much success) and plan to make another week long trip there this winter. Though I will still probably make the trip to Pactola I do not think I will be driving the 100 miles each way to go every weekend. This will be very hard for me. I think opening all the lakes to spearing pike would be a great move to keep people like me spearing as well as controlling the pike population. I think it is a win-win. I also like using March 15 as the end date for spearing.

Mitch Reker  
Estimator/ Project Manager

**Reker Construction and Aggregate, LLC:** Grading Contractor-Aggregate Producer  
Cell: 507.360.9119 | Office: 507.483.2544 | Fax: 507.483.2966

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - Hoop net and set line - John Koenig

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [rivercat@midstatesd.net](mailto:rivercat@midstatesd.net) [mailto:[rivercat@midstatesd.net](mailto:rivercat@midstatesd.net)]

**Sent:** Monday, October 22, 2012 7:25 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Hoop net and set line proposed rules

I find the proposed changes consistent with making catfish populations more utilized by fishermen. I'm in favor of the increased opportunities for fishing with setlines, a very relaxing and enjoyable endeavor.

John Koenig

208 W. 11th Ave.

Chamberlain SD 57325

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - HOOP NET AND SET LINES - L A Cameron

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [lcameron@gwtc.net](mailto:lcameron@gwtc.net) [mailto:[lcameron@gwtc.net](mailto:lcameron@gwtc.net)]

**Sent:** Friday, October 26, 2012 9:35 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** CHANGES TO HOOP NET AND SET LINES

HAVING BEEN A LICENSE AGENT FOR 34 YEARS , I HAVE VISITED WITH MANY HUNTERS AND FISHERMEN ...THERE IS NOT A LOT OF SET LINES AND HOOP NETS BEING USED AND I THINK MOST PEOPLE DO NOT FISH FOR CATS..ITS WALLEYES CRAPPIE AND BASS.. NEBRASKA ON THE OTHER HAND, HAVE QUITE A FEW SET LINES AS I FISH WITH SOME OF THESE PEOPLE ...WE NEED RULES SIMILAR TO THEIRS IN THIS AREA ,AS I KNOW PEOPLE LIVING IN SOUTH DAKOTA WHO PURCHASE A NON RES NEBR. LICENSE ..MOST OF THE FISH THAT ARE CAUGHT ON LINES ARE CATS WITH MINNOWS..PURCHASE OF MINNOWS HELPS THE LOCAL BAIT SHOP AND MAKES IT EASIER TO FISH FOR CATS CAUSE WE DONT HAVE TO LOOK FOR OR CATCH OUR OWN BAIT AND WE CAN SPEND MORE TIME ON THE WATER ..I LIVE IN THE RUNNING WATER / NIOBRARA AREA ..THANKS FOR LISTENING..

L.A.CAMERON, AVON SD

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comments - set lines - Greg Girard

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Girard, Greg

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 17, 2012 3:26 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Cc:** [fishmam189@mit.midco.net](mailto:fishmam189@mit.midco.net)

**Subject:** Set Lines

Please consider allowing 25 hooks on a set line.  
Most factory made set lines are made to allow 25 hooks per line.

Thank you

Greg Girard  
501 Oakmond Ave  
Mitchell SD 57301

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - fish bait - Mike Eisenmenger  
**Attachments:** ATT00001.txt

GF & P Commission,

Your proposal to increase areas where bait fish could NOT be extracted from SD waters is a very good rule change.

I firmly believe that using bait fish in any State will eventually allow unwanted fish into the State's fishing waters, but I do not have an answer to prevent this from happening unless live bait fish is outlawed!

Thank you for requesting people to respond,

Mike Eisenmenger  
508 East 21st Street  
Yankton, SD 57078

E-Mail: [mreisen1224@hotmail.com](mailto:mreisen1224@hotmail.com)

**Subject:** Comment - Aquatic Nuisance - Ron Moehring

**From:** Moehring, Ron

**Sent:** Thursday, October 11, 2012 9:31 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** ANS Rules

I would suggest that you also add Yellow Flag Iris to the list of Aquatic Nuisance Species. Yellow Flag Iris is already found in some South Dakota Ponds and streams in the Hills area. It presents a dual impact on both human interests and native environments. This plant displaces native plants including sedges and rushes. This can reduce the carrying-capacity of wetlands for waterfowl and disrupt other ecological relationships. Irrigation canals and flood control ditches can be severely restricted by the physical nature of the plant clumps. Removal can be costly requiring large excavation equipment or herbicides. Control of heavily infested waterways can be cost prohibitive due to the huge volume of plant material needing to be removed. Any rhizome fragments that remain quickly reestablish a population. Invaded marshes in some eastern states are experiencing a significant displacement of native sedges and rushes with monocultures of iris. Many waterfowl species are dependent on sedge and rush seeds as a high-energy food source. Replacement of this food source with yellow flag iris would reduce the carrying capacity of these marshes to sustain waterfowl populations. A small volume of yellow flag still exists in the nursery trade. A variegated variety is popular with aquatic gardeners and can be found in several catalogs and web sites. The ease with which this plant can be established using rhizome fragments has led to extensive trading among gardeners and aquatic plant enthusiasts.

Ron Moehring  
State Weed and Pest and Pest Supervisor  
South Dakota Department of Agriculture  
523 East Capitol Pierre SD 57501  
605 773-3796

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - license fees - Brad Moore

**From:** Brad Moore [<mailto:bkmemo@abe.midco.net>]

**Sent:** Thursday, October 11, 2012 7:19 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Commission Proposals

I would support the increase in non-resident hunting fees, contingent upon revising the 2 five-day sessions, to a 3, 3, 4 day session or any combination. Limiting the opportunity to 2 five day sessions limits the opportunity for an additional trip to SD, which would result in increased sales tax collected from money spent.

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to comment.

Brad Moore  
Aberdeen, SD

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - license fees - Robert Foote

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Robert Foote [<mailto:bobofoote@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Thursday, October 11, 2012 10:36 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Commission Proposals

I see that you are planning to increase the non-resident small game hunting license another \$10. It amazes me that you could only generate the million plus dollars from the non-resident and not increase any of the resident fees. If you had any idea how much money I spend to come and hunt in South Dakota you would be amazed. Now you decide to charge me \$10 more and you were already above the local state averages. I ask you to please reconsider this increase. If you must generate a million dollars than make the increase across the board to all hunters. This only seems fair especially considering that the resident has the opportunity to hunt every day of the entire season while I only get to hunt for 10 days. I am a retiree that loves to hunt in SoDak but I can't afford to continue to carry this entire burden.

Robert Foote, Whittier CA

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - license fees - Tim Lembke

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [timlembke@aol.com](mailto:timlembke@aol.com) [mailto:[timlembke@aol.com](mailto:timlembke@aol.com)]

**Sent:** Sunday, October 07, 2012 10:09 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** license fee increase

With the license fee increases we don't plan to hunt in SD anymore.

Tim Lembke

1110 Sunnyfield Rd N.

Mound MN 55364

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comments - ~~park~~ fees - Paul Tellinghuisen  
*license*

**From:** Paul & Tas Tellinghuisen [mailto:telling5@sio.midco.net]

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 03, 2012 5:47 PM

**To:** SDGFPINFO

**Subject:** Thoughts for the GFP Commission Meeting in Deadwood This Week

I would like to weigh in on the proposed increase in Out of State Hunting Fees.

I don't think that Out of State alone should burden the extra expense of SD GFP.

If you are going to increase the license fees I feel that it should be for SD hunters and Out of State.

When you check into a hotel in an out of state location and have to pay extra taxes don't you wonder why YOU need to fund THEIR event center, new projects, etc.?

Increasing out of state license is the same thing.

We gain huge dollars from them in other revenues.

If you have a few hunters that stay away that will not be spending Hotel money, Gas money, Restaurant money, Guided Hunt money, you get the idea, that would be even a bigger loss.

Just a few of my thoughts.

Paul Tellinghuisen

Sioux Falls SD 605 351-2413

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - license fees - Lana Greenfield

-----Original Message-----

**From:** lana greenfield [mailto:[lana.greenfield@gmail.com](mailto:lana.greenfield@gmail.com)]

**Sent:** Sunday, October 07, 2012 4:57 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Price hike

Just a note to let you know that we as owners of two businesses oppose the proposed rate increase in out of state hunting licenses. We as a state tout the idea of trying to promote tourism, and yet some over price motel rooms, food, and yes, now maybe licenses during peak tourist times...seems to me that some have tried to destroy a growth in the economy by doing these things. That is my opinion. Another thing : at the current prices of gasoline, now is not the time to think of increases. I fear greatly for our future pheasant seasons as much CRP has come out, and the pheasants are struggling for cover. Coupled with that is the terribly hot, dry summer we have had. This also did nothing for pheasant survival. Each year I notice a little more resistance on the hunters' part to pay the guided hunts as many of them, too, are over priced. Also I have noticed that some of the older hunters come out of tradition each year, but others have said they did not have the money so may come every other year. I think it is important to give input as I run a convenience store, restaurant/bar and lodging area. Hunters help boost our business tremendously in our small town for about 3 months. Would hate to see a price increase be a detriment, not only for our businesses, but for many small businesses struggling to survive. Thank you.

Lana Greenfield

D/ba Greenfield's Short Stop and Greeny's

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - license fees - Perry Lewis

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Lewis [<mailto:rustyjudy@midco.net>]

**Sent:** Friday, September 21, 2012 12:45 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** license fees

You are discussing the possibility of raising license fees to cover your increased expenses. Most of us, young and old, are dealing with less income and higher expenses and inflation also with no relief in sight. Personally I have cut back on fishing and may not buy a hunting license this year. I appreciate what our state has to offer and the work you do, but think this would be a very poor time to increase any costs to us.

Thanks.

Perry Lewis

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - license fees - Wm Pulscher

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Bob Pulscher [mailto:Pulscher@mchsi.com]

**Sent:** Monday, October 08, 2012 7:13 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info; Vonk, Jeff

**Subject:** GFP formally proposes price hikes for some parks, hunting licenses

Gentlemen,

I think it's time for nonresidents hunters to seriously consider boycotting SD after your new rates are announced. Wonder how long that will take to organize? This isn't solely about \$ - there's principle involved too. Other state licenses have similar cost but most issue their licenses for the season rather than attempting to repeatedly gouge and gore any nonresident who'd like to return more frequently than once or twice a season. I am confident you will succeed in encouraging adjoining states to retaliate. Most hunters get upset by IL trying to continuously pass legislation to take away firearms but I believe SD is coming up with a more effective approach -- just make it too expensive for all but the wealthiest nonresidents to keep hunting on your turf.

Way to Go!

Col (Ret.) William R Pulscher

**Subject:** Comment - license fees - Jack Zacher

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Jack Zacher [<mailto:old68goat@spe.midco.net>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 16, 2012 12:05 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:**

I've been hunting for 50 years and a proposal to raise hunting and fishing license in a bad economy is suicide. everything seems to go to the rich we people in the lower class aren't going to be able to hunt and I've already quit fishing because of all the fees. you buy a fishing license then you license your boat and trailer then you pay a launch fee then the fee to park your car because your disabled and have to park where you can get up and down the shore. you ask if you can hunt on someones land and they tell you does and coyotes only and charge a big fee out the back gate for bucks hunting will soon go the way of fishing. they lay there corn or apples out and they know the deer will come. get ten to twenty hunters together with bows and figure the escape routes out 4 pushing 8 or 10 set up on escape routes when I was bow hunting it was me and the game that was the main push of bow hunters but now it's get as many guys and kill, kill, kill.

jack zacher, spearfish disabled viet-nam vet.

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - license fees - Kevin Koenig

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Teri [<mailto:tkcc@conpoint.com>]

**Sent:** Friday, October 19, 2012 9:58 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Hunting license

I find it dissappointing that South Dakota does not allow a non resident landowner with a residence to hunt deer and only 10 days for pheasant at a cost of \$228 on my own property. My family and I enjoy wildlife and the people in South Dakota but the cost associated with hunting and fishing seems to be extremely high considering our investment in the state. Please forward as appropriate.

Sincerely,

Kevin Koenig, Wayne NE

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - license fees - Alan Kruse

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Alan Kruse [mailto:[akruse@pendulumsite.com](mailto:akruse@pendulumsite.com)]

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 09, 2012 2:09 PM

**To:** Vonk, Jeff; GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** FW: LICENSE PRICE HIKE FOR NON RESIDENT HUNTERS

Mr Vonk: I am a non resident and a frequent pheasant hunter in SD. I was a former SD military member and now live in Illinois. I heartily OBJECT to the commission's proposal to raise fees for us non residents. None of the surrounding states only allow non residents to hunt in two 5-day periods. Their yearly small game licenses are the same costs but qualify nonresidents to hunt the entire season and the ability to hunt the entire season applies to nonresident waterfowl licenses also.

You are driving nonresident hunters out of SD by increasing the rates. Many of my friends refuse to come to SD since they can hunt in other states at their convenience and not be charged higher rates if they stay past ten days. As you are undoubtedly aware, we bring a lot of commerce to the state but it is getting too expensive for us to come to SD for pheasant or waterfowl. The commission may feel it is a simple multiplication problem that you can count on the same number of hunters paying a higher rate will equal higher revenue. It is not true and all of the SD tourism industry will suffer. Many people in local communities rely on hunter's revenue and increases in fees will hurt them tremendously. The licenses should actually be reduced to draw MORE hunters to the state. Your revenue might actually soar due to increased hunters purchasing licenses and ALL of those associated with the tourist industry can benefit even more.

Alan Kruse  
COL, US Army (Ret)

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 8:49 AM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Subject:** FW: Commission proposal comments

**From:** George Bogenschutz [<mailto:mtnmach@itctel.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 29, 2012 7:15 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Commission proposal comments

I feel that if NR licenses fees are to be increased, then the license should be for the entire season. This would benefit the commercial community that caters to hunters and probably wouldn't have much effect on bird populations or hunting pressure. Some neighboring states already do this.

George Bogenschutz, Nunda, SD

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 8:48 AM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Subject:** FW: Commission proposal comments

**From:** Kevin & Jane Bontje [<mailto:kjbontje@iw.net>]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 29, 2012 8:05 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** RE: Commission proposal comments

I'd like to comment on increasing fees for non-resident hunters for pheasant season.

Already, we've made pheasant hunting in South Dakota a pursuit of the wealthy.

I've had friends who've come to South Dakota for several years in the past, but since the fees are now so excessive, they can only afford to do so once every few years.

Not everyone who wants to hunt pheasants in South Dakota can afford to fly in on their private jet.

I wish the state would look past license fees, and look at how much revenue through taxes these non-residents bring to the state, and appreciate that lowering the excessive fee for non-resident licenses would increase that tax revenue. It is unfortunate that GF&P's budget has to be a slave to increased license fees. So much money is spent acquiring public lands (which is a great thing, don't get me wrong!), but nobody can afford to hunt them.

Taking your own figures into account, each pheasant harvested in 2010 cost that individual hunter almost \$11.00 in license fees alone. Last time I checked, I could hunt pheasants at a game-farm for \$15.00 a bird. So, at \$11.00 a bird, and maybe two gallons of gas to drive to the nearest game-farm, one can see that a non-resident is already saving money just in license fees if they stayed home, kept their money in their local economy, and visited one of their local game-farms instead. Lost revenue for the state.....Let's hope more non-residents don't see those figures and do the math on their own.

Thanks for your time.

Kevin Bontje  
506 W Mary  
Worthing, SD 57077

PS: It's pretty easy to see why no one goes to Montana to hunt pheasants! Yikes.....

***Kevin & Jane Bontje***

email: [kjbontje@iw.net](mailto:kjbontje@iw.net)

***"Democracy is two wolves and a lamb voting on what to have for dinner. Liberty is a well-armed lamb contesting the vote"***

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 8:19 AM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Subject:** FW: Commission proposal comments

**From:** Robert Foote [<mailto:bobofoote@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 29, 2012 4:15 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Commission proposal comments

#2

I see that you are planning to increase the non-resident small game hunting license another \$10. If you had any idea how much money I (we) spend and bring to the State of South Dakota you would be amazed. Gas, air fare, food, drinks, hotels, vet needs and etc.! Now you decide to charge me \$10 more and you were already above the local state averages. I ask you to please reconsider this increase. If you must generate a million dollars than make the increase equally across the board to all hunters and fishermen. This only seems fair especially considering that the resident has the opportunity to hunt/fish every day of the entire season while I (we) only get to hunt for 10 days and probably far less. I am a retiree that loves to hunt in SoDak but I can't afford the increase you have planned.

Robert Foote, Whittier California

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 8:20 AM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Subject:** FW: Commission proposal comments

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [schoenfelder@juno.com](mailto:schoenfelder@juno.com) [<mailto:schoenfelder@juno.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 29, 2012 3:51 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Commission proposal comments

I have 9 hunters that come in from Pennsylvania to hunt Pheasants every year for the last 10 years. They are seriously considering giving it up due to the cost. They quit Montana Hunting due to the fees. Ten dollars don't seem like much but sometimes that is all it takes. These guys come in and hunt for 10 days. They put on a big feed for everyone at Hofers Lounge in Dimock every year between the two 5 day hunts. They spend a couple Thousand dollars while here.

Due to the economy, I suggest you leave the fee alone for now. Raise it when the economy is much better.

Robert Schoenfelder  
400 N. Main  
Mitchell, SD 57301  
(605) 990-2300

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 12:30 PM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Subject:** FW: Commission proposal comments

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Norb Barrie [<mailto:norbarrie@nvc.net>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 12:04 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info; Johnson, Dustin (GOV); George Kessler; Hagen, James; Glodt, Jason; Tim Kessler; Vonk, Jeff; [governor@state.sd.us](mailto:governor@state.sd.us)  
**Subject:** Commission proposal comments

I am writing to protest the Game, Fish and Parks plans to increase nonresident hunter license fees. I operate a small hunt-lodge operation in Spink County and I am actively involved in promoting economic development in the county.

Nonresident hunters, its own numbers, provide about 90% of the economic value of hunting in South Dakota. These last two years of pheasant hunting have not been banner years. Yet choosing to raise these fees for reduced opportunities to enjoy a successful hunt could cause some to just stay home or go to another state. After all, how we treat our nonresident hunting friends is an important reason why they choose to come here year after year for their hunting experience.

My suggestion for increasing both the number of hunters who come to South Dakota and increasing revenue without increasing license fees:

Work with our state legislators to pass bills such as 2011 SB 148, 2011 HB 1074, 2012 HB 1091, 2012 SB 88 and 2012 SB 143 that are nonresident user friendly.

Respectfully submitted

Norbe Barrie  
PO Box 155  
Turton SD 57477

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 12:54 PM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Subject:** FW: Commission proposal comments

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [jparzick@aol.com](mailto:jparzick@aol.com) [<mailto:jparzick@aol.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 12:30 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Commission proposal comments

Please keep your user fees non-resident freely. Learn from Idaho where the fees were raised recently for non-resident hunters; there is a surplus of tags that go unsold each year because of this faulty thinking. This is not the time to raise fees as most hunters have trouble paying for their hobby.

Joseph Parzick  
522 SE 199th Avenue #4  
Portland, OR 97233  
503-669-2545

Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** Comment - Robert D. Varick

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Friday, October 26, 2012 8:30 AM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Cc:** Adams, Geno  
**Subject:** FW: agreement

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Marilyn and Bob Varick [<mailto:buffobob@gwtc.net>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 25, 2012 10:08 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** agreement

Sirs:  
I am in agreement with these changes.  
Robert D. Varick, Buffalo Gap SD

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 31, 2012 8:23 AM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Subject:** FW: letter to editor

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Will & Fay [<mailto:stohill@itctel.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 31, 2012 8:14 AM  
**To:** [news@thepublicopinion.com](mailto:news@thepublicopinion.com); GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** letter to editor

GFP seems intent on biting the hand that feeds them by increasing non-resident and preserve licenses again. 28 years ago I was one of a half dozen preserves in the state. Now there are over 200 in the state and they have been a boon for the coffers of the GFP. Hunters who would not be coming to hunt in the state do so because of preserves. Most preserves provide hunting habitat that has taken years to develop. A high population of birds are available allowing hunters to bag their limits. Hunters who hunt preserves do not usually hunt public land thus taking hunting pressure off these areas. Preserves along public land are basically stocking pheasants on these areas with no cost to GFP.

A letter from Tony Leif states that the last time fees were "adjusted" was 2005. Adjusted is a pretty mild word for a 243% increase from \$35 annual to \$85 annual. I lost hunters because of that. So the state then received 0 in license fee, 0 in sales tax and the businesses that benefit from hunters dollars lost sales. Hunters boost our economy by millions each year, but if you are basically telling them to stay home by increasing their license fees everyone loses. The fee hikes now proposed range up to 41%. A license is basically a tax to hunt. So the tax is increasing 41%.

Many states like Minnesota have no license fees to hunt on preserves and the preserve operator pays no license. In SD the average preserve is paying over \$500 to operate. Preserve hunters pay \$87 for an annual license to on a preserve, 4% regular sales tax, 1.5% tourism tax, 1 to 2%, city tax., 25 cents for tags for birds shot plus a fee to hunt birds and habitat that preserve operators provide. The state does nothing for the preserve operator and hunters who utilize them. It is the operators land and habitat, their pheasants and their advertising that get them to the state.

Many preserves offer free or reduced rates to first time youth hunters. It just makes good business sense. Youth are our future business. I have had families call to do a family hunt. We give them a good rate and they plan on coming until they find out they also need a license to hunt a preserve on top of the fee to hunt.

Hunters who used to come out 2 to 3 times a year, now only come once or not at all. If you get them here they will willingly spend money, but if you stop them at the border, everyone including the state loses. Less licenses sold reduce the projected income from fee increases. Higher fees could equal less revenue.

All hotels, motels, restaurants and any business that benefits from non-resident hunters should oppose this increase. The GFP commission will act on this Nov. 1 at Camp Lakodia near Madison SD on Nov. 1 at 2pm. You can also e-mail them at [wildinfo@state.sd.us](mailto:wildinfo@state.sd.us) Will Stone 18203 486th av. Gary, SD 57237 [www.greatpheasanthunts.com](http://www.greatpheasanthunts.com)

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Monday, October 29, 2012 3:31 PM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Cc:** Schneider, Bob  
**Subject:** FW: Commission proposal comments

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Chuck Schroder [<mailto:ecschröder@alliancecom.net>]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 29, 2012 3:13 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Commission proposal comments

I feel that out of state visitors to our state parks and campers need to pay more for their state stickers. You look at the number of out of starters that camp and take residents spots is very evident. I also feel that only handy capped people with a valid sticker or plate should be allowed to reserve those spots. Not just anyone first come first serve. There is federal Law on this. Thank you for your attention.

E. C. Schroder  
124 S. 7th Ave.  
Brandon, SD 57005

Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Schlueter, Chuck  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 31, 2012 7:51 AM  
**To:** Ascher, Debra  
**Cc:** Schneider, Bob  
**Subject:** FW: Commission proposal comments

**From:** Jeff Peterson [<mailto:jpeterson4960@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2012 10:02 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Commission proposal comments

I appose an increase in park entrance fees. I am a middle class resident of South Dakota and for the last several years I have not seen a raise in income, but have experienced numerous increases in daily needs; gas, food, health insurance ect. My wife and I are both professionals in the fields that we went to college for, and we currently live pay check to check with are one child dependent. Raising recreational fees will decreases my ability to utilize state parks. I believe that state parks should cut spending by 150,000 vs increase fees.

Jeff Peterson  
607 Cressman Trail  
Hartford SD