

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: waterfowl changes

From: Mark Jenzen [<mailto:jenz@bevcomm.net>]

Sent: Friday, May 29, 2015 1:48 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: waterfowl changes

My name is Mark Jenzen. My group and I have had the great pleasure of hunting waterfowl and making new friends in NE SD over the last 10 years. While we have hunted NE SD not as often enough as we wished, we knew with the system we would get to often enough not to cancel our plans and move elsewhere. Our experiences have created many new friends, places to eat and stay near Webster, and the chance we can come back OFTEN, just to watch. I read with dismay once again that Non Residents are being asked to bear with us as we change a system for the good of????

I can not express to you the anticipation our group of 3 fathers and sons have, when we draw SD waterfowl, but the time we spend and the experiences are valuable enough to build family traditions on. Please consider the average family and modest water fowlers and not just outfitters, and guides. Our moneys help ND families just as much. Don't shut us out!

Mark Jenzen

Minnesota Lake, MN

jenz@bevcomm.net

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Non-resident waterfowl proposal

From: Scott Hed [<mailto:scotthed@hotmail.com>]

Sent: Friday, May 29, 2015 12:14 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Non-resident waterfowl proposal

Dear GF&P Commissioners,

As a resident South Dakota sportsman, I am asking you to oppose the proposal formed from a supposed "consensus" from the Non-Resident Waterfowl License Working Group. It is evident the recommendations of the South Dakota Wildlife Federation and the SD Waterfowl Association were not heeded - despite those organizations having seats at the table on the working group. Of the public comments received by the Working Group, the vast majority (90%+) of resident hunters and 40% of non-resident hunters wanted either a reduction or at minimum no increase in the number of non-resident licenses. Somehow this failed to register, and the commercial interests on the Working Group seemed to get what they wanted at the expense of the experience currently enjoyed by resident and non-resident waterfowl hunters.

I am sure you read the opinion piece in the Pierre Capitol Journal from Sunday, May 17

(http://www.capjournal.com/opinions/we-can-do-better-on-non-resident-waterfowl/article_5271361e-fd13-11e4-a30e-7707ebae2ee1.html) that found many flaws in the proposal and recommended that the proposal be scrapped and the work started over. Better to get it right than rush something that is so flawed.

A few ideas that the Commission should consider relative to the proposal, include:

- * Remove the 500 3-day licenses in Northeastern SD and return these licenses to the Missouri River area.
- * Decrease all non-resident licenses by 5 to 10%.
- * Allow some Non-resident youth licenses - but only for the same time frame as the resident youth season.
- * Whatever rules come out of this process, ensure these rules stay in effect for 3-5 years so we don't have this discussion every year.

Thank you for your service to South Dakota and for your consideration of my thoughts on this important matter.

Scott Hed
Sioux Falls, SD

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident Waterfowl Licenses

From: Glenn Moravek [gmoravek@pie.midco.net]

Sent: Friday, May 29, 2015 1:08 PM

To: Peterson, Cathy

Subject: Nonresident Waterfowl Licenses

In reference to the Nonresident Waterfowl Work Group recommendations, I'm opposed to reducing the number of three-day nonresident waterfowl licenses for central SD and transferring them to other areas of the state.

I'm also opposed to absorbing Bennett County 10-day goose licenses into a larger unit. This unit has provided high-quality goose hunting in the past and the regulations should not be changed.

Thanks for considering my views on these issues. --Glenn Moravek--

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Non resident waterfowl proposals

From: pgross [pgross@vyn.midco.net]
Sent: Friday, May 29, 2015 9:29 AM
To: Peterson, Cathy
Subject: Non resident waterfowl proposals

Ms. Peterson,

It is not accurate to say that Springfield wants more licenses, a phrase I have heard numerously. This myth was generated by a small group of merchants and Chamber members, most of which do not hunt. I live on the river in Springfield and oppose additional licenses for a number of reasons. Mainly, this is a quality of life issue for my wife and I, who are on the river about 80 days a year. We are overrun now with too many hunters for the area they insist on hunting. Non resident hunters typically spend all day on the river and do not allow the birds to roost/rest. Consequently, we no longer hold birds for longer periods of time and our quality hunts are disappearing. More hunters will end an era of good hunting and create additional hunter v hunter issues. Recently, we had two boat loads of Iowa hunters set up 50 yards from our traditional blind and then refused to relocate. I have 20 more examples of such activity.....all by non residents who come to run and gun.....and party.

It also disappointingly appears, based on Wildlife Division decision-making and working group selections, that removing the legislature from the fray of waterfowl management, did not eliminate politics from natural resource public policy. We hope you will vote to drop the proposal or at least declare a moratorium until more issues are resolved.

Thank you,

Patrick Gross
Springfield, SD

Ascher, Debra

From: Andy Vandel <andyvandel@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2015 6:43 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Strongly oppose non-resident waterfowl license increase

Game commission,

I am in strong opposition to any increase (including the shift of exiting Missouri River unit licenses) in non-resident waterfowl licenses. In addition, I would recommend that the 500 3-day licenses that have already been shifted by the legislature to the southeast corner of the state be returned to the central Missouri River unit.

As a resident hunter, waterfowl hunting is one of the only hunting opportunities that have not been over commercialized by non-resident hunters. Waterfowl hunting in SD can be considered as good as anywhere in North America due to the exceptional duck habitat and the protection against commercialized hunting. The resident hunters of SD live here for many reasons, but one of the most important is the quality hunting opportunities available. We are the folks that pay taxes here year round, not just a few days a year. Please help keep the quality of life here as good as we have grown to appreciate.

Andy Vandel
308 N Johnson Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501

Ascher, Debra

From: Mike Kleinwolterink <mklein@lakepanorama.org>
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2015 6:08 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Non Resident Input on Upcoming Decision

To Whom it may Concern

Over the past few years, myself along with my hunting party have took trips up to South Dakota to enjoy the opportunity that is available for nonresidents to hunt ducks and geese. Coming from the state of Iowa, South Dakota hunting offers something that we don't experience. For instance, I believe last year in November on the Missouri River, we killed over 10 species of ducks in one day. It was very amazing to say the list for us being from Iowa.

It is my recommendation that the quota for nonresidents stay the same for all areas of South Dakota like last year.

Thank you

Michael Kleinwolterink
Yale, Iowa

Michael Kleinwolterink
Assistant Golf Professional
Lake Panorama National Resort
5071 Clover Ridge Road
Panora, IA 50216
1-800-879-1917
1-641-755-2024
mklein@lakepanorama.org
www.lakepanoramanational.com
<http://mkdesignphoto.blogspot.com>
Michael Kleinwolterink Photography

Ascher, Debra

From: Mitchell Reuss <mitch.reuss@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2015 4:49 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Non Resident Waterfowl License Proposal

Dear GFP commissioners,

I am writing this to express my opposition to the 12 proposals currently on the table regarding non resident waterfowl licenses. It is clear that after reading through the majority of previous written comments and listening to the testimony at previous workgroup & commission meetings, that most residents and non residents are of the same opinion as I am; that there is already too much hunting pressure in certain areas of the state, and these proposals will do nothing to alleviate that.

A major reason in my decision to move to South Dakota 13 years ago was the great hunting and fishing opportunities afforded to the residents and non residents alike. I see nothing in these proposals that would do anything to alleviate hunting pressure, promote access to private lands, increase the quality of hunting opportunities, or regulate the commercial guides/outfitters who seek to profit from a public resource.

Thank you,

Mitchell Reuss
Sioux Falls, SD

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Commissioners & GF&P Staff

From: dianna carlson [<mailto:dollycarlson316@gmail.com>]

Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2015 3:38 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Commissioners & GF&P Staff

First we don't need any more non-residents than we have now. We sure don't need anymore in the northeast counties or the Springfield area. There is plenty of competition already at the sloughs where you can put in a duck boat and hunt over decoys with your dog or field hunt. I can't believe that the SD Game Commission and Staff would go along with this greed from a limited few. You have already heard how the S D hunters feel about this issue, but when you get money and politics involved there is no common sense left.

I will be training my labs this summer hoping I will have a place left to hunt. Fifty one years a proud water fowler.

Richard Carlson
112 N. Pasque Flower Trail
Brandon SD 57005
605-582-2158

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Proposed Waterfowl Changes

From: Mischke, Lee [<mailto:lmischke@lacrossefootwear.com>]

Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2015 1:24 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Cc: Info

Subject: Proposed Waterfowl Changes

I would like to express to you my disappointment with the proposed changes to the South Dakota Non-Resident Waterfowl regulations.

I have, when fortunate to have been drawn, hunted northeastern South Dakota. I choose to hunt late in the season when there is often more hunter pressure. While I certainly encounter non-resident as well as resident Waterfowlers during this season, I certainly don't feel it has a negative impact on my hunting experience and with the abundance of birds typically found at this time, I am generally able to find alternate birds to work when I find someone else has permission to hunt a field I have targeted.

Last year's early ice-up is a perfect example of how your restrictions can ruin a hunt. We possessed a "statewide" license but when the early ice-over occurred, we found hunting our Northeast area would be fruitless. So we proposed to hunt SE South Dakota only to find our "statewide" license was not valid in that area. Unfortunately, we cancelled our hunt and our lodging. Four hunters planning to hunt five or six days with corresponding lodging, meals, etc. were lost.

After learning of the complete ice-over in NE South Dakota, we secured lodging in the Yankton region. We realized our licenses were invalid there so we cancelled that lodging as well.

Two members of my group are pushing for us to relocate to Nebraska. Their attitude toward non-resident hunters appears to be much more welcoming and we can make plans for hunting dates which we can be confident may be kept. Your proposed restrictions are just that – restrictive. We "lost" our hunt last year and the proposed restrictions would increase the likelihood that we could lose a hunt to early ice-over in the future without the option to hunt farther south where waters may still be open.

It is my understanding the majority of your feedback has been negative regarding these proposed changes yet they will likely be implemented. Please explain why.

Sincerely,

Lee Mischke

35630 280th Street
Westbrook, MN 56183
(507) 445-3203 Office
(507) 360-4077 Mobile
lmischke@lacrossefootwear.com

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Bennett County Goose Hunting

From: Bob Hodorff [<mailto:hodorff@gwtc.net>]

Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2015 1:13 PM

To: GFP Wild Info; jlcoop11@aol.com; barryj@gwtc.net; Jensen, Gary; Phillips, W. Scott; Peterson, Cathy; hpd@nvc.net; Sather, Duane; Spies, Jim

Subject: Bennett County Goose Hunting

May 28, 2015

I object to eliminating the tag system that is currently in place for goose hunting in Bennett County. There are various reasons I believe this is a bad idea: at the head of this list is; (in my opinion) Bennett county is the only place in the state (at least west of the Missouri River) that one can have a few decoys and with a little effort, find a walk in area, go hunting and be successful. This is where my sons started goose hunting and all we needed were some shell decoys, a strong back and patience. It is my opinion that eliminating the tag system will turn the area into a pay-to-hunt area with walk-in areas being leased by private outfitters making it like the rest of the state. A sad result will be having the refuge lined with hunters (who are not willing to or cannot afford to pay) shooting at geese too high and wounding a bunch of birds.

It seems like opening up an area to hunting would provide more opportunity for hunting, but I believe that eliminating the tag system will have the opposite effect. The tag system spreads the wealth giving more people a chance to have a quality hunt. In Fall River County there are a few people who have access to the best places and they shoot hundreds of geese (if you can believe them) while the rest of us are limited to a few areas and hope for low flying birds off Angostura Reservoir. This will happen in Bennett County without the tag system. I am not sure that this is good for hunting. There is nothing that sickens me more than listening to people talk about killing hundreds of birds-that just seems to me to be ammunition for our friends who are trying to eliminate our sport. Another sad result, which is occurring across the US as it becomes tougher to find a place to have a quality hunt, is that people are just quitting hunting.

The last reason for maintaining the tag system is, as stated above, I believe that many walk-in hunting areas will be leased up. As we lose walk-in areas we will lose places to hunt upland game. I am sure people will say that the majority of the walk-in areas in Bennett County are wheat fields with very little upland game hunting. There are fence lines around these areas that I have hunted and been very successful. These areas take the pressure off the open areas on the refuge and game production areas spreading hunters around, which once again provides for quality hunting.

In my mind it is all about quality hunting. It is the tag system which is at the heart of the quality hunt that is provided in Bennett County. I commend the Game Fish and Parks for obtaining the Hill Ranch near Hot Springs, SD where I live - it is a wonderful place. The down side of the Hill Ranch, for upland birds and waterfowl hunting, is that as more people discover the area, there are limited places to hunt. Even during the week, there can be 5 or 6 different parties hunting and it is difficult to find a place to walk that you do not run into another hunter. It is possible to kill a bird a two, but it is not much fun to hunt there. The GFP recognized that a restrictive tag system for big game hunting makes for a great opportunity; the same is true for waterfowl and upland game hunting in certain areas.

My last comment is it seems our country is headed to privatization of wildlife and a pay-to-hunt system. This just seems like a huge mistake to me. I had the opportunity to work in Wyoming for Angus L. Ward a wildlife biologist who became a mentor for me. When people told him that this is the future and the way it is in Europe. His comment was, "There are some very good reasons people left Europe in droves." I wish the South Dakota Game Fish and Parks would not give in to private interests and make decisions that will give an advantage to outfitter/guide type organizations and endorse a pay-to-hunt system. I don't know how big of a hassle it is to provide tags, but I just do not understand why the GFP is trying to change a very successful program in Bennett County.

Robert Hodorff
410 Canton Ave
Hot Springs, SD 57747
hodorff@gwtc.net
605-745-5024

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: waterfowl proposals

From: george vandel [<mailto:gvan3@pie.midco.net>]

Sent: Friday, May 29, 2015 9:36 AM

To: Kiel, Emily

Subject: waterfowl proposals

Please provide the following comments to the Commission:

I am opposed the changes in waterfowl regulations that will increase the number of nonresident waterfowl hunters. I am also in opposition to creating more units and further complicating an already over-complex set of nonresident waterfowl hunting regulations. I am most opposed to the transfer of 3-day permits out of the Missouri River unit. I was heavily involved in the process that created these permits and it was never, ever intended to provide permits that became transferrable to other parts of SD. They were specifically tied to increased public waterfowl hunting access in counties along the Mo. River. The concept worked very well, still works well and should be left as is. If commercial interests want more nonresident licenses, they should be required to come up with an increase in public access just like we worked up along the Missouri River.

I do not oppose your rule proposals to create 100 nonresident youth licenses, valid only during the youth waterfowl season.

I support your rule to eliminate the Bennett County unit – this unit is selfish, silly, over-complicated, totally unnecessary and should have been eliminated a long time ago.

Thank you for your consideration.

George Vandel - Pierre

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

From: Leonard Skovly [<mailto:laskovly@icloud.com>]
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2015 2:44 PM
To: Ascher, Debra
Subject: Re: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

Brookings S.D.

Sent from my iPhone
Leonard Skovly

From: Leonard Skovly [<mailto:laskovly@icloud.com>]
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2015 11:39 AM
To: Leif, Tony
Subject: Re: Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota

I understand what the changing areas and number of nonresident waterfowl Lic. Issued would be and changes. Tom Kirschman from the Pierre office was very gracious to help me understand and pass on all the changes that could take place. I have had a number of our east river waterfowl hunters visiting about these changes. We enjoy taking many youth hunters out because of the learning experience for them and many don't have dads that can do this with them. Also on the eastern side if we add youth from Minnesota coming over here we will be see the reason they all want to come here. It will be almost useless to try and go out in Brookings-Hamlin-Codington and other close counties because we will be seeing the same issues they have. People on top of each other---mass confusion and we may as well just quit taking the youth from our own state out. The same will be with the other new unit changes and number of Nonresidents adults that will be using these mid eastern counties I mentioned before above to come and stay for their hunts. I will say again that if we need more money to keep our system as pure as it is let's raise the cost of our Lic. We feel we have some of the greatest conservation officers working with us right now and we want them and people like Tom who spent the time to call and explain these new proposals all to be well enough paid so they stay with us. Let's not destroy what we have worked for by opening the gates for non residents and lose the support of our hunters out here right now. We are trying to grow this sport not use it as a activity to bring in the world like other states have and then destroy its purpose and will without a doubt lose the support of the hunters in our state. We have lots of extra waterfowl hunters in Brookings--Hamlin--Codington counties because of the State University here in Brookings. Great young people and very supportive of our Waterfowl. If you let these out of state people change their hunting areas and they flood these counties the support of many here I am told will be non existent. I hope you understand the concerns of the hunters I am talking about over east here and I thank you for allowing us to express our concerns. Tony will you please get this to the people making these changes. Thanks Again.

Sent from my iPhone

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: non-resident waterfowl

From: Bob Marquardt <bmarquardt@iw.net>

Date: May 27, 2015 at 5:20:41 PM CDT

To: jlcoop11@aol.com, cathy.peterson@state.sd.us, hpd@nvc.net, barryj@gwtc.net, gary.jensen@state.sd.us, wscott.phllips@state.sd.us, duane.sather@state.sd.us, jim.spies@state.sd.us

Subject: non-resident waterfowl

Commission members,

I would like to go on record in opposition to item (37) Non-resident waterfowl license, and urge you commissioners to vote against this proposal. I believe that this proposal puts the state tourism industry ahead of the sportsman and women of South Dakota. I believe the commission would do a better job of representing the resident hunters in South Dakota if you would abandon this idea and instead decrease all non-resident license by 10% and eliminate the 500-3 day NE SD license. Is it not the mission for this commission is to enhance the hunting experience for the residence of South Dakota? I can not see how voting for this proposal would accomplish that mission.

Please vote no.

Respectfully submitted

Bob Marquardt

May 27, 2015

GFP Commissioners:

This letter is in regards to the recent proposal put forth by the SD GFP regarding nonresident waterfowl licenses. First, I'd like to say that I live in the NE corner of the state and spend upwards of 100 days per year hunting waterfowl. I moved to this area from MN roughly 8 years ago. One of the big draws was the fantastic waterfowl hunting. However, every year it seems like it's harder to find quality areas to hunt. While the license numbers haven't changed, I believe hunters are flocking to areas and time frames that allow the best chance at harvesting migrating birds. This puts a lot of people in a small area.

After the overall opposition from the majority of residents and nonresidents, I find it hard to believe that the GFP would still propose a change in the licensing structure. I believe there is a good balance of residents and nonresidents at the moment. Please listen to the residents and nonresidents that value quality hunting in SD and vote to keep SD licensing the same.

Sincerely,

Cody Warner, Roslyn, SD

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Nonresident Waterfowl Proposed changes

From: Fancis Barnett [<mailto:fbmvc@nvc.net>]
Sent: Friday, May 29, 2015 3:29 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Nonresident Waterfowl Proposed changes

Dear GFP Commission,

This sounds like it is a done deal. It will be interesting to see how it affects me and my 2 boys (ages 13 and 14 and their friends) waterfowl hunting experiences. We have thoroughly enjoyed our outings in Faulk, Edmunds, McPherson and Campbell Counties. It really is top quality hunting. I realize it is nice to share, but, some things a person likes to keep for themselves. Please don't share too much.

Francis Barnett
Aberdeen, SD

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Non-Resident waterfowl proposal

From: Mark & Kris [<mailto:mkwillie@venturecomm.net>]

Sent: Friday, May 29, 2015 3:35 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Non-Resident waterfowl proposal

Dear Game Commissioners and GF&P Personal,

I am writing as a concerned South Dakota Resident Sportsman. This issue keeps getting brought up year after year by the commercial special interests. I do not believe in making our wildlife resources commercial and subject to the Department of Tourism. The resident sportsman of this fine state deserve to be considered first. PLEASE vote against the proposal to further commercialize the waterfowl and all wildlife in our state.

Sincerely,

Mark Williamson

42310 112th St.

Britton, SD. 57430

605 448 2728

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE Smartphone

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: Increase in Non-resident waterfowl hunters

From: Schiefelbein, Derek
Sent: Friday, May 29, 2015 3:12 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Increase in Non-resident waterfowl hunters

Dear Commissioners,

I have been involved in commercial pheasant hunting for 25 years and my family farms and ranches in central South Dakota.

I oppose **ANY** increase to the number of non-resident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota. The current draw system in place now has worked excellent for non-residents and residents alike. It's a great balance that provides quality waterfowl hunting for all.

The South Dakota resident has been run over by non-resident - out of state money with pheasant hunting commercialization. The same thing will happen to the SD resident with waterfowl commercialization. Except it won't be nearly as profitable for the state of SD or small business owners. People in general cannot manipulate waterfowl hunting, like one can with pheasants. Example: Raising and planting pen raised birds. Also weather is a major factor with waterfowl and not so much with pheasants.

Please save the quality waterfowl hunting we currently have in SD. Please **do not** increase licenses numbers for non-residents. Do not give in to the very small percentage of special interest groups that want to commercialize waterfowl hunting for the limited benefit of a few.

Respectfully submitted,
Derek Schiefelbein
29504 Marble Rd
Pierre SD

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: FW: Social Canada goose season

From: Jeff Sorensen [<mailto:sorensenfam01@gmail.com>]

Sent: Friday, May 29, 2015 5:26 PM

To: Ascher, Debra

Subject: Re: FW: Social Canada goose season

Jeff Sorensen

Box 53

Viborg, SD 57070

From: Jeff Sorensen [<mailto:sorensenfam01@gmail.com>]

Sent: Friday, May 29, 2015 2:49 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Social Canada goose season

Plz do not do away with the special Canada goose season in Bennett County. Thank you.

Ascher, Debra

Subject: FW: GFP wildinfo@state.sd.us

From: Terry Liddick [<mailto:td7400@hotmail.com>]

Sent: Friday, May 29, 2015 5:28 PM

To: Ascher, Debra

Subject: Re: GFP wildinfo@state.sd.us

2630 Lookout Mountain Road, Spearfish, SD

Terry Liddick

From: Terry Liddick [<mailto:td7400@hotmail.com>]

Sent: Friday, May 29, 2015 1:55 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: wildinfo@state.sd.us

Again, I would like to object to the recommendations forwarded by the nonresident waterfowl working group. Few, if any of the recommendations will in any way benefit residents of South Dakota as the hunting opportunities continue to diminish for us.

Recommendation 1: adding Spink County, may spread out some of the non-resident pressure, but would decrease opportunities for residents to potentially gain permission to hunt. As the drift plain continues to be drained and potholes plowed, there is already less opportunity, adding more pressure to the county via non-residents would only further decrease opportunity for residents.

Recommendation 1: This one makes sense although with the loss of wetlands, one may want to consider reducing the number of non-resident tags.

Recommendation 3: This one makes sense although with the loss of wetlands, one may want to consider reducing the number of non-resident tags.

Recommendation 4: This one makes sense although with the loss of wetlands, one may want to consider reducing the number of non-resident tags.

Recommendation 5: This makes no sense except to put it onto the new proposed unit. Both recommendations would continue to decrease opportunities for residents and therefore I am adamantly opposed.

Recommendation 6: I am adamantly opposed to increasing any opportunity for non-residents. This would only result in less opportunity for residents. Again, as wetlands decrease through current agricultural practices and development, opportunity is already decreasing. To further decrease opportunity through allowing more non-resident pressure makes no sense. This only has the ability to move waterfowling opportunities for residents in the direction that pheasant

hunting opportunity has gone for residents. The result would be the same even if tag quotas were redistributed. Anywhere a non-resident opportunity is increased, resident opportunity will correspondingly decrease. This is evident in the way North Dakota has gone as well as resident pheasant hunting opportunities have gone in South Dakota.

Recommendation 7: Same objection as recommendation 6 above, adamantly opposed.

Recommendation 8: Makes no sense to do this unless you adopt 7, otherwise leave it alone.

Recommendation 9: Minor opposition but really makes no sense when you consider 6, 7, and 8 should not be adopted.

Recommendation 10: No opposition

Recommendation 11: Again, I fail to see any good coming from increasing non-resident hunting opportunities for reasons stated above, so therefor I oppose adamantly.

Recommendation 12: I would support this recommendation only if it were valid during the youth water fowl season, otherwise, it is just an increased opportunity for non-residents to reduce opportunity for residents.

I live in spearfish South Dakota. The argument that all of these recommendations are good for tourism and the increased revenue etc that these recommendations bring, I find as false arguments. I travel just as far as many of the non-residents, rent the same hotel rooms, buy just as much gas and food in the local restaurants. Many of my waterfowl hunting friends in the western portion of the state do the same.

It appears to me that the Commission, the SDGF&P and the South Dakota legislatures' number one obligation is to work for the residents of South Dakota, not the non-residents. To see resident opportunity lost due to the increased opportunity of non-residents is preposterous and a blatant disregard of their obligations. Therefore, I urge you to reject this proposal and these recommendations. I generally find it difficult to get a hotel/motel reservation during the waterfowl season, particularly on short or no notice. I receive permission to hunt approximately 50% of the time. I generally see good numbers of people in the restaurants when I am east river hunting waterfowl. This would indicate to me, short of someone having a special interest in increasing opportunity, that this would all only be bad for South Dakota residents and therefore wish you to reject the proposals.

Sincerely,

Terry S. Liddick

Terry & Debbie Liddick
td7400@hotmail.com
605-484-5485 (C)

Ascher, Debra

From: GFP Admin Rules
Sent: Friday, May 29, 2015 3:31 PM
To: GFP Admin Rules
Subject: Comment on : 2015 GFP May Proposals - June Finals

2nd

Name: Jerry Soholt

Address:

City: Sioux Falls

State: SD

Zip: 57103

Email:

Phone:

Comment: Greetings: I am a South Dakotan, I hunt ducks, pheasants and archery hunt for whitetail. When my son's lived in SD we hunted ducks almost exclusively in NE South Dakota. Each year I have seen more and more out of state vehicles through out the duck season. Increasing the numbers of Non resident liceses available in NE SD will provide less & less opportunity for our South Dakota hunters. Several new lodges have been built in the region there and with more licenses they will lease up more wetlands eliminating residents opportunity. We've sold our pheasant hunting to the non residents. We here the question why are there fewer resident hunters today. Easy answer access is limited. Increasing the number in NE will futher limit access. I encourage you to make no changes or reduce by 10% Thank you Jerry Soholt

Ascher, Debra

Subject: Feedback on Changing Gregory County Hunting Dates

From: kmbombalski@charter.net [mailto:kmbombalski@charter.net]
Sent: Friday, May 29, 2015 7:27 AM
To: Ascher, Debra
Subject: RE: FW: Feedback on Changing Gregory County Hunting Dates

2nd

Ms. Ascher, I am resending my response from my computer and if my first two responses from my phone did send; I am sorry for the multiple responses.

Kenneth Bombalski

2500 East Huckleberry Trail

Farwell, Michigan 48622

Thank you in advance for your efforts on this matter.

From: kmbombalski@charter.net [mailto:kmbombalski@charter.net]
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2015 7:33 PM
To: GFP Wild Info; 'kmbombalski@charter.net'
Subject: Feedback on Changing Gregory County Hunting Dates

I am a 66 year old Retiree who has for the first time after working 41 1/4 years was planning a Guided Archery Hunt in Ohio and a guided Gun Hunt in Gregory County, South Dakota. I have contracted Outfitters in both states with a 7 day window between the end of my first hunt and the Nov. 14th opener of 2015 except for County of my guide Gregory. I would have appreciated Game and Fish saying we are considering date changes in Gregory, and these few other counties; thereby avoiding me applying for the Premium Dollar West River Special Buck License. I know their could be extenuating circumstances that would make it impossible to have avoided this problem. And if that is the case I would appreciate your sharing those with me to lessen my frustrations.

If there is a genuine need to move the date in Gregory County, would it be possible to allow the small number of West River Special Buck Out of State Hunters to hunt from Nov. 14, 2015 like last year. This would preserve my life long dream of back to back out of state hunts for a potential Trophy Whitetail. There will be little to no affect on residents of South Dakota (except possibly for our guides family).

I cannot go on both hunts and will loose approximately \$1000.00 while upsetting one group of hunters I would have to cancel with.

Your consideration on this matter would be greatly appreciated; as I believe, at this time, the situation could have been avoided and can be worked thru by allowing West River Special Buck Out of State Hunters to hunt starting Nov. 14 2015. thanks in advance for your help.