

Johnson, Joy

From: Moisan, John
Sent: Saturday, July 23, 2016 8:27 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Land Purchase Suggestions

Paul: I am a 35 years of service retired state employee and landowner of 640 acres in Northwest Tripp County. For my entire life, I have been an active sportsman including hunting small game, waterfowl, big game, and fishing. The subject of "the state buying land" has always been controversial among landowners and the public and I'm sure that won't change anytime soon. At the same time, the state implemented the "walk in program" which works for some landowners, but the truth is.....as most landowners go, it's not worth it for the price. That said, I'd like to make the following comments:

- The state should consider 10-15 year leases of appropriate lands which benefit sportsmen, wildlife, erosion concerns, and adjacency to state land factors.
- The state should consider paying "the per acre going rate" (as determined by the FSA and NRCS) which, in my area, is \$52 an acre (for CRP), depending on the soil, erosion factors, wildlife habitat potential, and so on.
- Under a "state lease program", the state would pay the "going CRP rate" with the landowners only responsibility being to spray weeds, fix the fence and pay the taxes. Because the FSA/NRCS restrictions are so cumbersome and paperwork heavy, a "state lease program" would be far better for the landowner and the state over the long term.
- Under a "state lease program", rules, regulations, and management plan would need to be developed for each leased plot and the landowner would need to agree and sign a 10-15 year contract with GFP.
- Under a "state lease program", GFP would develop the plan to benefit the necessary local factors.
- For example, (I'll use my land in Tripp County): The state would lease 120 acres from me for \$52 an acre for 15 years at a cost of \$6,240 per year for 15 years at a total cost to the state of \$93,600. On the 120 acres, the state could do whatever it wants to manage the property. As a landowner, my job is to spray the weeds, fix the fence and pay the taxes which vary depending on the location and type of land). In my case, the taxes are about \$6.40 per acre or \$770 per year. Over the term of the lease, my landowner costs would be roughly \$900 a year including taxes, fence maintenance and weed control while my annual profit on that land would be \$5340.00. The 15 year cost to GFP would be \$93,600 plus whatever management the state wanted to do on the property. Over that same time, I would make approximately \$80,000 with no worries except fence, weeds, and taxes. (As long as the state maintains a controlled access to that property.....ie parking lot and no vehicle traffic.)
- If I were to sell that same land to GFP (which I wouldn't do), the appraised price (as of March 1, 2016) is \$300,000 (\$2500 per acre). The state would save over \$206,000 over 15 years.....leasing vs buying.
- Basically, I still own the land, am getting the FSA/NRCS price, and I'm making a reasonable profit for my business.
- Basically, GFP has total control of the management of that same land for a substantially reduced price over purchasing.
- In this case, it's a landowner "business decision" and a GFP management/access decision.....everybody is happy and the Federal Government is out of the deal with no massive bureaucracy involved.

- I'm sure landowners and the public would be far happier with this arrangement rather than GFP purchased land.
- This is even more important with highly fluctuating land and crop prices, plus it locks the state and landowner into a 15 year agreement to be re-evaluated in 15 years.
- An "option to buy" could be added to the contract at the end of the contract and actual sale could be negotiated at that time.
- Call it a "State CRP" which fits in with the Governor's Wildlife Habitat Plan for South Dakota.

Those are my comments. I hope they help. John G. Moisan (605)280-1750

Johnson, Joy

From: Joshua N <jlnsd41@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2016 10:16 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: RE: Land Acquisition Survey attn.. Paul Coughlin

What is the parliamentary procedures for being heard at a gfp commission meeting? Also what is the agenda for the Aug 4-5 meeting? I would like to only miss 1 day of work if I was to attend?

Thanks Again,

Josh

On Jul 25, 2016 11:44 AM, "Joshua N" <jlnsd41@gmail.com> wrote:

Really all's hunters would need is a lone of longitude or latitude to follow with a gps

On Jul 25, 2016 11:41 AM, "Joshua N" <jlnsd41@gmail.com> wrote:

Please do, my number is 605-261-2177. I am very interested in the subject and motivated to help out SD hunters access the public land that is already legally available and accessible, we just need a 2 foot path and a straight line to follow..I would also like to reiterate, I am NOT suggesting hunting in a section line right of way, that is illegal. Simply using the established right of way as a throughout to public lands..

Thanks for your time,

Josh

On Jul 25, 2016 11:30 AM, "Coughlin, Paul" <Paul.Coughlin@state.sd.us> wrote:

Josh –

Thank you for your response and suggestions. Because they desire to see all the comments received, I'll be sharing yours with the GFP Commission as they consider adopting the land acquisition guidance document.

Thank you again.

Paul Coughlin | *Habitat Program Administrator*

South Dakota Department of Game, Fish & Parks

523 East Capital Avenue | Pierre, SD 57501

605.773.4194 | Paul.Coughlin@state.sd.us

From: Miller, LouAnn
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 10:30 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: FW: Land Acquisition Survey attn.. Paul Coughlin

From: Joshua N [<mailto:jlnsd41@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 10:09 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Re: Land Acquisition Survey attn.. Paul Coughlin

Many of the paths would be, " rugged" however, most hunters would take them. Some lines run into stock dams or lakes. With the current laws, this would be a SOL situation for the hunters, unless they bought some waders or ported a canoe. This mostly a west river issue as most of the eastern half has roads on the lines. I know the walk in leases are quickly coming up. This section line idea would provide a *permanent fix.

Ok, I'm done ...for now,

Thanks,

On Jul 25, 2016 9:51 AM, "Joshua N" <jlnsd41@gmail.com> wrote:

The laws are already in place to support this. the section lines are in fact a public right of way, the key issue is this, THE SECTION LINES ARE NOT SURVEYED OR PLATTED! So in theory there is nothing to follow, and the law, landowners, and hunters are continually at odds with no real reference points on these lines. It creates a " mushy" situation that doesn't go to court, and never gets resolved because it's a very gray area. And the cause of alot of negative encounters. I have talked with gfp. ***I am not talking about actively hunting on section lines, that's ILLEGAL!*** I am simply talking about walking with a cased gun or bow while on the section line. That is legal.

Thanks

Josh

On Jul 25, 2016 9:41 AM, "Joshua N" <jlnsd41@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello my name is Josh. This is for Mr Paul Coughlin. I have hunted in SD my whole life. I saw the article on the kelo website. I have a possible idea for la d acquisition. First off we need to charge of state hunters more. Most licence plates at public areas are from out of state. The demand is high, supply is relatively low, so lets charge them alot more. Our western neighbors do this. Take the massive surplus created by that and pay for my idea. There is plenty of public land in the state. The problem is this. It can't be reached! Its land locked with no *public road to it, and for the most part the adjoining land owners do not allow crossing their ground to public land. There is a 66 foot wide public right of way at every section line in the state. The gfp should simply perform a survey and mark a *walking* path along these lines. Yes some of the paths may be miles but, most hunters would walk. and there would be rules, don't walk on crops, leave cattle alone, close gatez. if out of staters were charged more, an annual "trespass fee" may be able to be payed with a formula of how many feet of FOOT traffic paths are on their land, (the designated paths would be a couple feet wide) I don't know?? You would open up millions of acres of land..(ok not sure on the million acres but, it's alot). I wrote this on my phone in 5 mins. So it's poorly written. I have a file of research on the subject and would love to be on some kind of public panel for the initiative.

Thanks for your time,

Josh

Johnson, Joy

From: Glenn Moravek <gmoravek@pie.midco.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 3:17 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Comments on G, F, & P Public Lands Policy

Public lands are important to me, as I live in a city and don't know landowners who allow access for hunting or fishing without paying a fee. For recreation such as hiking and exercising hunting dogs, public lands can be used without having to bother a private landowner. Such areas are important, too, since they bring nonresidents to rural areas where they support the local economy. Public areas, considering these factors, will only become more important as time passes....It seems that the trend is for private land to be used more intensely for the production of food and fiber, to the detriment of wildlife habitat over the entire region. In the future, well-managed public land will likely be needed to provide habitat if viable populations of game and nongame wildlife species are to be maintained. Between ownership and leasing, I think that the most secure means of maintaining habitat over time should be selected when acquiring an area.... Emphasis should be placed on preserving native South Dakota wildlife habitats. Areas should be managed for quality hunting, fishing, wildlife viewing, other nonmotorized recreation, and solitude. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. -- Glenn Moravek--

Johnson, Joy

From: lthomas@midco.net
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 10:14 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Buying Land

I am in favor of GF&P buying land for public use. I have used numerous GF&P areas for hunting over my lifetime and enjoy most, the ability to access these areas without asking permission and being able to plan hunts with the public land as my main hunting source.

On a whim I can drive 15 minutes and access good areas for pheasant & deer hunting and look forward to hunting public land in Harding county. As long as the fair share of property taxes are paid to the county, I can't see any reason to not have public land.

Sincerely,
Lanny Thomas
510 Beach Ave. N.E.
Huron, SD

Johnson, Joy

From: Jerry and Mary Ann Lulewicz <jmlule@mitchelltelecom.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 12:16 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: public lands

Public lands are important to many people as a way to feel a part of South Dakota. They can go there and not be told they do not belong. For my own part I feel future purchases should prioritize access to public lands we already own. Thank you.

Jerry Lulewicz
Mitchell SD

Johnson, Joy

From: Charles Rokusek <crokusek55@outlook.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 23, 2016 10:27 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: FW: Position statement on GFP Lands

Please read below.

From: crokusek55@outlook.com
To: wildinfo@state.sd.us
Subject: Position statement on GFP Lands
Date: Sat, 23 Jul 2016 10:24:40 -0500

Dear Game, Fish & Parks:

The 29 - 90 Sportsman's Club supports the purchase of lands from willing sellers. I have place our position statement below:

- **Access for hunting and fishing**

- We support the G,F & P Department when they purchase private property from a willing seller where the public will benefit from the purchase of said property. This includes any lands which will be used for Game Production Areas, Lakeside Use Areas or Water Access Areas as these lands will provide access for the public to utilize a public resource. Then the residents and the visitors to our state are the winners of such actions.
- We also support the department leasing land for Walk-in-Programs or other associated access programs.

Sincerely,

Charles Rokusek
Sec. - Trea.
29 - 90 Sportsman's Club
5208 W. Emmitt Circle
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57106
605-362-9827

Johnson, Joy

From: George Bogenschutz <mtnmach@itctel.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2016 8:50 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Cc: Bogenschutz George
Subject: Land acquisition guidelines.

Paul,

The guideline looks very professionally thought out for the most part.

I am aware of a few parcels in my hunting/fishing territory that would be prime acquisitions. Some would open up public access to meandered waters currently inaccessible due to private land surrounding them.

Does the department have a site or contact person that could evaluate these lands for potential purchase and a method of tracking them for future purchase if they should be offered for sale?

I am also concerned about the pressure put on small town boards by adjoining landowners to vacate marginally maintained roads and deprive sportsmen access to huntable right-of-ways.

These requests to transfer public roadways should have to obtain approval from GFP and other state agencies before a town board could vote for transfer.

Thanks for your consideration,

Gorge Bogenschutz

46135 222 nd St

Nunda, SD 57050

05-270-0725

Johnson, Joy

From: djlove@gwtc.net
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 3:24 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Land purchase

Dear Mr. Coughlin,

I read the position paper of GF&P regarding future land purchases and agree with all of it. However it would be nice if GF&P cared about the wildlife beyond the wants of hunters, especially when it comes to the top predator which seem destined to extinction. How about preserving wildlife for their role in a healthy ecosystem, for their intrinsic value as creatures that God created (and called "good") and for all the non-hunters in the state (and non-ranchers also).

In the past forest service land has been traded if it's value was negligible i.e. small parcels surrounded by deeded land. I wonder if similar pieces of FS land could be sold and the monies go to the purchase of land which in contingent with larger parcels. For example there is a small strip of FS land that lies between my property and a neighbor's. It cannot be used for hunting due to the proximity to private lands and it has been logged. I have often wished I could purchase it and maintain it (no buildings) but have been told that this just isn't done. Maybe it is time to reconsider such an idea.

I like the idea of wildlife corridors but wish that GF&P would begin to take the advice of wildlife experts who are not in the employ of the state and are thus far more objective. Politics, I realize, is the big motivator, but it would be refreshing if an agency like GF&P did the right thing rather than the politically expedient, and often, wrong thing.

Sincerely,

David R. Love

12166 Silver Star Dr.

Custer, S.D. 57730

Johnson, Joy

From: grampaaj@nvc.net
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 10:24 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Buying land

I support the GFP to buy land for public use.
Allan Johnson

Johnson, Joy

From: Ken Swedeen <kswedeen@dakota-asphalt.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 12:21 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: SDGF&P

Mr. Coughlin:

I support any initiatives to purchase public lands and public access to quality habitat for wildlife.

Ken Swedeen
1807 Bristol Place
Pierre, SD 57501

Mobile: 605-360-0045
Office: 605-224-8500
Fax: 605-224-0134
Email: kswedeen@dakota-asphalt.org
Web Page: www.dakota-asphalt.org

Johnson, Joy

From: Charles Rokusek <crokusek55@outlook.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 23, 2016 10:34 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Public Lands of GFP

Paul Coughlin:

I personally support the Game, Fish & Parks purchasing private lands from willing sellers for Game Production Areas or Lake Access Areas. These parcels of land provide many hours of outdoor recreation for both residents and non-residents. If you look at the total number of acres that G, F & P owns and manages it is less than 1% of the total land base in the state of South Dakota.

I know that the state can not own enough land to support the demands of the outdoor users; however, ever parcel that is purchased is held in the public trust and the public wins when we add these vital acres for them to enjoy their pursuits.

Therefore, I strongly support this policy of the S. D.Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks.

Sincerely,

Charles Rokusek
5208 W. Emmitt Circle
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57106
605-362-9827

Johnson, Joy

From: McMahon, Ron (FHWA) <Ron.Mcmahon@dot.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 1:11 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: GFP land acquisition

Hi Paul,

I do support the GF&P efforts in land purchases and access for hunting and fishing opportunities. Please continue these great efforts to assure these opportunities are passed on to future generations of SD hunters and fishermen.

Thanks - Ron

Johnson, Joy

From: Colton Wientjes <wientjesc@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 3:27 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Purchasing Public land

I'm writing you to show my support in purchasing more land for the GFP, as it seems to be getting harder and harder to get permission to hunt private land I think this is the best option we as outdoorsmen and women have. I hunt a lot of public ground during the fall and even use some for fishing. its one of the only things the state can purchasing and usually holds its value for many year, if not increases in value

thanks for your time!
Colton Wientjes

Johnson, Joy

From: Jeff Clow <dj27193@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 7:29 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Public Land

Paul

I support any program that increases public land. Please keep up the good work.

Jeff Clow
Harrisburg SD

Johnson, Joy

From: Mike Henrickson <mikeh@frankenbox.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 1:12 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: public land

In all honestly, while I support the idea of more public ground for hunting/fishing, I don't want GF&P owning it.

I would much rather see you work through one of the big conservation organizations to accomplish this (i.e. PF, RMEF, NWTF).

They all have programs to hold land in public trust to be used specifically for purposes of wildlife conservation and hunting.

Thanks

Mike Henrickson

Johnson, Joy

From: tom gwen yseth <tgymeth@swiftel.net>
Sent: Saturday, July 23, 2016 1:54 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: land acquisition

To Paul Coughlin, Hepler, staff and Commissioners,
I have read your proposed guidelines for land acquisition and think they are very good!!!!
Tom Yseth
Former Commissioner

Johnson, Joy

From: berry <cberry@itctel.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 1:17 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: GFP land purchase criteria

Paul,

I support the protocols that GFP has been using to rank land for purchase and I think it is a good idea to formalize what GFP has been doing as "Land Acquisitions Priorities and Guidelines." I think that the 13-point check-off is a good way to evaluate any land the department considers purchasing. The three subject areas (process, economics and ownership and stewardship) seem reasonable and have worked when given a chance. I hope the Commission approves. Thanks for all you do for fish and wildlife habitat in South Dakota.

Chuck Berry

6980 Sunset Road

Brookings, SD 57006

605-693-7750

Johnson, Joy

From: sio.midco.net, sekliwj
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 3:32 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Re: Public Lands Acquisition

Pat Coughlin

Like Dean Schueleler has said we at the National Wild Turkey Federation believe in "save the habitat, save the Hunt". I'm a new Board member of the State Board for NWTF. My back ground goes back to the 1970's with as a committee member of Ducks Unlimited and Pheasants Forever. I truly believe in getting our young involved in the outdoors. I have been a Boy Scout Leader for over 20 years and Hunt Safe Instructor for 9 years. The State of South Dakota buying land so our young citizens can enjoy this beautiful country is outstanding. Thank you for everything you and everyone at SD GF&P are doing for our future today

Jeffy Wilkes
605-201-4480
sekliwj@sio.midco.net

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 26, 2016, at 10:33 AM, Coughlin, Paul <Paul.Coughlin@state.sd.us> wrote:

Dean -

It's good to hear from you, and thanks for your response, input, and valuable support over the years. You folks with NWTF and all you do for our wildlife resources are why we come to work every day. Because they desire to see all the comments received, I'll be sharing yours with the GFP Commission as they consider adopting the land acquisition guidance document.

Thanks again.

Paul Coughlin | *Habitat Program Administrator*

South Dakota Department of Game, Fish & Parks

523 East Capital Avenue | Pierre, SD 57501

605.773.4194 | Paul.Coughlin@state.sd.us

From: Dean Schueleler [<mailto:dean.schueleler@augie.edu>]

Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2016 9:42 AM

To: Coughlin, Paul

Cc: Mike McKernan; Gaskins, Randy; Collin Smith; Chuck Rokusek; Jennings, Dan; sio.midco.net, sekliwj; Ron Schauer

Subject: Public Lands Acquisition

Mr. Coughlin:

I want to take this opportunity to add my name to those who are supporting the Game Fish and Parks Department in adding new lands for public use. I am grateful that Governor Daugaard has now removed the moratorium on the purchase of private lands by willing sellers.

While I send this note of support and encouragement to you on my own behalf, I also want you to know that I am a member of the National Wild Turkey Federation's South Dakota State Board of Directors and have served on this board for over 20 years. As you may be aware, the NWTF began its initiative of Save the Habitat. Save the Hunt. in 2014. This two-pronged approach of providing habitat for wildlife and at the same time encouraging more people to enjoy the

outdoors and hunting will help all of us who have been hunting, fishing, hiking, boating and generally enjoying the outdoors for many years.

Only by providing public places for South Dakotans to enjoy the outdoors will we achieve our goals of increasing those numbers. While we have seen a slight uptick in the number of hunters these past years, if we don't have places for them to enjoy the hunt, we will lose them faster than they can be replaced. I strongly encourage the department to pursue the purchase of public land from willing sellers for all South Dakotans to enjoy. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dean A. Schueler

46717 2169th St.

Sioux Falls, SD 57106

605-940-0702

--

Dean A. Schueler

Johnson, Joy

From: Larry E. Lewis <lew@nrctv.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 9:13 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Land Acquisition Priorities and Guidelines
Attachments: Dear Governor Daugaard.doc

SDGFP Acquisition Committee:

In reviewing these guidelines they appear quite reasonable and should surface in setting priorities.

However, I do have feedback that is somewhat related that is likely appropriate to bring to your attention here. I would like to see attention given to the protection and enforcement of our public road ROW's. Particularly in the intensive agricultural areas of our state there is a conspicuous lack of highway ROW markers. Encroachment is a problem along nearly every road I drive and it appears no one is taking any action to address this issue. Attached is an email I sent Governor Daugaard relating my concerns. Perhaps it is appropriate to direct acquisition dollars to aid in protection of ROW's since it is land already publicly owned, but being "stolen" from the public by a lack of effective policy to protect the public's interest!

Your consideration of my concern would be appreciated;

Larry E. Lewis
40751 102nd St.
Hecla, SD 57446
Ph 605-994-7446

PS - I did get a reply that said I should take my concerns to the local highway authorities involved so they can get them corrected! When I did stop at the State DOT office and the Brown County Engineer's offices I actually got more support than anticipated, but they are underfunded, understaffed and without training or direction to effectively address this controversial issue. Townships where the biggest problems exist are a whole nother issue! I think ROW enforcement should quit being ignored by most authorities involved. Please help protect what the public already owns!

Dear Governor Daugaard;

I am writing you about an increasing problem I have observed. It will continue getting worse unless someone with your level of authority is willing to address it and force responsibility. In recent years of high crop prices I've noticed increased removal of fences, trees strips, etc. along all South Dakota road Right-of-Ways (ROW) When this occurs it is typically accompanied by a total lack of ROW markers or other presence by a road authority to protect the boundary. In fact, the once prominent ROW markers are seldom seen on most highways. Protection of the public's right-of way interest typically doesn't occur. It appears this is happening from the level of our federal and state highways to the county and township roads. Lower levels are the worst.

In addition to the obvious safety benefits; there are water quality, flood control and pheasant habitat benefits being stole from the public by this encroachment. It is blatantly obvious that nearly all road authorities are ignoring this growing problem. Added to this is the unfairness to respectful landowners who choose not to encroach on the ROW's. When no action is taken to correct an encroachment problem it is likely others will also violate after observing the "free" land to be gained and the total lack of enforcement. It's just human nature, particularly in our money driven society!

I'm a retired Biologist/Enforcement Officer with much experience dealing with encroachment onto public (rent free) land. I also realize that most road authorities lack both the funding and experience to deal with aggressive landowners who are willing to challenge them by trespassing on road ROW's. It's a thankless and undesirable job!

Correcting this problem that is already out of hand, particularly at the state, county and township levels will not be easy or pleasant. It needs to be done! In addition to benefits of safety, water quality and quantity; pheasants are the most important state commodity that would benefit. ROW's are one of the most important sources of nesting cover we have in South Dakota. It is ridiculous to spend millions buying/renting new lands when simply protecting what is already publicly owned will significantly supplement any new program we create. Re-directing pheasant program dollars for ROW enforcement may be a logical choice for some of these funds. It is my opinion land is being lost to encroachment at a rate faster than replacement can occur by purchasing!

I've given this much thought in my recent years of watching this problem escalate. One solution might be to hire & train several ROW enforcement specialists to assist and leverage existing highway authorities to protect this public resource. Placing ROW markers and then enforcing the public's interest is badly needed.

Right now when I drive down any highway or township road in eastern SD the lack of enforcement is blatantly obvious and very disturbing to me as a concerned citizen. I feel the problem is widespread and needs the leadership of your office to reverse course.

Your consideration of my observations and comments are appreciated & I look forward to your response.

Respectfully;

Larry Lewis
40751 102nd St.
Hecla, SD 57446

Ph. 605-994-7446

Johnson, Joy

From: Matt Scott <matt_scott@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 1:43 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: I support public land purchase

Mr. Coughlin,

I support the SD GFP in purchasing more land for public use.

Hunting is a tradition in so many of our lives. Hunting also teaches valuable lessons to our younger generations, as well as get families together and outdoors. We have a beautiful state that is capable of being greater through the joint efforts of hunters in the field and the governing body which oversees it. Please think of our future hunters to come!

Thank you,
Matthew J. Scott
3440 Corral Dr. #207
Rapid City, SD 57702

Johnson, Joy

From: broadheadshovel@yahoo.com
Sent: Sunday, July 24, 2016 9:09 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: GFP land purchases

Sirs:

After reading through the purchase outline document, I am in complete agreement with the reasoning and methodology of these purchases.

Having had the opportunity to utilize many of these purchased properties from the past, I am very pleased with their locations, their availability and their usefulness as an outdoorsman.

Examples are: the Mikkelson Trail, the Hill Ranch , the Romey property, the Frenshuh property. All large and controversial purchases that have become real jewels of preservation for future public use.

As an advocate of these and other purchases, I am in favor of more purchases in the future for more public access to lands that would otherwise have minimal public usage.

The guidelines of the purchase document are stringent yet not so unwieldy to make it difficult to make those purchases or acceptance of donations.

I am NOT in favor of any decreasing of our state public lands. Any time a public property is deemed "excess" and considered to be disposed, that same amount (or more) of property should be obtained elsewhere for public use.

Jim Dahlberg
Hot Springs, SD
605-745-5650

Johnson, Joy

From: Bill Antonides <billantonides@abe.midco.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 1:32 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Duck Slough-September 2015-Onida Watchman rewrite-by Bill Antonides
Attachments: Duck Slough-September 2015-Onida Watchman rewrite-by Bill Antonides.doc

Hi Paul,

Please share with the commissioners. If they prefer, just take the most pertinent passages concerning the value of publicly owned land, below:

"...By trial and error, mostly error, we learned that 90% of the wildlife is found in 10% of the habitat...It took us years to locate these treasure troves, in part because back then we didn't really know what to look for. We didn't understand the importance of food, water and shelter, all in just the right arrangement, to keep wildlife—and an insightful hunter—coming back to the same spot...During my travels in recent years, I've seen an ever-increasing problem for those of us who discovered these secret spots on private land, and it troubles me deeply. Lost Dog still has a wetland, but the sunflowers and grasses and every bit of vegetation near the water has been lost to the plow. Duck Slough is now a cornfield, the life-giving water siphoned away by drain tile. I haven't been past Four Farm Corner in years, but I'm willing to bet at most only one house is still in use. I can't take my grandkids to shoot their first deer in the exact spot it took me years to find, because the habitat that attracted the deer is gone. For that matter, so is the tree I leaned against as I waited for deer to pass by.

With only a handful of exceptions, the kind folks who once allowed us to hunt are retired or passed away. The names on the mailbox are no longer familiar, and although we could probably still obtain permission to hunt these farms, the price of admission starts well above my pay grade.

State game and fish departments have stepped in and solved some of these problems for us, using primarily our license dollars. In South Dakota alone, Walk-in-Areas (WIAs) and the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) have provided a million-plus acres of private land for sportsmen to use.

However, there seems to be a common misperception that public access is equivalent to public land. Private land is private land; it is subject to the management whims of the landowner and funding by the government. These leased areas are generally only at the highest hunting quality when there is a requirement for habitat enhancement, and then only if it has not been released for emergency haying and grazing. WIAs are not open in the summer, or for fishing, trapping, target shooting, bird watching or other activities. Some are closed the opening weekend of the pheasant season. In many cases, unharvested crops cannot be hunted, unlike the food plots on public land. While WIAs, CREP and similar programs do provide access to large acreages at a modest price, in the long run sportsmen's dollars are spent for short-term gains.

Perhaps most important, there is virtually no chance the government-leased land you hunted and learned as a youngster will still be open to the general public when you bring your own child on his or her first hunt. Land sells, management changes, or contracts expire.

On the other hand, I shot my first duck at the Paul Errington Memorial Waterfowl Production Area on what I call Blue Wing Point. Every time I drive past the WPA, a raft of ducks drifts contentedly just off Blue Wing Point. I can take my grandchildren there now, or ten years from now, and there will be ducks. We can decide on a whim to go hunting, we won't need to call ahead for permission, nor will we be asked to pay an admission fee other than our hunting license.

If other hunters beat us to the Point, I just happen to know most of the ducks they miss will slip over the hill to Gadwall Slough.

The Hogsback, Bluestem Ridge, Plum Patch Mountain, and a hundred other prime spots are all on public land, and will continue to produce game in the exact same locations for generations to come. I can pass on the knowledge to my sons and daughters and to their sons and daughters, and they will know exactly where to go.

Public lands such as Game Production Areas and Waterfowl Production Areas are managed for wildlife in perpetuity. The public can use these lands year-round for any lawful purpose not in conflict with the management of the area. The management of GPA's and WPA's is not influenced by drought, or the price of corn, or what the neighbors think about hunters who cannot afford to pay an access fee.

Sadly, the political mood of many of our leaders is to limit purchases of public land, and in some cases sell properties that have been publicly-owned owned for decades. Keep in mind these public properties are paid for entirely by license dollars and special excise taxes on sportsmen, as are the property taxes on Game Production Areas. Local townships even receive money from gas taxes paid by sportsmen to help with road repairs.

Perhaps most perplexing to me are landowners who demand total control of their own land, but then conspire to forbid other farmers and ranchers from selling their land to conservation-minded agencies. Why we would deny a landowner the basic right to sell their land to whomever they choose is beyond me."

Bill

Bill Antonides
President, SDWF Camo Coalition
514 North Arch Street
Aberdeen, SD 57401-2951

Phone 605-380-8586
billantonides@abe.midco.net



Duck Slough

The last few years have given me multiple opportunities to travel the back roads near my hometown in southeastern South Dakota. In decades long past, the gravel and grass roads were pathways to adventure for my companions and me. The only way to discover what treasure a road held was to travel as far as our old cars and worn-out tires would take us. We often went a little past that point, but that is how we learned to shovel snow or change a flat.

In most cases, the treasure we were after had feathers or fur. My hunting buddies and I found literally hundreds of places to hunt near those country roads, and even posted lands were open if we stopped to ask.

By trial and error, mostly error, we learned that 90% of the wildlife is found in 10% of the habitat. Many times a parcel of land was essentially worthless to us except for a narrow draw in the middle of a grain field, or a small wetland surround by 100 feet of grass and cattails, or a seemingly insignificant clump of willows in a vast field of soil bank (now known as CRP). These special places always produced pheasants, ducks or deer, while the rest of the area was great exercise but did little to help fill the game bag.

It took us years to locate these treasure troves, in part because back then we didn't really know what to look for. We didn't understand the importance of food, water and shelter, all in just the right arrangement, to keep wildlife—and an insightful hunter—coming back to the same spot.

We didn't have GPS units or county atlases or street signs to find our way, and even most towns were marked only by the name on the water tower. We simply knew how to get where we wanted to go because we'd traveled the roads so often. The major problem was determining what to call the prime hunting spots so we could all be on the same page about where we wanted to go.

One especially productive area was on private land. A patch of wild sunflowers growing in a few acres of prairie grasses never failed to produce pheasants, the wetland always held ducks, and we could always flush deer and pheasants from a patch of cattails and bulrushes at the shallow end of the wetland. We saved walking the tall wetland vegetation for last, because Dawn, my Labrador retriever, had a couple of faults. One was that she simply could not resist chasing deer. No amount of training could break her of this habit, although admittedly the training consisted primarily of an ever-increasing repertoire of cuss words.

One day Dawn disappeared over a hill a few hundred yards behind a nice buck. After hours of searching and calling, we tried a trick I had read about in an outdoor magazine: I laid an expensive goose-down jacket in the field where she could find it if she came back, and since it had my scent, she'd supposedly stay there. A few hours later we returned, and while the dog was nowhere in sight, the field looked like an entire flock of waterfowl had exploded. Did I mention Dawn's other fault was that if given half a chance she would chew up anything I owned?

As I recall, we finally found her the next day at a farm house a couple of miles away, snuggled up next to a German shepherd that probably, or at least hopefully, didn't smell at all like me. We

often returned to the area she disappeared from to hunt, but calling it “The place with the perfect combination of wetlands, forbs, native grasses and emergent wetland vegetation, where the dog chased a deer and we couldn’t find her” just did not roll off the tongue. We simply named that particular hunting spot “Lost Dog.” Over four decades later we all still know where Lost Dog is and how the name came to be.

Other hunting areas had names based on an experience (i.e. a fiasco), a geographical feature, the primary wildlife species, or even the name of a nearby town or landmark: Duck Slough, Deer Corner, Quicksand Creek, and Four Farm Corner, just to name a few. We could have named countless spots Flat Tire or Lost Muffler, but it would have been far too confusing as to which was which.

We also hunted a lot of public land. Even though most of those areas had large signs with the official name, we had our own codes, in part because we wanted to specify exactly where on the massive tracts of land and water we’d be hunting. Why trudge around miles of wetlands with 80 pounds of waders and decoys when we could sit for a couple of hours on The Hogsback or Bluestem Ridge and pass shoot a limit of ducks on dry land? Gander Island and Little Goose were always a good bet for waterfowl, as were Avocet and Sully Slough, and on the right day, Plum Patch Mountain would hold at least one covey of grouse. Better yet, we could magnanimously tell other hunters exactly where the best hunting could be found, and they didn’t have a clue of the location.

During my travels in recent years, I’ve seen an ever-increasing problem for those of us who discovered these secret spots on private land, and it troubles me deeply. Lost Dog still has a wetland, but the sunflowers and grasses and every bit of vegetation near the water has been lost to the plow. Duck Slough is now a cornfield, the life-giving water siphoned away by drain tile. I haven’t been past Four Farm Corner in years, but I’m willing to bet at most only one house is still in use. I can’t take my grandkids to shoot their first deer in the exact spot it took me years to find, because the habitat that attracted the deer is gone. For that matter, so is the tree I leaned against as I waited for deer to pass by.

With only a handful of exceptions, the kind folks who once allowed us to hunt are retired or passed away. The names on the mailbox are no longer familiar, and although we could probably still obtain permission to hunt these farms, the price of admission starts well above my pay grade.

State game and fish departments have stepped in and solved some of these problems for us, using primarily our license dollars. In South Dakota alone, Walk-in-Areas (WIAs) and the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) have provided a million-plus acres of private land for sportsmen to use.

However, there seems to be a common misperception that public access is equivalent to public land. Private land is private land; it is subject to the management whims of the landowner and funding by the government. These leased areas are generally only at the highest hunting quality when there is a requirement for habitat enhancement, and then only if it has not been released for emergency haying and grazing. WIAs are not open in the summer, or for fishing, trapping, target

shooting, bird watching or other activities. Some are closed the opening weekend of the pheasant season. In many cases, unharvested crops cannot be hunted, unlike the food plots on public land. While WIAs, CREP and similar programs do provide access to large acreages at a modest price, in the long run sportsmen's dollars are spent for short-term gains.

Perhaps most important, there is virtually no chance the government-leased land you hunted and learned as a youngster will still be open to the general public when you bring your own child on his or her first hunt. Land sells, management changes, or contracts expire.

On the other hand, I shot my first duck at the Paul Errington Memorial Waterfowl Production Area on what I call Blue Wing Point. Every time I drive past the WPA, a raft of ducks drifts contentedly just off Blue Wing Point. I can take my grandchildren there now, or ten years from now, and there will be ducks. We can decide on a whim to go hunting, we won't need to call ahead for permission, nor will we be asked to pay an admission fee other than our hunting license. If other hunters beat us to the Point, I just happen to know most of the ducks they miss will slip over the hill to Gadwall Slough.

The Hogsback, Bluestem Ridge, Plum Patch Mountain, and a hundred other prime spots are all on public land, and will continue to produce game in the exact same locations for generations to come. I can pass on the knowledge to my sons and daughters and to their sons and daughters, and they will know exactly where to go.

Public lands such as Game Production Areas and Waterfowl Production Areas are managed for wildlife in perpetuity. The public can use these lands year-round for any lawful purpose not in conflict with the management of the area. The management of GPA's and WPA's is not influenced by drought, or the price of corn, or what the neighbors think about hunters who cannot afford to pay an access fee.

Sadly, the political mood of many of our leaders is to limit purchases of public land, and in some cases sell properties that have been publicly-owned owned for decades. Keep in mind these public properties are paid for entirely by license dollars and special excise taxes on sportsmen, as are the property taxes on Game Production Areas. Local townships even receive money from gas taxes paid by sportsmen to help with road repairs.

Perhaps most perplexing to me are landowners who demand total control of their own land, but then conspire to forbid other farmers and ranchers from selling their land to conservation-minded agencies. Why we would deny a landowner the basic right to sell their land to whomever they choose is beyond me.

Perhaps I'll take my grandsons over to Bluestem Ridge and ponder on that a spell while we wait for a flock of ducks to fly by.

Bill Antonides is a retired SD conservation officer and a habitat consultant. Bill lives in Aberdeen and can be contacted by e-mail at billantonides@abe.midco.net.



Bluestem Ridge may not look like much, but sooner or later, every duck and goose in the area will fly over it. Chances are the ridge will be an excellent hunting spot for a great many future generations of sportsmen.



Publicly-owned land is the salvation of the common man: Every sportsman is part owner of thousands of acres of land. For the price of a tank of gas and a hunting license, he can be a King.

Johnson, Joy

From: Beatis <beatis@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 3:49 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: GFP Land Purchases

The Black Hills Sportsmen's club is in full support the draft document of future land purchases by the GFP. The department has a good record on managing these lands for future generations. It is important to keep acquiring lands from willing sellers to keep hunting destinations for all South Dakotans.

Jeff Olson

Pres Black Hills Sportsmen's club

Johnson, Joy

From: Ross Swedeen <reswedeen@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 9:15 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Re: GFP Commission seeking input on purchase of public lands (please send email)

Mr. Coughlin,

I support GFP buying land for public use.

Thanks,
Ross Swedeen
617 Indiana Street
Rapid City, SD

On Wednesday, July 27, 2016 1:12 PM, Dana Rogers wrote:

All,

Please see below and take a minute to send an e-mail in support of GFP purchasing more public lands.

Thank You
Dana R. Rogers
(605) 415-8443

From: Chris Hesla
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 1:52 PM
To: dana.rogers.1@hotmail.com
Subject: GFP Commission seeking input on purchase of public lands (please send email)
You still have one week to do this....PLEASE will only take a few minutes to do, all you have to say is I support GFP buying land for pub;lic use.....

This is very Important we let them know what we think of public lands and the continuing purchase of public lands, PLEASE send an email today, link is provided at the end of this notice. t.

Any questions please call me.

Chris

PIERRE, S.D. ♦ The South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks (GFP) Commission is seeking input on proposed land acquisition priorities and guidelines through Aug. 3, 2016.

♦ The purpose of this document is to help guide our agency and the GFP Commission in conducting land acquisitions over the next decade, ♦ stated Kelly Hepler, GFP Secretary. ♦ While the current priorities and guidelines are based on a traditional approach, we are seeking input from hunters, anglers, and state park and recreation land users to help shape future land acquisition priorities. ♦

Lands administered by GFP provide South Dakota residents and visitors with myriad hunting, fishing, boating, camping and other outdoor recreational opportunities, as well as places to enjoy wildlife and the beauty of the South Dakota landscape.

This document sets forth GFP acquisition priorities and details the guiding principles by which land purchases are conducted. To view the document, please visit gfp.sd.gov/land-acquisition.pdf. Please email comments and feedback to Paul.Coughlin@state.sd.us.

For no more emails from us go here. <http://mlist.orchidsuites.net/lists/lt.php?id=NkoGBAFQUwRSBltICFJWAw9JAFZaDIJX>

Johnson, Joy

From: Jim Madsen <jimmadsen@iw.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 3:40 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Public lands

Paul Coughlin,

I understand the GF&P is requesting input on the continuation of the departments ability to purchase lands for public use. I whole heartedly endorse the existing process and hope the department will be able to continue purchasing lands for the public good. That process should be from willing land owners and without pre-approval of any other governing power such as county commissioners. In addition to existing criteria I think the protection of water quality and other threatened resources should be considered, I think areas of the state that are short of public lands should have some kind of priority.

Jim Madsen, Watertown SD
605-237-1419

Johnson, Joy

From: Glen Ekeren <m870m77@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 3:58 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Land Purchasing

Hello Paul

Just wanted to let you know that I support purchasing land for hunting and fishing etc for the general public to enjoy. I am very much against commercialized hunting and fishing.

Thank you
Glen Ekeren

Johnson, Joy

From: Chris Hesla <sdwf@mncomm.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 1:39 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Public lands letter
Attachments: 2016LandAcquisitions.pdf

Paul,
Please find attached a letter that SDWF presented last Nov. to the Commission. The groups that signed on have a combined membership of over 18,000 members.
Chris

Chris Hesla, Executive Director
South Dakota Wildlife Federation
South Dakota Wildlife Federation Camo-Coalition
208 Linnell St., PO Box 7075 SDWF
208 Linnell St., PO Box 952 SDWF-Camo
Pierre, SD 57501
605-224-7524 Office



DEPARTMENT OF GAME, FISH, AND PARKS

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

Wildlife Division Land Acquisition Priorities and Guidelines January 2016

Today

South Dakota Game Production Areas and Water Access Areas provide residents and visitors with myriad hunting and fishing opportunities, as well as places to enjoy wildlife and the beauty of the South Dakota landscape. In addition to recreation, Wildlife Division lands provide high quality habitat for hundreds of species of resident and migratory wildlife, including rare and declining species.

Private property dominates the South Dakota landscape, accounting for more than 80 percent of the state's acreage, and is important in conserving our natural resources. Every year, hundreds of thousands of hunters, anglers, trappers, and other outdoor enthusiasts enjoy the bounty of our vast natural resources - a strong testament to the high quality of land stewardship provided by South Dakota landowners.

Wildlife Division lands are an equally important part of the South Dakota landscape, as they exist exclusively for the use and enjoyment of hunters, anglers, and all citizens. Found scattered across the vast South Dakota landscape, Game Production Areas and Water Access Areas often provide a county or region with its most important and readily available hunting or fishing opportunities.

Tomorrow

This document serves to guide the Wildlife Division in its land acquisition activities over the next decade. In doing so, it sets forth and describes the Wildlife Division's land acquisition priorities and guiding principles. These priorities and guiding principles are based upon the expertise of Wildlife Division staff, and the input of Wildlife Division land users and other conservation interests who have shared their thoughts about Wildlife Division land acquisition direction over the years.

When the Wildlife Division began purchasing public hunting lands in the late 1930s, efforts were centered on obtaining Game Production Areas and Water Access Areas to provide management and recreational opportunities for individual species rather than specific habitat types. Over time the Wildlife Division shifted its land acquisition efforts to securing native habitat types that support resident and migratory wildlife species, and parcels that improve management efficiency and effectiveness, while still providing a variety of wildlife related recreational opportunities. This approach has resulted in a widely distributed Wildlife Division land inventory of high quality habitat types that is both biologically sound and publicly acceptable.

Land Acquisition Priorities

The Wildlife Division has established the following land acquisition priorities:

Additions to existing Game Production Areas and Water Access Areas

This includes:

- Parcels that improve public use on and access to existing Wildlife Division lands.
- In-holding and round-out parcels that consolidate or connect existing Wildlife Division lands or other public lands open to hunting and fishing related recreation.
- Parcels that facilitate more efficient and effective wildlife habitat management and development activities on existing Wildlife Division lands.
- Parcels that provide buffers or are necessary for maintaining or enhancing the integrity of existing Wildlife Division lands.

Lake and river access

This includes:

- Parcels providing access to public waters for fishing, boating, and hunting.
- Parcels necessary to address public access needs to newly developed fisheries.

Important habitat types, landscapes, and recreational opportunities:

This includes:

- Parcels necessary to expand existing or develop new administrative facilities.
- Parcels containing significant habitat and hunting opportunities for pheasants.
- Parcels containing significant wetland habitat complexes.
- Parcels that represent intact native prairie grassland systems.
- Parcels of undeveloped lakeshores and riparian corridors.
- Parcels associated with planned and coordinated flood mitigation buyout projects.
- Parcels that provide hunting, fishing, and related wildlife recreation opportunities near population centers.
- Parcels with containing rare, unique, or significant plant or animal species or their habitats.

Land Acquisition Guidelines

The Wildlife Division utilizes the following guidelines when conducting land acquisitions:

Regarding process, the Wildlife Division will:

- Utilize existing and long-standing land acquisition procedures, based in Wildlife Division Policy, South Dakota Administrative Rule, and South Dakota Codified Law, in acquiring property as Game Production Areas and Water Access Areas.
- Work only with willing sellers.
- Utilize a property's market value, as determined by an independent appraisal, in negotiating a purchase price.
- Ensure that property appraisals conducted on behalf of the Wildlife Division are completed by State-Certified General Appraisers and conform to Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP) or Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions (UASFLA) as applicable.

Regarding economics, the Wildlife Division will:

- Carefully consider the economic impacts of proposed land acquisition projects, and champion only those projects with minimal financial burdens and maximum conservation and public use benefits.
- When available as an option, evaluate the costs/benefits of leasing a property for wildlife habitat management and public access opportunities over purchasing it.
- Identify anticipated land management operation, maintenance, and development needs and their associated costs, and develop strategies for meeting these needs prior to acquiring new properties.
- Utilize financial support offered from conservation partners for acquisition and management activities, making the most efficient use of these resources as potential matching funds through grant programs such as the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration program.

Regarding land ownership and stewardship, the Wildlife Division will:

- Strive to be a good neighbor in communities in which it owns land, and involve communities when discussing land management issues.
- Work to identify existing Wildlife Division lands that could be considered surplus to its mission and potentially available for disposal via exchange or sale.
- Utilize carefully evaluated land exchanges above the sale of surplus lands to improve management efficiency and effectiveness in addition to ensuring overall wildlife conservation values and public use opportunities are maintained.
- Ensure compliance with all applicable state and federal laws, rules, regulations, and policies regarding disposal of Wildlife Division lands.
- Only consider accepting land donations that serve its mission, meet or exceed standards for state ownership, and do not impose significant management, liability, or financial concerns on the Wildlife Division.

Johnson, Joy

From: RAYMOND HOHEISEL <RayHoheisel@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 3:52 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Land Acquisition Feedback

While I'm not a SD resident, I have enjoyed pheasant hunting in your state since the early 1990's. Our group (anywhere from 6-8 people for four days) has not missed a year since then. We have hunted in the Eureka/Long Lake area, exclusively on public land. Having that hunting land, and I might add, quality hunting land available for most of those years is the reason we have kept coming to SD.

Unfortunately we have seen a decline in the quality of the habitat the last 4-5 years. It seems like "emergency haying" has become the norm on many of the parcels we have hunted over the years and the land surrounding many of the public parcels are now corn and bean fields. Less cover, means fewer birds, at least on the public lands. Without public land our non-resident group could not hunt in SD. We have a major conflict this year and will not be hunting for the first time in 25 years.

Will we return, we are not sure? If we would have the places to hunt like we did for the first 20 years, we would most definitely return. Having public land available to hunt is why we came 25 years ago and kept coming back. Without them we will not make the trip.

Johnson, Joy

From: Gerry Shaw <photolab.gsp@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 9:56 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: I support more public lands

Dear Mr. Coughlin -

I strongly support the SD GFP buying more land for public use.

As an active outdoorsman and hunter, having more access to land is the key to the long term survival of hunters and outdoorsmen alike. No Access is the greatest threat to the lifestyle we so dearly love. On the edge of what most consider western states, where public land is indeed so prevalent, South Dakota is poised to be taking a step in the right direction to securing more land for its people. In a time where land is being sold off by the billions in other states, South Dakota is smart enough to see the long term value in public lands for all the people, not just the select few. More land, means more access for hunters and the outdoors. More access leads to more hunters which leads to more income to businesses which leads to more tax revenue to the state which in turn could buy more land and repeat.

So I encourage you to go forth and buy more land for the people of South Dakota as well as the rest of America!

Thank you for your time.

--



Gerry Shaw

PHOTOLAB STUDIOS

Owner

tel 605.354.4434

address 204 Madison St., Aurora, SD, 57002

Johnson, Joy

From: Eric schoenfelder <ericschoenfelder4@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 5:11 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Acquiring state land

I feel it is the greatest investment for the state is to continue to purchase lands for the use of public enjoyment. Our public lands are the only land many of us have to hunt and it shows even during archery seasons it can get crowded. It will help spread hunters out and be an investment for future licence sales. The way things are going many sportsmen and woman will eventually just leave the sport because of how crowded public lands are. One suggestion look at ways to mark section lines to enter other wise land locked public ground. The ground is already public and many are on section lines but they are unmarked signage is a cheap alternative to avoid a confrontation with a neighboring land owner.

Thanks

Eric

Johnson, Joy

From: Dave Johnson <dj@baeteforseth.com>
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 6:52 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Land Purchasing Guidelines

I think this is a very good idea to keep purchasing as much land that the state can buy. Most of us common hunters and fisher men-women cannot afford to hire guides, or pay a farmer, rancher to hunt their land. I hunt waterfowl and pheasants on public shooting areas and really appreciate what the state has to offer but more is needed. Thank you.

Dave Johnson

BAETE-FORSETH HVAC
4700 N. NORTHVIEW AVE.
SIOUX FALLS, S.D. 57107
P.O. BOX 84008
PHONE - (605) 336-0545
OFFICE FAX - (605) 336-0629
SHOP FAX - (605) 575-0942
SERVICE FAX - (605)330-2664
WEB ADDRESS - www.baete-forseth.com

Johnson, Joy

From: Scott Hed <scotthed@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 2:04 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Comments on Land Acquisitions

Hello Mr. Coughlin,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the proposed SD Game Fish & Parks' proposal on Land Acquisition Priorities and Guidelines.

As a native of Minnesota who's lived in South Dakota since 1993, I have enjoyed recreating on state public lands for several decades. Whether it's fishing, hunting, camping, or hiking, my family has made great memories on the water and in the fields of South Dakota. I've also witnessed many changes on the landscape, not the least of which are loss of habitat and loss of access opportunities.

I'd like to commend the Department on the proposals in the Land Acquisition Priorities and Guidelines, and fully support their implementation to ensure that the ability to recreate on state lands in South Dakota is not only retained but enhanced for future generations to enjoy.

Thanks for your time to consider my views.

Scott Hed
Sioux Falls, SD

Johnson, Joy

From: Dan Jennings <danjennings@sio.midco.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 4:22 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Land Acquisition/Access Plan/Priority

Paul,

I support the GFP buying hunting land and most of all for habitat.

With that said a priority in securing Walk in areas, CREP, CHAP, COOP Hunting Access Areas maybe the future of hunting for the general public.

I believe a priority should be put on land that borders any water resource (river, lake, wetlands, etc.) Habitat - Habitat A double priority on land that has water and that is adjacent to public land or helps with access.

I do believe it is more important to improve land already owned by the people of SD over buying new.

With limited resources to buy, maintain and improve GPA's a priority should be made on quality of walk in land.

I am a lifelong resident of South Dakota, shot my first pheasant when I was 12 and have not missed a season.

Member of SDWLF, Pheasants Forever, NWTF, RMEF. Was on Ducks Unlimited committee for 15 years,

East Dakota Chapter of NWTF committee member for 20 years

Board of Directors for the SD Chapter of the NWTF for the past 17 years.

The above views are my personal views and not necessarily that of the above organizations.

Thank you for doing this survey for all outdoors men and women.

Dan Jennings
913 S. Gardner Dr.
Sioux Falls SD 57103

Johnson, Joy

From: Rod Sather <bison@gwtc.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 10:02 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: public land purchase

Those of us who hunt mostly private land appreciate and often share the experience with those that do not have access to private land. How would you get a dad to take junior and the trusty dog for a walk in the grass, along the tree line to flush a bird, to experience the rush of the moment without public land. The hope that goes into that walk, be for flush a casual walk to see what is there.

I am really not for a state to be in the land business, but the benefits of state owned public access far outweighs any negative. The opportunity it presents for a young person and there dog and camera to go for a walk is a Terry Redlin picture.

So, find a balance where public land will enhance people and wildlife.

Thank you,

Rodney Sather

PO Box 26

Vivian.SD 57576

Bison@gwtc.net

Johnson, Joy

From: Tom Cummings <tc@gwtc.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 5:36 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Cc: Ross Swedeen
Subject: Public land purchase

Dear Mr. Coughlin:

I am writing you to pledge my support to the SDGF&P to purchase more land for public use. This request is not for myself as much as my children and their children. I am a sixty five year old man, who has been a resident hunter and fisherman in this state my entire life. You know the majority of our small and big game hunting has become extremely commercialized in the past decades. This has led to a large decline in the adult and youth hunting participation due to a lack of available property to hunt. These people would love the opportunity to hunt, but cannot afford the money to access private land. If we want our youth to enjoy the excitement and tradition of family and friends hunting experience, we are in desperate need of more public land. Hunting should not be a sport only available to the rich! It should be enjoyed by everyone!!!

Thanks for your consideration,

Tom Cummings
PO Box 405
Hot Springs, SD 57747

Johnson, Joy

From: Miller, LouAnn
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 9:04 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: FW: Position statement on GFP Lands

From: Charles Rokusek [<mailto:crokusek55@outlook.com>]
Sent: Saturday, July 23, 2016 10:25 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Position statement on GFP Lands

Dear Game, Fish & Parks:

The 29 - 90 Sportsman's Club supports the purchase of lands from willing sellers. I have place our position statement below:

- **Access for hunting and fishing**

- We support the G,F & P Department when they purchase private property from a willing seller where the public will benefit from the purchase of said property. This includes any lands which will be used for Game Production Areas, Lakeside Use Areas or Water Access Areas as these lands will provide access for the public to utilize a public resource. Then the residents and the visitors to our state are the winners of such actions.
- We also support the department leasing land for Walk-in-Programs or other associated access programs.

Sincerely,

Charles Rokusek
Sec. - Trea.
29 - 90 Sportsman's Club
5208 W. Emmitt Circle
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57106
605-362-9827

Johnson, Joy

From: Jerry Hirschhoff <jhirschhoff@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 2:10 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul

Paul

I support the formalization of the process for purchase of lands by the SD GFP.

JERRY HIRRSCHOFF
Rapid City

Johnson, Joy

From: Jerry Larsen <jlarsen@venturecomm.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 4:26 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Purchase of land for public access and use

My suggestion is to continue to purchase and improve land for public use. Wildlife has traditionally been thought of as public property in SD but there continues to be an emphasis on the exploitation of this public resource for private use and monetary game. The only way for people of limited means will continue to be the public land that the state of SD owns and manages. By all means continue to purchase tracts of land that will increase public access to present holdings and future holdings that become available!

Jerry A. Larsen
419 East Chestnut Street
Sisseton, SD 57262

Johnson, Joy

From: Mike Baker <MBaker@baldwinsupply.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 10:31 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Land acquisition

Paul – I think it is very important that the GFP continues to acquire land. The average sportsman does not have the means to pay to hunt or fish. I am now a senior citizen (hard for me to say) but I have enjoyed the outdoors all my life. My son is also an avid outdoorsman and I am sure his children will be too if they have the opportunity. Without the public lands they will likely have few choices they enjoy those hobbies.

The other important part of this that seems to not be talked about nearly enough is the importance of clean water. Why wouldn't we want to have the natural filters that wetlands provide? I believe that clean water could be a big problem in my grandkids lives if the trend of tile and drainage of wildlands continues.

In closing, I want to reiterate my support of the acquisition of land for outdoor activities and clean water.

--

Mike Baker

Account Sales Manager | Baldwin Supply-Sioux Falls

o 605.977.4561 | c 612.387.3422 | f 605.977.4565

mbaker@baldwinsupply.com / www.baldwinsupply.com

Disclaimer: This communication, along with any documents, files or attachments, is the property of Baldwin Supply Company and is intended only for the use of the addressee(s) and may contain privileged, confidential or inside information, and may be subject to attorney-client privilege or work-product protection. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and destroy the original communication and its attachments without reading, printing or saving in any manner. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of any information contained in or attached to this communication is strictly prohibited. Any comments, statements or opinions expressed in this communication do not necessarily reflect those of Baldwin Supply Company or its subsidiaries and affiliates.

Johnson, Joy

From: Paul Vinatieri <pvinny4@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2016 10:04 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Land Acquisition

Paul,

I am a hunter and I believe that land acquisition is a very important way of preserving our hunting rights. With out additional lands there will be to much pressure on these lands.

Thank you
C. Paul Vinatieri

Johnson, Joy

From: Miller, LouAnn
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 10:25 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: FW: Land Acquisition Survey attn.. Paul Coughlin

From: Joshua N [<mailto:jlnsd41@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 9:42 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Land Acquisition Survey attn.. Paul Coughlin

Hello my name is Josh. This is for Mr Paul Coughlin. I have hunted in SD my whole life. I saw the article on the kelo website. I have a possible idea for land acquisition. First off we need to charge of state hunters more. Most licence plates at public areas are from out of state. The demand is high, supply is relatively low, so lets charge them alot more. Our western neighbors do this. Take the massive surplus created by that and pay for my idea. There is plenty of public land in the state. The problem is this. It can't be reached! Its land locked with no *public road to it, and for the most part the adjoining land owners do not allow crossing their ground to public land. There is a 66 foot wide public right of way at every section line in the state. The gfp should simply perform a survey and mark a *walking* path along these lines. Yes some of the paths may be miles but, most hunters would walk. and there would be rules, don't walk on crops, leave cattle alone, close gatez. if out of stater were charged more, an annual "trespass fee" may be able to be payed with a formula of how many feet of FOOT traffic paths are on their land, (the designated paths would be a couple feet wide) I don't know?? You would open up millions of acres of land..(ok not sure on the million acres but, it's alot). I wrote this on my phone in 5 mins. So it's poorly written. I have a file of research on the subject and would love to be on some kind of public panel for the initiative.

Thanks for your time,

Josh

Johnson, Joy

From: Bob VanSickle <rvansickle57@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 2:12 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Land

Yes we need to purchase all the land we can now for future generations our grandkids!!!
Sent from my iPhone

Johnson, Joy

From: Brett Buchheim <brett@tssphones.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 4:40 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: land purchase for public use

Hello Paul,

I'm 100% in favor of purchasing land for public use whether it's for hunting or any other recreational use.

I'm the Chapter Chair for the Big Sioux Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation and one of the main reasons I volunteer is because they believe in land conservation and improving public access so everyone can have a chance to hunt elk and other wildlife.

This should be no different in the state of South Dakota. We need as much land as possible for the average hunter to continue our hunting tradition.

I hunt a lot of public land for deer, waterfowl, and pheasants and the state of SD has a lot of good public land but we need more.

We all know how important pheasant hunting is to the economy of SD so it would be safe to say the more good public land we have to hunt the more hunters we will have.

Thanks for all your work,

Sincerely,

Brett Buchheim
General Manager/Owner
Telephone Systems And Service, Inc.
1109 East 14th Street
Sioux Falls, SD 57104
605-338-0330
Brett@tssphones.com

Chapter Chair
Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation

Johnson, Joy

From: Brett Barnes <brettb@innovsys.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 10:50 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: GF&P Public land

Mr. Coughlin,

I support GF&P buying land for public use.

Thanks,

Brett Barnes
1000 Innovative Drive
Mitchell SD, 57301
Office: 605-995-6120
Direct: 605-990-7209

Johnson, Joy

From: Miller, LouAnn
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 10:29 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: FW: Land Acquisition Survey attn.. Paul Coughlin

From: Joshua N [<mailto:jlnsd41@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 9:52 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Re: Land Acquisition Survey attn.. Paul Coughlin

The laws are already in place to support this. the section lines are in fact a public right of way, the key issue is this, THE SECTION LINES ARE NOT SURVEYED OR PLATTED! So in theory there is nothing to follow, and the law, landowners, and hunters are continually at odds with no real reference points on these lines. It creates a " mushy" situation that doesn't go to court, and never gets resolved because it's a very gray area. And the cause of alot of negative encounters. I have talked with gfp. ***I am not talking about actively hunting on section lines, that's ILLEGAL!*** I am simply talking about walking with a cased gun or bow while on the section line. That is legal.

Thanks

Josh

On Jul 25, 2016 9:41 AM, "Joshua N" <jlnsd41@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello my name is Josh. This is for Mr Paul Coughlin. I have hunted in SD my whole life. I saw the article on the kelo website. I have a possible idea for la d acquisition. First off we need to charge of state hunters more. Most licence plates at public areas are from out of state. The demand is high, supply is relatively low, so lets charge them alot more. Our western neighbors do this. Take the massive surplus created by that and pay for my idea. There is plenty of public land in the state. The problem is this. It can't be reached! Its land locked with no *public road to it, and for the most part the adjoining land owners do not allow crossing their ground to public land. There is a 66 foot wide public right of way at every section line in the state. The gfp should simply perform a survey and mark a *walking* path along these lines. Yes some of the paths may be miles but, most hunters would walk. and there would be rules, don't walk on crops, leave cattle alone, close gatez. if out of states were charged more, an annual "trespass fee" may be able to be payed with a formula of how many feet of FOOT traffic paths are on their land, (the designated paths would be a couple feet wide) I don't know?? You would open up millions of acres of land..(ok not sure on the million acres but, it's alot). I wrote this on my phone in 5 mins. So it's poorly written. I have a file of research on the subject and would love to be on some kind of public panel for the initiative.

Thanks for your time,

Josh

Johnson, Joy

From: Jared Bloomgren <jaredbloomgren@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 2:25 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: I support

I support the GF&P buying more land for public use!!!

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

Johnson, Joy

From: John Simpson <jrsimpson@pie.midco.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 4:40 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Land Acq.

Reviewed the document. Very good, it appears to clearly state what the Dept.'s been doing for years. Obviously the process used for the last umpteen years has worked very well and provided amazing outdoor opportunities. My thought was if it works why fix it? I see no overpowering or compelling need to make any major changes. Minor clarifications are fine. So it looks good. I would suggest just a few minor additions:

On pg. 1, under Today, 4th sentence, between by & South, I would insert the word "most".

On pg. 2, under Tomorrow, 3rd sentence, between the words the & expertise, I would insert the words "experience and".

On pg. 2, under Regarding Economics, last bullet, I would add something to the effect that says, "Work to establish a permanent endowment fund specifically to use only interest earned for GPA acquisition, management, maintenance, or enhancement." (Would suspect P&W Foundation could manage. Perhaps already on the radar screen.)

On pg. 3, under Regarding land ownership..., first bullet, perhaps word communities should be changed to "counties", or perhaps add counties in along with communities.

Good luck, keep up the excellent work, & so relieved the moratorium has passed. If Kelly's looking for gov. candidate input, attempt to solidify land acq. importance & avoid moratoriums, etc.

PS: Hope to see you at picnic 8/3!

Johnson, Joy

From: Darin LaQua <darrin@tnics.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 11:19 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Land acquisitions

Dear Honorable GF&P Commissioners and Staff,

As a South Dakota resident and life long outdoor enthusiast, I would like to thank you for your service, your work of protecting our natural resources, and expanding the opportunities for generations to come. It is so very important to promote our resources to resident and non-resident outdoor enthusiasts alike. I strongly feel that it is essential to further expand that opportunity by acquiring more land for the many reasons outlined in this **FISH HUNT** format:

- **F**reedom of being able to have access to hunting, fishing and other outdoor activities.
- **I**nsuring that our youth will always have access to the outdoors and help retain/recruit them to our state.
- **S**ense of ownership.
- **H**abitat, habitat, habitat!!!
- **H**anding down ethical values and foresight to future generations.
- **U**nifying outdoor enthusiasts.
- **N**otoriety of being a state with large amounts of public access.
- **T**ax revenue from increased commerce.

I feel very positive about the purchasing of land for the very reasons I have mentioned and trust that you do as well. Keep up the good work.

Thank you,
Darrin LaQua
Watertown, SD

Johnson, Joy

From: Miller, LouAnn
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 10:30 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: FW: Land Acquisition Survey attn.. Paul Coughlin

From: Joshua N [<mailto:jlnsd41@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 10:09 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Re: Land Acquisition Survey attn.. Paul Coughlin

Many of the paths would be, " rugged" however, most hunters would take them. Some lines run into stock dams or lakes. With the current laws, this would be a SOL situation for the hunters, unless they bought some waders or ported a canoe. This mostly a west river issue as most of the eastern half has roads on the lines. I know the walk in leases are quickly coming up. This section line idea would provide a *permanent fix.

Ok, I'm done ...for now,

Thanks,

On Jul 25, 2016 9:51 AM, "Joshua N" <jlnsd41@gmail.com> wrote:

The laws are already in place to support this. the section lines are in fact a public right of way, the key issue is this, THE SECTION LINES ARE NOT SURVEYED OR PLATTED! So in theory there is nothing to follow, and the law, landowners, and hunters are continually at odds with no real reference points on these lines. It creates a " mushy" situation that doesn't go to court, and never gets resolved because it's a very gray area. And the cause of alot of negative encounters. I have talked with gfp. ***I am not talking about actively hunting on section lines, that's ILLEGAL!*** I am simply talking about walking with a cased gun or bow while on the section line. That is legal.

Thanks

Josh

On Jul 25, 2016 9:41 AM, "Joshua N" <jlnsd41@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello my name is Josh. This is for Mr Paul Coughlin. I have hunted in SD my whole life. I saw the article on the kelo website. I have a possible idea for la d acquisition. First off we need to charge of state hunters more. Most licence plates at public areas are from out of state. The demand is high, supply is relatively low, so lets charge them alot more. Our western neighbors do this. Take the massive surplus created by that and pay for my idea. There is plenty of public land in the state. The problem is this. It can't be reached! Its land locked with no *public road to it, and for the most part the adjoining land owners do not allow crossing their ground to public land. There is a 66 foot wide public right of way at every section line in the state. The gfp should simply perform a survey and mark a *walking* path along these lines. Yes some of the paths may be miles but, most

hunters would walk. and there would be rules, don't walk on crops, leave cattle alone, close gatez. if out of states were charged more, an annual "trespass fee" may be able to be payed with a formula of how many feet of FOOT traffic paths are on their land, (the designated paths would be a couple feet wide) I don't know?? You would open up millions of acres of land..(ok not sure on the million acres but, it's alot). I wrote this on my phone in 5 mins. So it's poorly written. I have a file of research on the subject and would love to be on some kind of public panel for the initiative.

Thanks for your time,

Josh

Johnson, Joy

From: jrud.sio.midco.net
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 2:25 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: SD GFP purchase of land

Hello -

I wholly support the land purchases by the SD GFP from willing sellers. These land acquisitions go a long way in helping what I feel is the number one issue facing outdoors men and women today; access to quality areas for outdoor activities. The landowners who offer to sell these lands should not be denied the opportunity. The often overlooked (by the public) benefit of improved water quality and reduced erosion from these acquisitions are positives as well.

Sincerely,

Jeff Rud
Madison, SD

Johnson, Joy

From: Rod Sather <bison@gwtc.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 5:24 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: land purchases

I am all for state wildlife areas. Those that don't have a family tie to the land may not have an opportunity to recreation. Pheasants Forever in Nobles county MN has raised thousands of dollars matched with other partners and state wildlife dollars to make opportunities for recreation even in the middle of corn and soybean country.

State parks, everyone can enjoy them.

Keep adding to public land.

MN also has a sales tax supported fund that SD could do something similar. Remember to keep the politicians away from control of the dollars as they have a tendency to spend in the wrong direction.

Rod Sather

PO box 26

Vivian,SD 57576

bison@gwtc.net

Johnson, Joy

From: Terry Sampson <tsampson2126@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 11:22 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Land Acquisition Position

I support your position on this issue

Terry Sampson
1515 11th Ave NE
Watertown SD

Johnson, Joy

From: Miller, LouAnn
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 10:30 AM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: FW: Land Acquisition Survey attn.. Paul Coughlin

From: Joshua N [<mailto:jlnsd41@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 10:17 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Re: Land Acquisition Survey attn.. Paul Coughlin

This may / will be a very unpopular idea with the folks that's lease or own adjoining land to our public land as they may be involved in guided hunts (pay hunting) and currently may guide hunters on the land that could be opened up through the section line.

On Jul 25, 2016 9:41 AM, "Joshua N" <jlnsd41@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello my name is Josh. This is for Mr Paul Coughlin. I have hunted in SD my whole life. I saw the article on the kelo website. I have a possible idea for la d acquisition. First off we need to charge of state hunters more. Most licence plates at public areas are from out of state. The demand is high, supply is relatively low, so lets charge them alot more. Our western neighbors do this. Take the massive surplus created by that and pay for my idea. There is plenty of public land in the state. The problem is this. It can't be reached! Its land locked with no *public road to it, and for the most part the adjoining land owners do not allow crossing their ground to public land. There is a 66 foot wide public right of way at every section line in the state. The gfp should simply perform a survey and mark a *walking* path along these lines. Yes some of the paths may be miles but, most hunters would walk. and there would be rules, don't walk on crops, leave cattle alone, close gatez. if out of stater were charged more, an annual "trespass fee" may be able to be payed with a formula of how many feet of FOOT traffic paths are on their land, (the designated paths would be a couple feet wide) I don't know?? You would open up millions of acres of land..(ok not sure on the million acres but, it's alot). I wrote this on my phone in 5 mins. So it's poorly written. I have a file of research on the subject and would love to be on some kind of public panel for the initiative.

Thanks for your time,

Josh

Johnson, Joy

From: Stephen Foster <1972foster@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 5:49 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Please continue purchasing land for public use. More and more private land is out reach for those who want to hunt and fish, but cannot afford to lease land for such purposes.

Thank you. Stephen J. Foster 101 17th St. S.E. Watertown,S.D. 57201

Johnson, Joy

From: Widman Financial <widmanfinancial@swiftel.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 3:06 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Public lands

Hi Paul,

I'm guessing you haven't got a lot of responses because people are busy, on vacation, or just plain lazy! LOL But, I know I speak for most, if not all, the 160,000 plus sportsmen/women in this state on how valuable our Public lands are to the people of this state!

Simply put, our Public Lands are sometimes the only place the average person can go to enjoy our outdoor traditions, and we must maintain these current lands and purchase more lands (especially east river) or we will continue to become more and more like the old European model- where only the wealthy, privileged, or "royalty" get to enjoy the outdoors. Some people don't think this would ever happened, but it's already happening with all the commercialization going on over the years. Rarely can you stop and get permission to hunt anymore without the landowner wanting \$\$\$. Some say we should just have walk in areas- which are great, but can be taken away when the landowner gets a better offer. Case in point, Brule county used to have several walk in areas along with the public lands. Today, all the walk in areas are gone, but the Public lands are there forever for all of us. Unfortunately, and another reason why we need to purchase more Public Lands, those areas are packed and overrun to the point where I've been shot because there are too many hunters in the only small area left for the public!

thanks,
Rich Widman
President
SDWF

Johnson, Joy

From: Arnie and Lori Goldade <arnielori@abe.midco.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 9:24 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Public Land Purchase

Purchase all you can!!!
Thanks,
Arnie & Lori Goldade
Aberdeen SD

Johnson, Joy

From: Linda Vaa <lindavaa@brookings.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 12:03 PM
To: Coughlin, Paul
Subject: Guidelines for GPA acquisitions,

Paul Coughlin, SD Department of Game, Fish & Parks,

I think the proposed guidelines for the purchase of Game Production Areas are good and should be implemented. The bottom line is any individual citizen should have the right to sell his/her land to SD GFP on a voluntary basis. Period.

The GPA's purchased over the years by SD GFP provide some of the best hunting opportunities available for both resident and nonresident hunters. They also provide wildlife viewing opportunities for all of our citizens as well as breaking up the monopoly of a landscape dominated by nothing but corn & soybeans. SD GFP's acquisition program ranks right up there with the Federal Duck Stamp program that targets wetlands/grasslands for waterfowl, gamebirds and nongame species. Many hunters would likely not hunt if these lands were not available. Some of my favorite deer hunting areas are found on SD GPA's. My advice is simple: follow the Guidelines and keep adding land parcels when and where appropriate.

Spencer Vaa
1819 Olwien Street
Brookings, SD 57006

text_0.txt

The Game, Fish and Parks should NOT be purchasing any additional land in South Dakota. The gfp goes around the State with an open checkbook backed by the taxpayers and competes directly against the local farmers and ranchers. They need to respect the decisions of County Commissioners and respect local governing bodies when they deny approval of a sale to the gfp. There is a case in McPherson County where the County Commissioners denied a sale to the gfp and the gfp went to the Governor and he overturned the McPherson County decision to deny a sale to the gfp. Gfp holdings do not add to the local tax base as there are no improvements to the land they purchase. The gfp argues they pay local property taxes, but where does the gfp get the money to pay the taxes? From the tax payer.

Gfp must stop purchasing any additional land and improve what they currently have. Actually, in some cases, they should be returning the land they hold back to farmers and ranchers that could manage it better than the State.

Colin Hoffman
Leola, SD