



AGENDA - Revised

Game, Fish and Parks Commission

November 1-2, 2018

Good Earth State Park

26924 480th Ave, Sioux Falls, SD

Livestream link <http://www.sd.net/home/>

9:00 AM Tour Palisades State Park

11:00 AM Tour Good Earth State Park

Call to order 1:00 PM

Division of Administration

Action Items:

1. Conflict of Interest Disclosure
2. Approve Minutes of the October 2018 Meeting
<https://gfp.sd.gov/commission/archives/>
3. Additional Commissioner Salary Days

Information Items:

4. Sioux Falls Convention & Visitors Bureau Welcome
5. Code of Conduct
6. Non-meandered Waters
7. Wildlife and Nature Forum
8. Resident Nonresident Discussion
9. Future Commission Discussion on Public Input

Public Hearing 2:00 PM

Finalizations

10. Park Fees
11. Spring Turkey Hunting Seasons (Black Hills, Prairie, Archery and CSP)
12. Waterfowl Hunting Seasons
13. Spring Light Goose Conservation Order
14. Elk Raffle License

Open Forum

Division of Wildlife

Action Items:

15. Monarch Management Plan Adoption

This agenda is subject to change without prior notice.

Division of Wildlife (continued)

Information Items:

16. Body Camera Update
17. Chronic Wasting Disease Workgroup Update
18. Resident Canada Goose Management Plan Update
19. Turkey Management Plan Update
20. Aquatics Data Management System Overview
21. James River Catfish Project Overview
22. Shooting Range Updates
23. License Sales Update

Division of Parks and Recreation

Action Items:

24. Black Hills Playhouse Lease

Information Items:

25. Good Earth State Park Updates
26. Winter Outdoor Recreational Opportunities
27. Revenue, Camping and Visitation Report

Solicitation of Agenda Items from Commissioners

Adjourn

Next meeting information:

December 6-7, 2018

Ramkota Hotel & Convention Center

920 W Sioux Ave, Pierre, SD

GFP Commission Meeting Archives <https://gfp.sd.gov/commission/archives/4/>

Code of Conduct and Conflict of Interest Policy for Use By State Authority, Board, Commission, and Committee Members

Purpose

The purpose of this code of conduct and conflict of interest policy ("Code") is to establish a set of minimum ethical principles and guidelines for members of state authorities, boards, commissions, or committees when acting within their official public service capacity. This Code applies to all appointed and elected members of state authorities, boards, commissions, and committees (hereinafter "Boards" and "Board member(s)"). A Board may add provisions to, or modify the provisions of, the Code. However, any change that constitutes a substantive omission from the Code must be approved by the State Board of Internal Control.

Conflict of Interest for Board Members

Board members may be subject to statutory restrictions specific to their Boards found in state and federal laws, rules and regulations. Those restrictions are beyond the scope of this Code. Board members should contact their appointing authority or the attorney for the Board for information regarding restrictions specific to their Board.

General Restrictions on Participation in Board Actions

A conflict of interest exists when a Board member has an interest in a matter that is different from the interest of members of the general public. Examples of circumstances which may create a conflict of interest include a personal or pecuniary interest in the matter or an existing or potential employment relationship with a party involved in the proceeding.

Whether or not a conflict of interest requires a Board member to abstain from participation in an official action of the Board depends upon the type of action involved. A Board's official actions are administrative, quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative.

A quasi-judicial official action is particular and immediate in effect, such as a review of an application for a license or permit. In order to participate in a quasi-judicial official action of the Board, a Board member must be disinterested and free from actual bias or an unacceptable risk of actual bias. A Board member must abstain from participation in the discussion and vote on a quasi-judicial official action of the Board if a reasonably-minded person could conclude that there is an unacceptable risk that the Board member has prejudged the matter or that the Board member's interest or relationship creates a potential to influence the member's impartiality.

A quasi-legislative official action, also referred to as a regulatory action, is general and future in effect. An example is rule-making. If the official action involved is quasi-legislative in nature, the Board member is not required to abstain from participation in the discussion and vote on the action unless it is clear that the member has an unalterably closed mind on matters critical to the disposition of the action.

Administrative actions involve the day-to-day activities of the Board and include personnel, financing, contracting and other management actions. Most of the administrative official actions of a Board are done through the Board's administrative staff. To the extent Board members are involved, the conflict of interest concern most frequently arises in the area of state contracting which is addressed in more detail below. If issues arise that are not directly addressed by this Code, the Board member should consult with the attorney for the Board.

"Official action" means a decision, recommendation, approval, disapproval or other action which involves discretionary authority. A Board member who violates any of these restrictions may be subject to removal from the Board to which the member is appointed.

Contract Restrictions

There are federal and state laws, rules and regulations that address conflict of interest for elected and appointed Board members in the area of contracts. As an initial matter, a Board member may not solicit or accept any gift, favor, reward, or promise of reward, including any promise of future employment, in exchange for recommending, influencing or attempting to influence the award of or the terms of a state contract. This prohibition is absolute and cannot be waived.

Members of certain Boards are required to comply with additional conflict of interest provisions found in SDCL Chapter 3-23 and are required to make an annual disclosure of any contract in which they have or may have an interest or from which they derive a direct benefit. The restrictions apply for one year following the end of the Board member's term. The Boards impacted by these laws are enumerated within SDCL 3-23-10. For more information on these provisions, see the State Authorities/Boards/Commissions page in the Legal Resources section of the Attorney General's website at: <http://atg.sd.gov/legal/opengovernment/authorityboardcommission.aspx>.

Absent a waiver, certain Board members are further prohibited from deriving a direct benefit from a contract with an outside entity if the Board member had substantial involvement in recommending, awarding, or administering the contract or if the Board member supervised another state officer or employee who approved, awarded or administered the contract. With the exception of employment contracts, the foregoing prohibition applies for one year following the end of the Board member's term. However, the foregoing prohibition does not apply to Board members who serve without compensation or who are only paid a per diem. See SDCL 5-18A-17 to 5-18A-17.6. For more information on these restrictions see the Conflict of Interest Waiver Instructions and Form on the South Dakota Bureau of Human Resources website at: <http://bhr.sd.gov/forms/>.

Other federal and state laws, rules and regulations may apply to specific Boards. For general questions regarding the applicability of SDCL Chapter 3-23 or other laws, a Board member may contact the attorney for the Board. However, because the attorney for the Board does not

represent the Board member in his or her individual capacity, a Board member should contact a private attorney if the member has questions as to how the conflict of interest laws apply to the Board member's own interests and contracts.

Consequences of Violations of Conflict of Interest Laws

A contract entered into in violation of conflict of interest laws is voidable and any benefit received by the Board member is subject to disgorgement. In addition, a Board member who violates conflict of interest laws may be removed from the Board and may be subject to criminal prosecution. For example, a Board member may be prosecuted for theft if the member knowingly uses funds or property entrusted to the member in violation of public trust and the use resulted in a direct financial benefit to the member. See SDCL 3-16-7, 5-18A-17.4, and 22-30A-46.

Retaliation for Reporting

A Board cannot dismiss, suspend, demote, decrease the compensation of, or take any other retaliatory action against an employee because the employee reports, in good faith, a violation or suspected violation of a law or rule, an abuse of funds or abuse of authority, a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety, or a direct criminal conflict of interest, unless the report is specifically prohibited by law. SDCL 3-16-9 & 3-16-10.

Board members will not engage in retaliatory treatment of an individual because the individual reports harassment, opposes discrimination, participates in the complaint process, or provides information related to a complaint. See SDCL 20-13-26.

Anti-Harassment/Discrimination Policy

While acting within their official capacity, Board members will not engage in harassment or discriminatory or offensive behavior based on race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, pregnancy, age, ancestry, genetic information, disability or any other legally protected status or characteristic.

Harassment includes conduct that creates a hostile work environment for an employee or another Board member. This prohibition against harassment and discrimination also encompasses sexual harassment. Sexual harassment includes unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexually harassing nature, when: (1) submission to or rejection of the harassment is made either explicitly or implicitly the basis of or a condition of employment, appointment, or a favorable or unfavorable action by the Board member; or (2) the harassment has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment.

Harassment or discriminatory or offensive behavior may take different forms and may be verbal, nonverbal, or physical in nature. To aid Board members in identifying inappropriate conduct, the following examples of harassment or discriminatory or offensive behavior are provided:

- Unwelcome physical contact such as kissing, fondling, hugging, or touching;

- Demands for sexual favors; sexual innuendoes, suggestive comments, jokes of a sexual nature, sexist put-downs, or sexual remarks about a person's body; sexual propositions, or persistent unwanted courting;
- Swearing, offensive gestures, or graphic language made because of a person's race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age or disability;
- Slurs, jokes, or derogatory remarks, email, or other communications relating to race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, or disability; or
- Calendars, posters, pictures, drawings, displays, cartoons, images, lists, e-mails, or computer activity that reflects disparagingly upon race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age or disability.

The above cited examples are not intended to be all-inclusive.

A Board member who is in violation of this policy may be subject to removal from the Board.

Confidential Information

Except as otherwise required by law, Board members shall not disclose confidential information acquired during the course of their official duties. In addition, members are prohibited from the use of confidential information for personal gain.

Reporting of Violations

Any violation of this Code should be reported to the appointing authority for the Board member who is alleged to have violated the Code.

This Code of Conduct and Conflict of Interest Policy was adopted by the State Board of Internal Control pursuant to SDCL § 1-56-6.

Minutes of the Game, Fish, and Parks Commission
October 4-5, 2018

Vice Chairman Gary Jensen called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. CT at Cadillac Jack's SpringHill Suites in Deadwood, South Dakota. Commissioners Gary Jensen, Mary Anne Boyd, Jon Locken, Cathy Petersen, Scott Phillips, Russell Olson and Douglas Sharp and approximately 70 public, staff, and media were present.

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION

Conflict of Interest Disclosure

Vice chairman G Jensen called for conflicts of interest to be disclosed.

Phillips disclosed that he does take a few commercial deer hunters out on his property. It is not a majority of his income it is a very small part of his agricultural beef cattle business. Wants to bring this forward as the Commission will be taking action on the deer license allocation proposal. The hunting business has been run by him and his wife with a small lodging operation for approximately 20-25 years. The most hunters taken in one year was 10, usually 6-9 annually and most come from out of state. Relatively small part of income and do not close land off to public. Allow public to hunt deer, antelope, coyote, prairie dogs, and sharp-tail grouse. Also allows for youth hunts, but not commercial hunters.

G. Jensen asked Phillips if he perceives this as a conflict and if it would impact his decision in regards to the deer license allocation proposal.

Phillips responded the way the proposal is worded it make it more difficult for a nonresident do obtain a license which would actually negatively impact his business. Phillips responded that he can look past it and does not think it is a conflict and he can debate impartially and fairly.

Sharp said he appreciated the explanation and noted the proposal would hinder his operations and knowing the facts and he thinks there is not a conflict.

Boyd thanked Philips for bring this to the Commissions attention and does not think there is a conflict.

Motion by Sharp, second by Peterson TO CLARIFLY COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS DOES NOT HAVE A CONFLICT OF INTEREST. Motion carried unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

G. Jensen called for any additions or corrections to the September 6-7, 2018 minutes or a motion for approval.

Motion by Boyd with second by Phillips TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 6-7, 2018 MEETING. Motion carried unanimously.

Additional Commissioner Salary Days

Commissioners G. Jensen, requested one additional salary day for participating in the mountain lion workgroup.

Motion by Boyd with second by Sharp TO APPROVE THE ADDITIONAL SALARY DAY AS REQUESTED. Motion carried unanimously.

License List Request

Chris Petersen, administration division director, informed the Commission no new licenses lists have been requested.

City of Deadwood

David Ruth, city commissioner, spoke to the partner projects with GFP and welcomed the GFP Commission to Deadwood.

Deer License Allocation Briefing

Kevin Robling, special projects coordinator, and Tony Leif, wildlife division director, presented a summary the justification and public involvement process for the draft deer drawing regulation changes being considered by the Commission. They presented current draw statistics, projected draw statistics and the pros and cons of the current commission proposal and provided examples.

Jensen asked staff to explain what is the goal of the proposal and who does it favor and who does it not favor.

Robling explained this proposal is to give all deer hunters a better chance at drawing their preferred deer season. 68.5 percent only apply/hunt one of those four seasons. This would give more people a chance to draw their preferred deer license.

Jensen asked if there would 3,500 more hunters out there than the previous season.

Robling responded yes, under this model.

Jensen asked which hunters are giving something up and what is that percentage chance they are losing.

Robling responded that as a multi-season applicant they are giving up the chance to have their name in two draw buckets for a first choice first draw license. They still have a chance to draw a difficult to obtain license.

Sharp said he has heard people say they will be forfeiting their preference points and that preference points are expensive and only for the wealthy.

Robling preference points will remain as they are today. The cost will continue to be \$5.00 and they will continue to need to select to purchase that preference point should they want to.

Locken asked what would be the timeframe when draws would take place

Robling responded if proposal approved the timeframe would occur in June to allow for time for the additional drawing.

Non-meandered Waters

Kevin Robling, special projects coordinator, provided the commission an update on nonmeandered waters stating currently, 3,795 acres have been marked closed to public recreational use. This is less than 2 percent of the publicly-accessible nonmeandered water acres across the state and down from the peak of over 5,000 nonmeandered water acres closed in March 2018. To date, one access agreement has been signed with the landowners who own flooded property under Reetz Lake in Day County. This agreement reopened one of the most popular walleye fisheries in northeastern South Dakota for public open water fishing from May 1 – September 30. Between August 1 through September 30, 2018, 371 boats were launched at the Reetz Lake public access, resulting in approximately 850 angler use days.

The department's goal is to continue providing recreational opportunities for families and outdoor enthusiasts who enjoy South Dakota's great outdoor resources, while also addressing concerns of landowners who own the land under the water. The "Recreation and Respect" campaign and the "Adopt-a-Lake" program have been front and center. With ice fishing season around the corner the department has been strongly encouraging recreational users to "leave no trace" and pick up all garbage.

Wildlife and Nature Forum

Robling provided information on the next forum that is part of the GFP forum series is the Wildlife and Nature Forum on October 11 in Pierre. Invites went out to 47 different organizations on September 20. Groups included but are not limited to; Bramble Park Zoo, Great Plains Zoo, SD Master Gardeners, Park and Rec Assoc., SD Horticulture Society, Outdoor Adventure Center in Brookings, Birding Clubs, Canoe and Kayak Assoc., Friends of the Big Sioux River, Nature Conservancy, Butterfly House, Prairie Hills Audubon Society and more. This was a challenging list for the Department to compile because we never reached out to these groups in an organized consistent basis. Agenda includes the discussion of these major areas: identify key challenges for outdoor recreation, increase and fund sustainable habitat, explore joint conservation projects, increase quality and access to public lands, balance landowner rights and resolve land use conflicts.

The forum series provide all groups an opportunity to listen, learn and share key issues facing South Dakota's natural resources while building strong partnerships allows our department to promote understanding, encourage engagement and find successful solutions to complex resource management issues.

Resident Nonresident Discussion

Scott Simpson, wildlife administration chief, an update on the resident/nonresident discussion initiated by the commission. Simpson and staff met with Commissioners B. Jensen and Phillips to outline how best to help identify a set of criteria the commission could use when deciding the allocation of both resident and nonresident licenses. A survey of nonresidents will be conducted to better understand who are nonresidents are (family, business associates, returning guests, etc.). A workgroup will also be formed. This workgroup will be a cross section of hunters, anglers, outdoor groups, tourism, landowners and other entities and will meet in early December with a second meeting in early January. The purpose of the group will be to formulate a list of criteria

they think is relevant to the topic of license allocation. This list would be presented to the commission, edited by the commission as they deem necessary, and then put out to the public for comment.

G. Jensen explained the discussion began at the May Commission meeting to find a way to aid in making decisions fairly. The one page summary of questions is on the department website for people to review and make comment on. There has also been discussion at each meeting since May and a few newspaper articles.

Sharp asked if GFP staff will be putting together a list of data points from surrounding states for multiple species and fees for the workgroup.

Simpson responded yes that info has been assembled for numerous topics over the years and can provide additional information for the workgroup.

PROPOSALS

Park Fees

Katie Ceroll, parks and recreation division director, presented the recommended creation of rule to establish a fee for use of modern cabins and the Good Earth State Park amphitheater. She explained that currently, state park campgrounds offer campsites, camping cabins and group lodges as overnight lodging options. A demand has been expressed for a cabin option having modern amenities (heat/AC, bathroom & kitchen) designed primarily for a family. The proposed fee is \$150 per night. Ceroll noted they are currently expanding a popular group lodge at Shadehill Recreation Area by adding another bedroom and a 2nd bathroom. The added capacity warrants a fee increase. An outdoor amphitheater was constructed at Good Earth State Park this summer. The amphitheater has seating for 150 individuals with capacity for up to 500 on the ground. A special event fee needs to be established for public use of the facility.

1. A definition is needed in administrative rule to define a new service offering and to establish a fee - "Modern cabin – a structure provided by the department furnished with beds, electricity, sewer and water."
2. Establish a per night fee of \$150 for a modern cabin.
3. Change the per night fee for the lodge at Shadehill Recreation Area from \$205 to \$280.
4. Establish fees for use of the Good Earth State Park amphitheater of \$300 for 4 hours and \$600 for all day (6:00 a.m. to 11 p.m. from May 1 to September 30, and 6 a.m. to 9 p.m. from October 1 to April 30).

Motioned by Peterson, second by Locken TO CREATE A RULE TO DEFINE AND ESTABLISH A FEE FOR USE OF MODERN CABINS AND THE GOOD EARTH STATE PARK AMPHITHEATER. Motion carried unanimously.

Spring Turkey Hunting Seasons (Black Hills, Prairie, Archery and CSP)

Kirschenmann presented the recommended changes to the 2019 and 2020 spring wild turkey hunting season.

1. Offer residents 55 more one-tag "male turkey" licenses and 150 less two-tag "male turkey" licenses for the Prairie Units than 2018 for an overall decrease of 245 tags. Offer nonresidents 2 more one-tag "male turkey" licenses and 12 less two-tag "male turkey" licenses for the Prairie Units than 2018 for an overall decrease of 78 tags.
2. Modify the season end date for all turkey seasons from the eighth day prior to Memorial Day weekend to May 31.

3. Adjust hunting season end date for Sica Hollow in unit 48A to end on May 31.
4. Remove the allowance of rifles to hunt turkeys during spring turkey season.

Motion by Olson, second by Phillips TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE SPRING WILD TURKEY HUNTING SEASON. Motion carried unanimously.

Kirschenmann presented the Custer State Park spring wild turkey hunting season for 2019 and 2020 with no recommended changes.

Kirschenmann presented the recommended change in administrative action to allocate spring turkey hunting licenses by unit.

Motioned by Olson, second by Boyd TO APPROVE THE ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION ALLOCATING SPRING TURKEY LICENSES. (Appendix A). Motion carried.

Waterfowl Hunting Seasons

Kirschenmann presented the recommended change to the duck hunting season to decrease the pintail daily bag limit from 2 to 1. He noted the federal framework is taken into consideration when making these recommendations.

Motion by Olson, second by Sharp TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO REDUCE THE PINTAIL DAILY BAG LIMIT TO 1 FOR THE DUCK HUNTING SEASON. Motion carried unanimously.

Kirschenmann presented the recommended change to the goose hunting season to modify the white-fronted goose season from 86 days (2 bird daily limit) to 74 days (3 bird daily limit).

Motion by Phillips, second by Peterson TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE TO MODIFY THE GOOSE HUNTING SEASON TO BE 74 DAYS. Motion carried unanimously.

Kirschenmann presented the recommended change to the sandhill crane hunting season to modify the open unit from that portion of the state lying west of U.S. Highway 281 to that portion of the state lying west of a line beginning at the South Dakota-North Dakota border and State Highway 25, south on State Highway 25 to its junction with State Highway 34, east on State Highway 34 to its junction with U.S. Highway 81, then south on U.S. Highway 81 to the South Dakota-Nebraska border.

Motion by Sharp, second by Boyd TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE TO THE SANDHILL CRANE HUNTING SEASON. Motion carried unanimously.

Kirschenmann presented the goose hunting season august management take for 2019 with no recommended changes.

Kirschenmann presented the early fall Canada goose hunting for 2019 with no recommended changes.

Kirschenmann presented the special Canada goose hunting season for 2019 with no recommended changes. He explained each license allows a hunter to harvest 3 Canada geese and individuals can have up to 5 licenses for the season, if licenses are available after the 2nd drawing. In 2017, a total of 164 hunters received multiple licenses, including 36 hunters who received the maximum of 5 licenses each. Of the 219 hunters who responded to the hunter harvest survey, only 116 (53%) indicated that they actually hunted during this season.

Kirschenmann presented the tundra swan hunting for 2019 with no recommended changes.

Kirschenmann presented the youth waterfowl hunting for 2019 with no recommended changes.

Spring Light Goose Conservation Order

Kirschenmann presented the recommended change to the spring light goose conservation order season dates to be from "79 days beginning the day after the Unit 2 dark goose season" to "the day after the Unit 2 dark goose season to May 15".

Motion by Locken, second by Sharp TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE TO THE SPRING LIGHT GOOSE CONSERVATION ORDER. Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Public Hearing began at 2:00 p.m. and concluded at 2:57 p.m. The minutes follow these Commission meeting minutes.

FINALIZATIONS

Fishing Season Methods

John Lott, fisheries chief, presented the recommended changes to the general fishing provisions and fishing seasons with no changes from proposals. The first finalization presented was to modify the general provisions and fishing seasons by repealing liberalized fishing regulations and removing definitions. Lott explained that previously when a fish kill was anticipated on a water, the department utilized liberalized fishing regulations to allow people to utilize the fish in those waters prior to the fish dying. Once liberalized regulations were instituted on these waters, fish were already dying (not susceptible to angling) and were not utilized by anglers. For this reason, liberalized regulations have not been used for some time as they have not been effective at accomplishing their goal.

Motioned by Sharp, second by Peterson TO APPROVE THE FINALIZATION OF 41:07:01 REPEALING LIBERLIZED FISHING REGULATIONS AND REMOVING DEFINATIONS. Motion carried unanimously.

The second recommended change is to modify general provisions by adding a definition of possession limits and allowing for an unlimited domicile possession limit. Lott explained possession limits do not have a biological impact on fish populations and are difficult to enforce. This change would provide additional flexibility in how and when anglers keep and store fish. He noted domicile is defined as a person's established, fixed,

and permanent home to which the person, whenever absent, has the present intention of returning.

Phillips inquired about domicile possession limits and asked under what circumstances can a conservation officer enter a domicile to check fish.

Mike Klawsowski, wildlife regional supervisor, responded that home inspections can occur when a violation is reported and consent is given or if officers have a warrant. He also noted that some game can be gifted.

Locken said he is uncomfortable giving this tool away out of the tool box. We want to provide recreation not subsistence throughout the winter.

Klawsowski said they have had that conversation and possibly considering an increase possession limit, but once you get into a domicile there are multiple family members who fish and gifted fish.

Jensen shares the same concerns for the same reasons. Noting he understands it is difficult to enforce, but a lot of what we have for rules are difficult to enforce.

Hepler said with as often as this utilized it doesn't make sense as people establish daily bag limits by biological factors and people can have multiple bag limits in their freezer and it doesn't make them a criminal.

Jensen asked what is the domicile limit.

Lott responded for most species it is twice the daily limit.

Jensen said this has been around for a long time assuming there was a good reason to have it.

Lott explained it was because people were harvesting more fish than they would use then dispose of them as they were freezer burnt. Noted he has yet to meet an angler who says I have 8 fish in my freezer so I guess I am not going fishing today.

Peterson said in that incidence the person is not a criminal. A violator would harvest more than they should, not someone who hasn't had an opportunity to eat their fish.

Phillips said we have all seen the pictures where people find 800 perch. Where do these photos come from home, camper, vehicle, etc.

Klawsowski responded those occur all over the place and staff have encountered a variety of violations. It is most common when people travel. More often than not the people with this type of violation have other violations.

Sharp appreciated Peterson's comments and understand the reason we have limits, but doesn't feel the domicile position limit is valid. This is a very reasonable proposal and makes sense. The daily limit violations take care of concerns.

Motioned by Sharp, second by Boyd TO APPROVE THE FINALIZATION OF 41:07:01 ADDING A DEFINATION OF POSSESSION LIMITS AND ALLOWNG FOR AN UNLIMITED DOMICILE POSSESSION LIMIT. Roll Call Vote: Boyd-yes; Locken – yes; Peterson-yes; Phillips – no; Sharp- no; G. Jensen-yes. Motion passes with 5 yes votes and 1 no vote. Motion passes.

Lott presented the third recommended change to modify the South Dakota – Minnesota boundary waters by removing closed fishing seasons for game fish on SD/MN boundary waters. He explained this regulation change would reduce regulation complexity and increase recreational opportunities for SD licensed anglers on the SD/MN border waters. This change would align the SD/MN border waters fishing season with SD inland water seasons and provide additional angling opportunities in the spring.

Motioned by Sharp, second by Boyd TO APPROVE THE FINALIZATION OF 41:07:02:02 REMOVING CLOSED FISHING SEASONS FOR GAME FISH ON MINNESOTA – SOUTH DAKOTA BOUNDARY WATER. Motion carried unanimously.

The final recommended change is to modify the special management waters by removing stream closures in Eastern South Dakota. Lott explained closed seasons on streams are not regulating fish populations biologically. There are very few people that utilize angling opportunities in the spring in these systems. In cooperation with this regulation change, opening spearing for Northern Pike and catfish species year-round would also allow additional opportunity in these streams.

Motioned by Sharp, second by Boyd TO APPROVE THE FINALIZATION OF 41:07:02:05 REMOVING STREAM CLOSURES IN EASTERN SOUTH DAKOTA. Motion carried unanimously

Fish Limits

Lott presented the recommended changes to in regards to fish limits and snagging of paddlefish with no changes from proposal. The first recommended change is to remove the daily and possession limits for White Bass and Rock Bass which are in high abundance throughout many South Dakota waters. Angler attitudes towards these species vary, but few anglers specifically target them. For those that do target and harvest these species, there is no reason we should limit their ability to harvest.

Motioned by Peterson, second by Locken TO APPROVE THE FINALIZATION OF 41:07:03:01 REMOVING WHITE BASS AND ROCK BASS DAILY POSSESSION LIMITS. Motion carried unanimously

The second recommended change is to modify daily possession, and length limit restrictions on special management waters to:

- a. Eliminate the 1 trout over 14” regulation from Black Hills lakes
- b. Establish a minimum length limit of 24-inches and a daily limit of 1 for Lake Trout or Splake in the Black Hills Fish Management Area
- c. Remove the 15” minimum size restriction on Walleye for all waters that have a 4 fish Walleye daily limit except for waters with evaluations in progress (Mo River Reservoirs, Angostura, Shadehill)
- d. Remove black bass (Largemouth and Smallmouth Bass) size restrictions from all waters with the exception of Burke Lake, New Wall Lake, and Lake Yankton

- e. Add a 28-inch minimum length and a daily limit of 1 for Walleye on Horseshoe Lake (Day County)

Phillips requested history on the recommended changes.

Lott responded since around 1990 the 14 inch minimum in the management toolbox was standardized to 15 inches.

Motioned by Boyd, second by Sharp TO APPROVE THE FINALIZATION OF 41:07:03:03 IN REGRDS TO DAILY POSSESS AND LENGTH LIMIT RESTRICTIONS ON SPECIAL MANAGEMENT WATERS. Motion carried unanimously

Lott also presented the recommended change to modify snagging season in special management areas by allowing Lake Francis Case Paddlefish license holders to take a Paddlefish with snagging gear or bow and arrow. He explained there has been some desire by anglers for the ability to take Lake Francis Case Paddlefish with archery equipment. Currently the Lake Francis Case Paddlefish season only allows snagging of Paddlefish. This change would give any license holder the opportunity to take a Paddlefish with either gear.

Motioned by Boyd, second by Locken TO APPROVE THE FINALIZATION OF 41:07:05:02 ALLOWING LAKE FRANCIS CASE PADDLEFISH LICENSE HOLDERS TO TAKE A PADDLEFISH WITH SNAGGING GEAR OR BOW AND ARROW. Motion carried unanimously

Spearing and Archery

Lott presented the recommended changes in regards to spearing of rough fish in South Dakota and Nebraska border waters with no changes from proposal. He explained this would allow additional opportunity for rough fish spearing and archery on the border waters with Nebraska.

He also presented the recommended changes to modify areas open to spearing of game fish specifically:

- a. Opening the entirety of Lake Sharpe and Lake Francis Case to gamefish spearing and archery
- b. Removing the requirement to purchase a game fish spearing and archery permit
- c. Change spearing season dates for Northern Pike and catfish on inland waters to year round
- d. Changing border water gamefish season to July 1-Dec 31 to match NE
- e. Allowing for take of gamefish below Gavins Point Dam

Lott presented the recommended change to remove the game fish spearing and archery permit from the list of licenses and permits and modify restricted areas by prohibiting spearing and archery in Angostura Marina and Lewis and Clark Lake Marina

Phillips asked if Lake Sharp and Lake Francis Case are currently open everywhere except the upper areas.

Lott responded yes, but only closed to game fish spearing and not rough fish and catfish.

Phillips stated previous action was taken due to concerns with congestion so why change now.

Mark Ohm, wildlife regional supervisor, responded they did not see a large amount of congestion with that tournament and most of it was resolved with the event organizer as they closed off the congested area to his tournament fisherman. Those areas were open to anyone not participating in the tournament and we didn't see congestion

Phillips going forward do you see a problem?

Ohm said if we open for a limited time period there would potential for people to utilized during a limited time, with it being open all time.

Motioned by Locken, second by Boyd TO APPROVE THE FINALIZATION OF 41:07:06 SPEARING REGULATIONS. Roll Call Vote: Boyd-yes; Locken – yes; Peterson-yes; Phillips – no; Sharp- yes; G. Jensen-yes. Motion passes with 5 yes votes and 1 no vote. Motion passes.

Aquatic Invasive Species

Lott presented the recommended change to add Starry Stonewort to the list of aquatic invasive species which will enable law enforcement to prevent boaters with Starry Stonewort present from launching in SD waters and slow its from spread here.

Lott presented the recommended change to allow exemptions for commercial plant harvesters and lakeshore property owners from the prohibition on possessing aquatic invasive species. He explained there is no provision for commercial aquatic plan harvesters to possess and transport aquatic invasive plants as part of their harvesting operation. This rule change establishes that mechanism, if commercial operators abide by the conditions of the agreed-upon department work plan. Shoreline property owners who want to remove aquatic invasive plants from their lakeshore would be permitted to dispose of them at locations identified in their permit.

The final recommended changes to the aquatic invasive species rule presented by Lott were to allow the GFP department secretary to authorize certain boats to keep plugs in while trailered and add Lake Yankton to the list of containment waters. He explained the department secretary currently has the authority to allow anglers participating in events where transport of fish in live wells is desirable to increase survival of fish after a weigh-in event to transport fish in water from a lake, river, or stream. Allowing the secretary to authorize boat plugs to remain in place outside of boat ramp parking areas would facilitate the occurrence of off-site, live release tournaments in highly regulated situations where sufficient oversight and monitoring occurs to ensure that water will not be transferred between waterbodies. In regards to Lake Yankton he noted it now has Asian Clams and Zebra Mussels and adding it to the list of containment waters would help slow the spread of these aquatic invasive species to other waters in the state.

Boyd asked if there would there be extra policing to inforce.

Lott responded yes and there are specific routes for follow-up and oversight.

Motioned by Phillips second by Peterson TO APPROVE THE FINALIZATION TO 41:10:04 AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES REGULATIONS. Motion carried unanimously.

Deer License Allocation

Leif summarized the rule change process for the deer license allocation. He noted that for the past 10 years there has been discussion on how to alter the draw system to allow more deer hunters to go hunting each year. There have been other proposals in the past. The current proposal was brought forward after discussions with focus groups, deer stakeholder workgroup and considerations of the deer management plan, original proposal brought forward in July, modification to the proposal in September. An unprecedented level of public outreach in regards to this rule change including Facebook live with 14,000 views, open sessions at State Fair, and live SDPB Focus Program discussing in detail the proposal designed to increase the number of deer hunters who draw their preferred license. One aspect discussed was to make a change to special buck. Leif provided a handout with 3 alternatives if the Commission chooses to move the proposal forward as a finalization. He noted if they want one of the suggested changes or a different change they would need to take action to modify the proposal before final action on the proposal could be taken.

Special Buck License Alternatives

1. Retain special buck license allocation as a separate drawing independent from the proposed combined BHD, WRD, ERD and MZD drawing (currently in the proposed rule change). Residents could draw a special buck license and then submit an application for one of the other 3 deer seasons but could not submit a combined-drawing application for a second license in the season where their special buck license is valid.
2. Deer hunters that apply for special buck license would not be allowed to submit an application for the combined BHD, WRD, ERD and MZD drawings.
3. Deer hunters that draw a special buck license would not be allowed to submit an application for the combined BHD, WRD, ERD and MZD drawings.

Leif noted we have a great opportunity in this state to hunt deer and people are very passionate about it as it is very important this opportunity is to our residents and visitors. Wants people to recognize the Commission and Department have everyone's best intentions in mind in hopes to make it better or leave it as it is.

Jensen thanked everyone for their work on this process.

Phillips asked for history on the special buck tag.

Leif explained in 2005 there was discussion about possible outfitter or transferable licenses. The West River deer workgroup was established and tasked with multiple issues and one of the things that came out of that group were special buck licenses. They were only allocated for the West River deer season then a few years later the East River became available. There is an allocation for residents and nonresidents West River and only residents East River.

Sharp asked if we put special buck back in the draw how would it affect the draws and percent of success.

Robling responded the department receives about 1,000 applicants West River and 1,200 applicants East River for special buck. The license typically gets drawn with one preference point. If they had to make this the preferred season approx. 500-800 would not be in the combined drawing. Currently approximately 300 people apply for special buck license only. Therefore you will not see a major change in draw probabilities. At the end of the day it would take 1,400 – 2,000 people out of the combined drawing.

Sharp asked to confirm that taking special buck out or keeping it in it would not have much of an impact on the outcome of the draws.

Robling responded yes. He said something to remember is because special buck would be out of the combined drawing under the proposal we expect to see an increase in applications as it is an opportunity for people to get two buck licenses.

Olson said it was noted yesterday that special buck is part of east and West River units so if adopted as amended would there be a need to make changes to the rules that would now separate the special buck and do we still intend to do the draw for special buck earlier so people know if they received their preference choices.

Leif responded the drawing for special buck would continue to be earlier regardless of how the proposal moves forward. Rules were crafted to describe the proposal without reference to special buck. The original proposal addresses the overlap to address special buck and combined drawings and we can make the modification to the rule should the Commission choose to make an amendment.

Phillips said this effort has been truly unprecedented. It has been out for comment for 90 days. We have amended the proposal based on input and put it out for additional 30 day comment period. He noted the commission has the authority to modify the proposal, but doesn't think it is the right thing to do. Leadership is about responsibility not authority. People have been commenting on the rule as it is currently written. This doesn't mean we can't make a change in the future or upon review in 3 years.

Motion by Phillips second by Sharp TO FINALIZE THE CHANGES TO THE DEER LICENSE ALLOCATION DRAWING STRUCTURE.

Drawing	Resident	Nonresident
1 and 2	Maximum of 1 license in ERD, WRD, BHD, or MZD	Maximum of 1 license
3	Maximum of 1 license in <u>each</u> of the WRD, ERD BHD and MZD seasons.	
Leftover Resident and Nonresident Licenses Pooled		
4	Maximum of five additional licenses for a maximum total of nine licenses.	Maximum of 1 license, for a total of no more than one license per hunter.
5	Unlimited. First-come, First-served	Unlimited. First-come, First-served

Sharp noted this has been long process with a lot of public input. It was gratifying to hear comments yesterday that said change is not easy, but people make changes every day. This is a reasonable approach to try to get more people in the field to hunt. Not everyone is going to agree with this but this is the most reasonable compromise that pushes ahead to a positive change in getting more people in the field.

Peterson said this has been a long process and a very good process allowing the Commission to hear from many people. The department has done an amazing effort toward this. We always hear from people against change because there is concern and fear of what change may bring. This will not affect those that only get one or two licenses but it will those who get multiple licenses. There are still opportunities to get multiple tags possibly up to 9 tags. As a commissioner I feel the need to help new hunter's opportunity to get out to hunt. Seasoned hunters know the process, but new or younger hunters who have not figured out how to apply in certain units do not have that opportunity. A vote for this is not against our seasoned hunters it is a vote to get more hunters in the field. Hope people will still apply and continue their family traditions and hope this will allow additional hunters the ability to also make those traditions. Last comment received said it would be cool if more people got the chance to get a tag when some people get lots of tags. We are here for all of our hunters.

Boyd echoed what fellow commissioners said that this will increase the number of hunters in the field. Boyd asked when would be the earliest reasonable timeframe to review this.

Robling responded three years of data as part of the deer management plan review in 2021, but the commission can always propose a modification at any time. The department is committed to measure metrics with three years of draw probability data.

Olson said we keep getting question why do this and why now. His response is we are losing hunters every year we wait and hunters do not get tags. We need to look at the wants and needs of existing customers and retain those who have left the application pool. This would entice those with children and grandchildren to get back into hunting and shooting sports. Nobody is going to move out of state if this goes through. We are one of the few states in the upper Midwest that allows you to shoot more than one deer each year. This proposal still provides the opportunity to harvest more than one deer each year. This is reasonable approach that has been put together well. Sad at some comments and lack of sensitivity to the big picture. This encourages future shooting enthusiast to participate in hunting which is one of the greatest activities our state has to offer.

Motion carried unanimously.

Secretary Hepler thanked staff involved in this process who worked hard on this. There will be some very disappointed people and we have had some very negative comments. It is human nature for people to have different perspectives, but we need to progress and try different alternatives and see if they work. Asked people to please have faith in the process and if it doesn't work we will go back and fix it.

Jensen thanks to all for their help and feels this is a good result.

Black Hills Elk Raffle

Tom Kirschenmann, wildlife deputy director, presented the finalization for the Black Hills Elk Raffle License. He explained a petition was submitted to the GFP Commission requesting another elk license be made available for a raffle for one wildlife conservation organization per year to be used to generate funds for wildlife management. The petition requested the license be made available in any unit where an "any" elk license is allocated within the Black Hills elk hunting season, but not to include Custer State Park. Kirschenmann noted recommended changes from the proposal to make it clear the raffle license would only be valid in hunting units within the Black Hills elk hunting season where "any" elk licenses are allocated and funds raised are to be held within an account that can specifically identify and track the revenues and expenditures of the raffle to assure funds generated are spent on wildlife management activities enhancing SD natural resources. He also presented proposed rules to include:

1. Establish an Elk Raffle License in the Black Hills Elk Hunting Season to be valid in any unit where an Any Elk license is allocated.
2. Elk Raffle License would not be valid in Custer State Park.
3. Raffle license only available to qualifying residents.
4. Raffle license would be available to any 501(c)3 non-profit conservation organization dedicated to wildlife management.

And noted the specific rules developed for this raffle license follow the same format as the rules currently in place for the Custer State Park elk raffle license found in 41:06:27.

Olson asked what is the criteria to select a 501c3 if more than one apply.

Kirschenmann said in draft rules criteria would include: their qualifications to run a raffle like this, how successful have they been at raising funds, what specific projects they see these funds going towards, and essentially sell themselves as the entity that would make the best use of these funds. If we receive multiple applicants the department would review all applications and bring a recommendation to the commission for their approval. If it becomes more competitive they may need to take it further to elaborate on the criteria that is currently in place.

Olson said the RMEF has done an excellent job of utilizing dollars for habitat. Would be supportive with an amendment to have an Olympic average noting they have to meet a dollar amount or they would not get to hold the drawing and would need to return the funds. Olson noted he is a member of RMEF, Ducks Unlimited, ProPheasant, Pheasants Forever and started Lake County chapter of NWTF. He supports all these groups and do not want to see their work diminished if another group only raises \$10,000.

Philips noted we do not need to tell people these are coveted licenses. He noted it is a little strange that an international organization like Ducks Unlimited is looking at the Black Hills of South Dakota to raise funds by raffling off one of our coveted elk tags. Phillips said he is not in support of the petition.

Sharp said he not against the idea and agree with Olson that we need to create a commitment amount of 30,000-50,000 and if all funds are not raise they are not returned. Also need further restrictions or solid parameters possibly for a specific project on how the funds will be used to ensure it is spent in a meaningful way. Not sure if this is possible under the rules.

Kirschenmann explained the draft rules include the requirement of the chosen entity to form a committee that would include department staff to ensure funds go toward meaningful management activities and that generated funds spent within 3 years. If not spent then the funds would return to the department to spend appropriately.

Peterson said she is in support if amended per Olson.

Boyd asked if we know if there will be an impact to the funds raised by the other tag if there are two.

Kirschenmann explained that we do not know what that impact could be. Noted RMEF has concerns as stated during the public hearing.

Phillips asked if this action can be amended since it began as a petition.

Kirschenmann explained that because the Commission approved the petition it became the commission's proposal and it is up for finalization and can be amended. Noted petitions cannot be amended only approved or denied.

Sharp okay with that if they want to take this on the expectations are high. If they make an application they are committing to raising a specific amount of dollars as coveted tags have high expectations.

Olson motioned TO AMEND THE PROPOSAL TO ADD #5 STATING THE ENTITY WOULD MEET AND AGREE TO A SET REVENUE AMOUNT AND GUARENTEE FUNDS UTILIZED FOR WILDLIFE HABITAT IN SOUTH DAKOTA.

Phillips asked if the amendment could note that a percentage of the funds go back to the Black Hills as that is the elk's habitat.

Hepler cautioned the addition of other stipulations as would establish different standards for a different raffle when you already have another raffle. Recommend tabling the action at this time.

Olson withdrew his motion to amend and motioned TO TABLE ACTION TO ALLOW STAFF TIME TO FORMULATE ADJUSTMENTS AS DISCUSSED TODAY. Second by Locken. Motion carried unanimously.

OPEN FORUM

Vice Chairman G. Jensen opened the floor for discussion from those in attendance on matters of importance to them that may not be on the agenda.

Russ Roberts, St. Onge, SD, laws concerning transportation of turkey's in SD. It is difficult for hunters to haul an entire bird carcass around. It would be a lot easier if we could just transport the edible portions. Has not visited with local conservation officer, but assumes they will be competent enough to identify the sex of the bird if the required parts are there such as tail feathers. Understands there would be rule and regulation changes, but it would make it a lot simpler for hunters.

Don Hausle, Spearfish, SD, spoke in regards to elk damage at his place across the road from Mr. Rantapa. He explained that they kept subdivision out because ag operation. Loss of forage is unbelievable and didn't even get any bales of hay off their land this year.

No regrowth and grass is only an inch high and full of elk droppings. To quantify gave permission to two archery hunters who saw 70 head of elk. So with 40 head of elk at an average weight of 600 lbs. and they eat 3 percent of their body weight per day it is a lot of forage over 6 months it is 43 ton of forage that he cannot afford to replace at \$5000. Conservation officer has been up there twice this year to assist and the forage replacement plan is only \$800. Noted he may be unique in this situation and asks that something be done.

Kenneth Hargens, Rapid City, SD. Provided handouts: photos of cabin and sign, personal correspondence, and letter from Snyder. Said his family has owned the property in CSP since 1892. Last summer placed sign on property indicating it is the first school house in Custer County in 1877. Received a letter from Matt Snyder, CSP noting that it was illegal to place sign and it is not accurate. Provided documentation that grandfather came to property in 1892 and used it as a hunting and fishing lodge. Hargens asked the commission to provide guidance to Snyder allowing them to keep their sign up.

Phillips asked Hargens to allow the Commission time to review the materials he provided and look into the matter.

Gary English, Rapid City, SD thanked the commission and staff for works in regards to Canadian geese at Rapid City Regional Airport where he is an operations technician. Extending the season in Pennington County has alleviated the problem by allowing hunters to hunt the ground around and therefore they have not had any incidents with the geese in the last several years.

Jensen thanked people for comments and reminded them they can always reach out to the Commission and GFP staff.

DIVISION OF WILDLIFE

Land Donation in Day County

Paul Coughlin, habitat program administrator, provided a request to accept a land donation from The Nature Conservancy. The property is located 5 miles southeast of Webster in Day County and consists of 580 acres to be utilized as a Game Production Area for wildlife habitat management and public hunting access. Coughlin explained how this property rounds-out parcels that consolidate or connect existing public lands open to hunting, fishing, and other recreational related activities; and has parcels containing significant wetland habitat complexes.

Sharp inquired that if the department accepts this does this change the nature of any bodies of waters that are currently part of this land.

Coughlin responded it would at the west end of Bitter Lake.

Motioned by Phillips with second by Locken TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 18-08 (Appendix B) AUTHORIZING AND CONFIRMING ACCEPTANCE OF DONATION FROM THEN NATURE CONSERVANCY FOR 580 ACRES IN DAY COUNTY. Motion carried unanimously.

GPA Management Review

Robling and Coughlin provided information on the recently completed a comprehensive project to identify Game Production Area (GPA) habitat and public use needs wherein regional habitat management staff rated existing habitat quality and public use opportunities on 712 GPAs across South Dakota. Habitat staff further identified and quantified development opportunities on GPAs, where targeted habitat and public use improvements would substantially improve the areas for wildlife and public hunting. The assessment purpose is to help better identify, quantify, and prioritize both existing and potentially new resources (e.g. people, money, equipment) needed to further move GFP towards meeting habitat and species management objectives on our existing GPAs. While GFP staff identified numerous improvement opportunities specific to individual GPAs, common among the needs list were resources needed to further address noxious weed control; expand prescribed burning capacity as a grassland management tool; and to further develop, improve, and maintain public access roads, trails, parking areas, and boat ramps. In addition to the internal habitat needs assessment, GFP also conducted a public opinion survey. The survey - sent to over 23,000 small game, big game, and waterfowl license holders - provided the public an opportunity to rate the quality of wildlife habitat and public use opportunities on GPAs, as well as provide a measure of public attitudes toward various habitat management practices utilized on GPAs (e.g. woody cover planting, food plots, prescribed burning, managed grazing, etc.). Finally, a grant application was submitted to US Fish & Wildlife Service – Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program to obligate funds from the South Dakota Game, Fish & Parks – Wildlife Division Land Bank to complete the habitat enhancement projects and purchase the needed equipment identified through the habitat and public use needs assessment. The objective of the grant project is to utilize the specific habitat development practices, such as grass and woody cover plantings, to enhance habitat and further develop public use facilities on GPAs across South Dakota in calendar years 2018 through calendar year 2021, and purchase needed equipment to complete the enhancement projects.

Mountain Lion Population and Management Update

Andy Lindbloom, senior wildlife biologist, provided an update on mountain lion management and research. Population management and potential trend indicators include: Observation reports, documented mortalities, mortality density, hunter harvest statistics, and biopsy darting DNA analysis for population estimates. Season dates for the 2018 mountain lion season were held from December 26, 2017 to March 31, 2018, and a total of 31 mountain lions were harvested in the Black Hills Fire Protection District (12 males, and 19 females). Mountain lion season is open year-round on the prairie, and a total of 9 males and 2 females were harvested on the prairie.

Biopsy darting of mountain lions is used to collect DNA samples from mountain lions before the season, and the data is utilized to determine a population estimate. During the 2017/2018 DNA collection period, a total of 63 DNA samples were collected with an end result of 54 total individual lions being documented. This information was entered into Mark-Recapture Lincoln Petersen analysis of adult and subadult mountain lions, and a total population of 413 adult and subadult mountain lions was estimated.

In summary, harvest per unit effort of hunters has been trending downward over the last few years. Human caused lion mortalities show the lion population at approximate stable levels when compared to other western states. Additionally, adult female harvest is above proportions considered stable for some western populations. With one year of data,

observation reports, non-harvest mortalities, and age of adult females is up. Biopsy darting catch/unit effort is stable to increasing, and the population estimate showed an increase this last year. Finally, the current mountain lion management plan is in the revision process and will be completed in the next year.

Phillips asked at what rate does the Lincoln model become more accurate.

Lindbloom said for each individual increase the confidence intervals are significantly impacted.

Jensen said the workgroup was terrific. Current situation in regards to mountain lions is pretty good shape.

License Sales Update

Scott Simpson provided the monthly licensing report for the wildlife division. Resident combination and annual fishing licenses, as well as most nonresident fishing licenses, are all at lower levels from 2017. A high percentage of the licenses that include fishing privileges have been sold at this point in the year so those numbers will not be increasing significantly prior to 2019 sales beginning on December 15, 2018. Both resident and nonresident small game licenses will hit their peak between now and December 15. At this point, very few licenses have been sold and it is too early to tell what participation might be. All told, the wildlife division revenue from over the counter fishing and hunting licenses is down almost \$200,000 compared to 2017.

Simpson also provided an update on the impacts of cubing preference points. Several examples were provided over from different seasons that showed cubing preference points is having the intended effect of issuing more licenses to those with more preference points. Simpson also reminded commissioners that by giving advantage to those with more preference, it was coming at the expense of those with less preference. Without reducing the applicant pool or increasing license allocation, the frequency of drawing some hard to get licenses will not be increased.

DIVISION OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Buffalo Round-up Update

Matt Snyder, parks and recreation regional supervisor, provided a brief update noting this year the park had 15,750 visitors attend the 53rd annual buffalo roundup. The visitation was down 25% primarily due to weather. The surrounding communities had 5 to 6 inches of snow on the ground. The event was deemed a success across the board and had a large variety of news coverage from international outlets, local outlets and even NBC Nightly News.

The overall condition of the animals was good. There was plenty of moisture this summer and grass production was excellent. The park rounded up approximately 1,287 animals, including the 423 calves that were born in 2018. The park will sell 330 animals at its annual auction on November 17 and plans to overwinter 960 bison.

Spring Creek Prospectus

Al Nedved, parks and recreation assistant director, updated the Commission on the recent prospectus for Spring Creek Resort. The Commission approved a Settlement Agreement as well as the issuance of a prospectus for Spring Creek at the June 2018

meeting. The required investment in the prospectus was for the Possessory Interest assets which consists of the cabins, restaurant, shop building, and marina docks; as well as the existing liquor license. The appraised value of the Possessory Interest was \$1,749,487. The value of the liquor license was listed at \$75,000. The advertised lease included the same levels of required services and accommodations and fee structures as currently exist. Existing required fees are: Franchise Fee of 2% on all Gross Receipts; plus 50% of A-Dock revenues and a 2% R&M fund. The prospectus was issued on June 28th and expired on September 21st. No proposals were received. The Concessionaire has been informed of the results. The Department has engaged in discussion with the concessionaire regarding the options for additional prospectus issuances and future operations.

Olson asked if there is a time when the concessionaire would turn over the keys and GFP would operate a facility

Nedved responded we could possibly hire an operator but to knowledge has not operated concessionaire by agency

Guest Rated Services

Emilie Miller, parks and recreation visitor services coordinator, presented information on two avenues the South Dakota State Parks uses to keep the channels of communication open with visitors. Since park staff work out in the open alongside visitors, the parks are immersed in their clientele's opinions all the time. Staff receive a good amount of high-quality, personal interaction with their customers, but two feedback methods provide more quantitative information. The Guest Rated program allows visitors to leave reviews and feedback on their experience, and makes them available for other visitors to read. Overnight users receive an email after they check out of the campground, asking them complete the survey. A day use survey is also available. Both surveys also ask for information such as miles traveled, frequency of visit and age, which helps in marketing and analyzing economic impact. Out of 48 parks in the review system, 40 currently have an overall A or A- rating, with the remaining parks scoring B or B+. The state parks also use several email newsletters to communicate with visitors. The most popular list, the Summer Weekend Newsletter, highlights weekend weather, events, camping availability and other outdoors information. The list has over 109,000 subscribers and an average open rate of 15% each issue. Both methods are very valuable tools to gauge customer satisfaction and solicit feedback from state park visitors.

Mickelson Trail Overview

Shannon Percy, district park supervisor, updated the Commission on provided an overview on the Mickelson Trail. He explained Black Hills Trails have 15 trailheads that spans 114 miles from Deadwood to Edgemont including the loop on the northern edge. They have 4 hard rock tunnels over 100 railroad trestle bridges. Host the Mickelson Trail Trek annually that is open to 600 riders and spans over 3 days of biking the 114 miles of the Mickelson Trail. Last fall they dedicated the Spearfish Canyon Nature Area which was a new bridge and lower observation area overlooking Spearfish Falls and improved trails at all three nature areas.

Percy said Bear Butte State Park has 15 campsites. It is the start of the Centennial Trail and is approximately 1800 acres. They had a fire that burned 512 acres that started on the North side. We have approximately 12-15 Bison there that we rotate out. Hope

next fall to replace the platform at the summit with the possibility of the National Guard to do an airlift. Resurfaced the lower trail and got rid of some steps.

We have 350 miles of snowmobile trails in the Black Hills. We do work with the state of Wyoming as we do go into Wyoming so we have agreements with them. We do have a Governor Snowmobile Advisory Board that is citizen group appointed by the Governor that advise on policies and programs that affects snowmobiling opportunities for the state as well as expenditure of the funds.

Recreational Trails Program

Randy Kittle, parks and recreation grants coordinator, provided the Commission an update on the Recreational Trails Program (RTP). He explained how the program funds motorized and non-motorized trail projects. Funds come to the State through the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). RTP grants reimburse project sponsors up to 80% of the approved project cost. There is a 5 person Governor appointed citizen advisory council that oversees awarding of program grant dollars. Kitty Kinsman, a bicyclist from Rapid City is the Chair. Dave Sweet, a snowmobiler from Sioux Falls, DeEtte Goss, an off highway vehicle enthusiast from Belle Fourche, Ken Buhler, a walker from Pierre and Mel Fish, an off highway vehicle enthusiast from Yankton make up the RTP Advisory Council. 30% of the RTP funding must go to motorized trail projects, 30% to non-motorized trail projects and 40% to diverse trail projects.

2018 Motorized Trail Projects

GFP Snowmobile Trail Groomer \$192,000

GFP Seasonal Labor for Snowmobile Trail Grooming \$198,000

2018 Non-Motorized/Diversified Trail Projects

Bear Butte Replace Viewing Platform on Trail \$32,000

Mickelson Trail Replace Deck on Bridge 120 \$70,000

Mickelson Trail Limestone Surface Material \$160,000

Mickelson Trail Maintenance \$108,000

Aberdeen Moccasin Creek Trail \$92,571

Deadwood Whitewood Creek Trail \$60,000

Dell Rapids Sioux River Red Rock Trail \$100,000

Elk Point Trail Paving \$24,903

Pierre L&C Trail Section Repaving \$125,000

SD Has received \$17,600,000 from RTP which has produced over \$22,000,000 in completed trail projects across the state.

Revenue, Camping and Visitation Report

Katie Ceroll, parks and recreation division director, presented the reports explained that as we close out September, the year to date revenue is up 3%, camping is down 1%, and visitation is down 3%. Just for the month of September revenue was up about 18%, which helped to drive that overall year to date revenue number up 2% from last month. Now please look at the camping services line item within the revenue by item report. The camping services line item encompasses the dollars collected from reservations made to date and is up 4% year to date. Overall, considering the weather this year, cold spring and rain events, the park use remains strong.


Solicitation of Agenda Items from Commissioners

No agenda items were recommended

Adjourn

Motioned by Phillips, second by Peterson TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. Motion carried unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m. MT

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kelly R Hepler". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Kelly R. Hepler, Department Secretary

Appendix A

2019 and 2020 Spring Turkey

Unit #	Unit Name	Resident		Nonresident		License Totals							
		Tom T	2 Tom T	Tom T	2 Tom T	RES	RES	RES	RES	NR	NR	NR	NR
		32	35	32	35	1-tag	2-tag	Licenses	Tags	1-tag	2-tag	Licenses	Tags
01A	Minnehaha	80	0	0	0	80	0	80	80	0	0	0	0
02A	Pennington	200	0	16	0	200	0	200	200	16	0	16	16
06A	Brookings	20	0	0	0	20	0	20	20	0	0	0	0
07A	Yankton	260	0	0	0	260	0	260	260	0	0	0	0
08A	Davison/Hanson	80	0	0	0	80	0	80	80	0	0	0	0
08B	Davison/Hanson	80	0	0	0	80	0	80	80	0	0	0	0
11A	Bennett	30	0	3	0	30	0	30	30	3	0	3	3
12A	Bon Homme	250	0	0	0	250	0	250	250	0	0	0	0
13A	Brule	150	0	0	0	150	0	150	150	0	0	0	0
15A	Butte/Lawrence	350	0	28	0	350	0	350	350	28	0	28	28
16A	Campbell/Walworth	10	0	0	0	10	0	10	10	0	0	0	0
17A	Charles Mix/Douglas	350	0	0	0	350	0	350	350	0	0	0	0
19A	Clay	120	0	0	0	120	0	120	120	0	0	0	0
19B	Clay	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20A	Corson	50	0	4	0	50	0	50	50	4	0	4	4
21A	Custer	150	0	12	0	150	0	150	150	12	0	12	12
22A	Day/Codington	80	0	0	0	80	0	80	80	0	0	0	0
23A	Deuel	100	0	0	0	100	0	100	100	0	0	0	0
24A	Dewey/Ziebach	150	0	12	0	150	0	150	150	12	0	12	12
27A	Fall River	75	0	6	0	75	0	75	75	6	0	6	6
29A	Grant	220	0	0	0	220	0	220	220	0	0	0	0
30A	Gregory	700	0	56	0	700	0	700	700	56	0	56	56
31A	Haakon	0	200	0	16	0	200	200	400	0	16	16	32
32A	Hamlin	10	0	0	0	10	0	10	10	0	0	0	0
35A	Harding	100	0	8	0	100	0	100	100	8	0	8	8
36A	Hughes	30	0	0	0	30	0	30	30	0	0	0	0
37A	Hutchinson	60	0	0	0	60	0	60	60	0	0	0	0
39A	Jackson	150	0	12	0	150	0	150	150	12	0	12	12
40A	Jerauld	10	0	0	0	10	0	10	10	0	0	0	0
41A	Jones	75	0	6	0	75	0	75	75	6	0	6	6
44A	Lincoln	50	0	0	0	50	0	50	50	0	0	0	0
44B	Lincoln	50	0	0	0	50	0	50	50	0	0	0	0
45A	Lyman	100	0	8	0	100	0	100	100	8	0	8	8
48A	Marshall/Roberts	400	0	0	0	400	0	400	400	0	0	0	0
49A	Meade	0	300	0	24	0	300	300	600	0	24	24	48
50A	Mellette	350	0	28	0	350	0	350	350	28	0	28	28
52A	Moody	60	0	0	0	60	0	60	60	0	0	0	0
53A	Perkins	0	100	0	8	0	100	100	200	0	8	8	16
56A	Sanborn	10	0	0	0	10	0	10	10	0	0	0	0
58A	Stanley	40	0	4	0	40	0	40	40	4	0	4	4
58B	Stanley	2	0	1	0	2	0	2	2	1	0	1	1
60A	Tripp	400	0	32	0	400	0	400	400	32	0	32	32
61A	Turner	20	0	0	0	20	0	20	20	0	0	0	0
62A	Union	120	0	0	0	120	0	120	120	0	0	0	0
62B	Union	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
65A	Oglala Lakota	40	0	4	0	40	0	40	40	4	0	4	4
67A	Todd	75	0	6	0	75	0	75	75	6	0	6	6
	TOTAL	5,657	600	246	48	5,657	600	6,257	6,857	246	48	294	342
	Unit	Tom T	2 Tom T	Tom T	2 Tom T	RES	RES	RES	RES	NR	NR	NR	NR
		32	35	32	35	1-tag	2-tag	Licenses	Tags	1-tag	2-tag	Lic	Tags
						RES & NR:	5,903	648	6,551	7,199			

Appendix B
RESOLUTION 18 - 08

WHEREAS, The Nature Conservancy, a non-profit corporation of the District of Columbia, owns real estate (Property) described as:

Lot 1, Puckett's Subdivision, located in the Southwest Quarter (SW¼) of Section Fourteen (14) in Township One hundred twenty-one (121) North, Range Fifty-five (55) West of the 5th P.M., Day County, South Dakota, as shown on the plat recorded in Book 7 of Plats, page 459; and

The East Half of the Northeast Quarter (E½NE¼) of Section Twenty-two (22) in Township One hundred twenty-one (121) North, Range Fifty-five (55) West of the 5th P.M., Day County, South Dakota; and

The North Half (N½) and the Southwest Quarter (SW¼) of Section Twenty-three (23), Township One hundred twenty-one (121) North, Range Fifty-five (55) West of the 5th P.M., Day County, South Dakota, subject to any easements, restrictions, covenants, and reservations of record.

Whereas, pursuant to its wishes, The Nature Conservancy desires to gift and transfer title to the Property to the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks (Department) for use as a Game Production Area; and

Whereas, the Department has evaluated and determined that the Property would serve very well as a Game Production Area, offering wildlife habitat, public hunting, and other wildlife related outdoor recreational opportunities; and

Whereas, the Department is authorized to accept gifts of property for Game Production Area as per SDCL 41-2-19 and desires to accept the gift of the Property upon confirmation of the gift by the Game, Fish and Parks Commission; and

Whereas, the Game, Fish and Parks Commission desires to acknowledge the Department's acceptance of this gift of property from The Nature Conservancy for use as a Game Production Area, and further acknowledge the extreme generosity of The Nature Conservancy.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Game, Fish and Parks Commission does hereby confirm the decision by the Department to accept the transfer and gift of the Property from The Nature Conservancy to be used as a Game Production Area.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Game, Fish and Parks Commission, on behalf of the citizens and sportspersons of South Dakota, does hereby acknowledge and express its deepest appreciation and gratitude to The Nature Conservancy for its generosity, and further acknowledge the outdoor recreation opportunities this gift will provide to South Dakotans for many years to come.

Public Hearing Minutes of the Game, Fish and Parks Commission
October 4, 2018

The Public Hearing Officer Scott Phillips began the public hearing at 2:00 p.m. at Cadillac Jack's SpringHill Suites in Deadwood, South Dakota. Commissioners Gary Jensen, Mary Anne Boyd, Jon Locken, Cathy Petersen, Scott Phillips, Russell Olson and Douglas Sharp were present. Vice Chairman Jensen indicated written comments were provided to the Commissioners prior to this time and will be reflected in the Public Hearing Minutes. Phillips then invited the public to come forward with oral testimony.

Fishing Season Methods

Ken Adel: Rapid City, SD opposed removal of 15 inch walleye, possession limits, Said there is a need for conservative limits. A lot of people honor these limits and many do not. Oppose as we are doing an injustice to our fisheries.

Fish Limits

Spearing and Archery

Aquatic Invasive Species

Deer License Allocation

Chris Hesla, SDWF believes we need to change something in the application and the way current draw system as it doesn't work as well as it should. The current proposition has been watered down too much. SDWF now opposes the proposal because the 4 seasons were removed at the Yankton meeting proposal. Support change but all of the change.

Russ Roberts, St. Onge, SD, disappointed that several of the seasons were eliminated from the process and it was intended to provide more opportunity. Disagree with the bonus seasons. Because of the number of license involved can accept CSP and refuge season. Separating these tags give folks with private land the opportunity to double dip and have opportunities other who only have access to public ground do not get. It's just how the license are allocated. Wants special buck tags back in the buckets as it would improve the amount of success and be the fairest system. This change doesn't eliminate people from hunting both sides of the state.

Dana Rogers, Hill City, SD wants to point out the original reason why the department was tasked with doing this. It was to provide additional opportunity. Passion has gotten very high as it looks like there is going to be a change. Should look at all hunters first then landowners second. We have 60-70 percent who only applies for one tag per year and a handful of folks to apply for multiple seasons. Supports proposal because he would like to see more hunters participate. Noted misinformation on social media and public comments is astounding. Proposal will increase odds and those with multiple licenses have their odds slightly diminished. Knows a petition has been signed by several hundred people who disagree because change is difficult for people.

Lance Dunlop, Sioux Falls, SD looks like you can keep the current system under voting by public opinion. He always applies East River and Black Hills saw this happening

and now will not be able to apply for Black Hills. With 3,999 applications by 3rd draw will you will not be able to get a license West River, can get a whitetail tag. More people prefer no change. Right now he can apply for both and wait my years and get preference points. Doesn't understand how new season will benefit. No change would be preferred by most people.

Gary English, Rapid City, SD This is well thought out and will provide many an opportunity to receive a license. Attend focus groups and read information provided by the department. Seen on social media sites lots of derogatory statements and untruths. Commended commission on hard work on difficult task. Provided a previous post he put on social media when he drew 11 tags. Hunted one deer that year leaving 10 left over that a grandfather, father, and son could have used to hunt. Thinks getting all these tags is selfish. Supports the change.

Ron Disbrow, Sioux Falls, SD, opposes the new system having concerns with preference points. Knows a dozen people who will no longer be purchasing preference points.

Steve Beardsley, Rapid City, SD commends commission to have the guts to do what you did. Best point is comment made early on to add 3,500 more hunters. You will get irate people. Applied for West River deer as did his son. Also applied for East River deer and didn't get it. When you do not get an application you do not get the opportunity to take grandchildren and involve youth. When taken away from 3,500 hunters you take this away from them for life. Making this change will try to fix that. Gary English said it well and it took guts on his part to admit that. What the commission is doing it telling people to be reasonable and be fair to others.

Ray Oyen, Lead, SD appreciates change being made and work that has been put in. Went to meeting and heard people opposed it and wanted to come and tell you we need this change. Live in the hills and has deer in back yard every day

Ross Sweeden, Rapid City, SD noted email sent to commission and talked with commission. Thank you for taking on this topic and firmly believe this is why you were awarded commission of the year. Supports proposal with the exception of special buck. As public landowner this is only opportunity so those with access to private land they should not be allowed to double dip. Pubic land is for everyone to hunt. Please support this change and place special buck back into the mix.

Gary Shaw, Rapid City, SD Appreciates time to comment. Supports proposal with the addition of special buck. Feels this should be placed back into the mix.

John Gerberdin, Spearfish, SD Huntsafe Instructor, followed this topic and has not gone into all details but has concerns for young hunters to get the opportunity to draw tags. If you do not get kids involved early and allow them a tag they will no longer be hunters. This needs to be altered to provide the youth more opportunity. Keep in mind not only the old guys need to be hunting.

William Locken, Lead, SD thank you for taking public comment. Is in favor of the change to the deer license allocation process. Hunting is on the downswing just as it is across the nation. If we do not keep people involved it will go away. We need to keep

interested by allowing people the opportunity to participate. Really appreciate the commission taking this on. Look at the overall hunting population Applauded the commission for efforts.

David Lewton, Rapid city, SD opposes, thinks people cannot get a tag, but you can get a doe tag in West River. Thinks there are tags left right now. It is open to however many you want. People just think they need a trophy hunt. Kids do not need to hunt for horns they just need to learn how to hunt. This year applied and didn't get a single tag, probably will get a couple next year. It's all into statistics. It just may take a few years. Why should only people in the Black Hills get an opportunity to go? If most people are against this why push it through.

Mike Sneesby, Deadwood, SD welcome to deadwood. Approve everything that has been stated would like to see it go through. Have two little boys who will be hunting and for BH tags currently draws every 2-3 years. Under current system may draw tag at 14-15 years old or a few years after that would only draw one maybe two tags while under the age of 18 and still living with him.

Black Hills Elk License Raffle

See attached public comments submitted prior to the public hearing

The public Hearing concluded at 2:57 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kelly R Hepler". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Kelly R. Hepler, Department Secretary

Public Comments

Aquatic Invasive Species

Keith Bauman

Yankton SD

keith.bauman@sealedair.com

Comment:

I live in Yankton and have to pay Nebraska \$15 a year to fish 13 blocks from my house. Wake up raise the fees and charge so we have money to have enforcement at the docks in SD. It costs money for enforcement so charge they will pay. Every boat and truck you see from out of state is worth a lot of money. They will pay it to fish.

David Froehlich

Brookings SD

sammf03@gmail.com

Comment:

I would approve a measure allowing in state boats could transfer fish from a lake to a cleaning station or home where the plug must be removed or valve opened before accessing another lake.

Tyler Hengen

Rapid City SD

tylerhengen@gmail.com

Comment:

This seems like a fine idea in practice, but it will require diligent oversight to ensure that the entire chain of this system is carried out appropriately. I think when exemptions are offered, you open the door for people to start taking shortcuts if they aren't being monitored, and there is a real risk of an increased spread of invasive species if transport and disposal aren't monitored extremely carefully. Further, I think the actual harvesting can be problematic if it is not done correctly. A real risk of not removing the full organism exists, and this also could result in higher invasive populations, as one would assume that the plants would repopulate at least as aggressively, if not more so, if open space and a need for increased reproduction exists. If the state is willing to spend the resources to ensure this is done correctly, I think it is a good plan. If the people harvesting the plants are willing to foot the bill for third-party oversight that reports to the state, I'm in favor of the plan. But, if this is done in a way that is nothing more than an agreement to do things a certain way, without thorough and consistent oversight, I don't think this plan makes much sense, and I think it could be potentially very damaging.

Carl Gustafson

Rapid City SD

cvgrcsd@gmail.com

Comment:

Oppose the GF&P being able to allow plugs to be in place away from the dock. If the law is required for regular fishermen & women it should be applied equally to ALL, with NO EXCEPTIONS for tournaments.

Douglas Mitchell
Pierre SD

Comment:

support

Black Hills Elk License Raffle

Darrel Jones
Dell Rapids SD
darrel.jones@k12.sd.us

Comment:

I think this is an excellent idea to raise needed funds for wildlife management. Look what the auction tag for Bighorn Sheep has done. Bringing in additional sheep to supplement the existing herd.

Patrick Ballensky
Akaska SD
pcb5591@yahoo.com

Comment:

This elk raffle is totally unacceptable to hunters who have 20+ years in preference points.

Duke Remitz
Frederick SD

Comment:

I support the idea but...how will the winner be determined among so many organizations if these organizations all raffle that one chance? Would it be beneficial to possibly raffle two tags?...if population can support the extra harvest?

Roy Hendrickson
Caputa SD
rhendrickson@nvanet.com

Comment:

When a resident can not get a license for an Elk Tag with 17 years of preference points, then you want to sell those precious licenses to the highest bidder. I am strictly opposed to that idea.

Drew Pitt
Rapid City SD

Comment:

oppose

James Johns
Blackhawk SD
james.johns@rcgov.org

Comment:

The elk license in SD is a highly coveted tag, and I like many others have years of preference points built up. The Custer State Park already goes to someone who has the cash to buy tickets in the drawing. Hunters like me who do not have the funds to buy tickets then miss out on another opportunity. I recognize the fund raising for a non-profit but please keep the tags in the pool for hunters who are hoping to get drawn through the application process. It's very frustrating seeing an elk tag opportunity get sold to only those who have the money to buy tickets. Please do not allow this proposal to go through.

Grant Jones
Deadwood SD
grntjones@aol.com

Comment:

This would be just another example of the rich and elite being granted privileges over the average working citizen! I don't think that our wildlife nor The morality of the Game Fish and Parks should be for sale to the highest bidder!! Let the 501c live by private funding. There are many local people who do as much or more to help the elk than the RMEF! And they do it privately, without accolades or special privilege. Let each elk hunter get his license on a fair and equal basis...and NOT because he was simply rich enough to buy it or because he attended some money grubbing banquet!! NO! To giving or selling any tag to any privileged group!!

Kayne Larimer
Rapid City SD
kaynelarimer@gmail.com

Comment:

Great idea! And I dont mind losing a few tags from the general pool knowing that these groups are doing good things with the \$\$\$.

Terrance Dosch

Pierre SD

tladosch@dakota2k.net

Comment:

I regard the proposal with mixed feelings, but wish to extend my qualified support. If such raffle option is made available to Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation or South Dakota Wildlife Federation, both of which I maintain membership, then I am confident that the proceeds will be utilized directly to support needed conservation priorities. That notwithstanding, I believe the actual number should be extremely exclusive and limited. After all, you are technically pulling a tag from the field of deserving applicants. I am glad to denote that the CSP season would be excluded from this policy. The extremely low tag availability for residents trying to draw one of those very limited licenses should preclude inclusion in the proposal. To wit: I have been unsuccessfully applying for a CSP Any Elk tag every year since 1986 and have now amassed 33 years of preference with no positive outcome in sight. Thanks!

Rick Albrecht

Albuquerque NM

ralbrecht6480@comcast.net

Comment:

Concerning a petition for rule change to establish an elk raffle license that would be valid during the Black Hills elk hunting season and be available for qualifying residents only: I would request this be amended to include retired military, born a

Amendment Requested . Request Elk Raffle License Proposal be amended as stated above. I was born and raised in Aberdeen. I served in the US Navy 25 years. Moved back to Sioux Falls for a short duration, but no jobs were available in my career expertise, bomb disposal and counter terrorism. I was recalled to Albuquerque, where I now reside, and still apply when I can for the East River Deer hunts. It would be greatly appreciated if Military retirees, born and raised in SD and who had to move out of state for continued support of nation and family, could still apply for the Proposed Elk Raffle License . Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely, Rick Albrecht

Justin Allen

Pierre SD

Comment:

I'm only in support of the elk raffle if it is limited to at max. of 1-3 organizations with a min. donation to SDGF. The donation would used to further elk hunting opps. to SD residents. Basically similar to the Big Horn license. Otherwise IMO all this does is take opp. from avg. elk hunter waiting 10-20 years to hunt with nothing in return. SD wildlife isn't set aside for folks with deep pockets that can buy 100s of dollars of raffle tickets for the chance to side step the fair general draw.

Brad Scott

Pierre SD

scottfamily22@pie.midco.net

Comment:

I have been applying for an Elk License for over 15 years and this would be one less license in the pool. I understand the need to support activities like this, but I am getting frustrated with the draw process and at the rate it is going will be in a wheel chair and won't be able to hunt for my bull.

Roger Thue

Colman SD

Roger.thue@qseng.com

Comment:

The proposed rule is missing significant details such as:

Is the raffle license valid during the archery season, rifle season or both?

If a hunter wins this raffle license, does it affect a hunter's preference points in any way?

How is the money that is raised split? (i.e Does some of it go to the non-profit and some directly to GFP?)

Does the non-profit need to spend 100% of the proceed raised on the raffle within the state of SD?

If a hunter wins the raffle, do they still need to buy a license or is that included in the raffle cost?

Is there a cap on the number of raffle licenses that can be issued (i.e. no more than 1 per each non-profit)?

What if there are multiple local chapters within a statewide organization like RMEF, can each chapter get a raffle license?

Is there a total limited number of raffle licenses available each year (on first come/first serve basis for the non-profits)?

Will the number of licenses available to the public be reduced by the number of raffles licenses available to the non-profits.

This proposal is very vague and I would not support it as written. I would possibly consider supporting it if there could be answers provided to many of the questions and issues noted above.

Judy Derrickson

Kyle SD

canyonhomestead@gmail.com

Comment:

support

Tom Vergeldt

Rosholt SD

ctverg@venturecomm.net

Comment:

Regardless whether it is through a non profit organization, its contrary to the lottery system now in place. Those organizations could apply, just like everyone else.

Dwain Hudson

Custer SD

Marshalcotton@hotmail.com

Comment:

Only the rich will win not fair to the fixed income folks.

Brenda Wood

Rapid City SD

brendawood61@me.com

Comment:

It needs to stay in the normal hunting seasons that are allocated. Residents are waiting too long to draw tags now.

Rod Moon

Mobridge SD

rsmoon@westriv.com

Comment:

This will be available only to the rich.....the current system does not give an advantage nor disadvantage to the "common working South Dakotan"... keep it on a level playing field for all

Phillip Campbell

Pierre SD

Waleyhntr@hotmail.com

Comment:

support

Troy Kuxhaus

Martin SD

tahaus@gwtc.net

Comment:

I think you open the door for non-profit organizations to want elk tags you open the door to a lot of head aches. Who should get one, and how many will be sold, where do you draw the line? Will they be sold to the highest bidder? Impossible to police. Sporting groups can raffle off firearms or a variety of other stuff they don't need elk tags.

Ralph Troelsen

Lennox SD

Sdralph@hotmail.com

Comment:

A lot of people have waited over 10 to 15 years for a tag and not received one now you want to give them away to people who have never applied for one and not had to pay the 5 dollar yearly cost of the program

Greg Delzer

Rapid City SD

Comment:

oppose

Daniel Owens

Keystone SD

605dano@gmail.com

Comment:

Bad Idea

Gordon Davis

Wessington SD

gbtdavis@sbtc.net

Comment:

Is it possible there would be other licenses for elk available for other non-profit organizations?

Brady Gabel

Rapid City SD

brady.gabel.1@gmail.com

Comment:

I am on the board of directors with Black Hills FlyFishers, a 501(c)3 organization headquartered in Rapid City, SD. As a group dedicated to wildlife conservation, I think this is a great idea and would be a significant fundraising opportunity for a group like us.

Stephen Turner

Rapid City SD

Comment:

That is just one more tag that could go to some one with 20 yrs pref.

Fred Carl

Rapid City SD

fkcarl@rap.midco.net

Comment:

Would support as long as;

1. It's an additional license beyond those set for the regular drawing
2. Funds generated go exclusively to elk habitat improvements

Anthony Busche

Brookings SD

apbusche@gmail.com

Comment:

But,.... must ensure that the raffles are legitimate. Don't need to have the "good ole boys club" always get the prize. There must be some rules with penalties that are severe.

Ken Thompson

Wall SD

sdaktoa1970@gmail.com

Comment:

Only the wealthy would be able to get this license. SDF GF&P selling out to the highest bidder. Since when did "our" prized elk become a how much the most money to purchase a license, become your endeavor?

Harold Bickner

Kimball SD

BICKNER@MIDSTATESD.NET

Comment:

support. This will provide some money for conservation

Chris Bailey

Rapid City SD

captainchris14@hotmail.com

Comment:

I currently hunt multiple seasons every year and feel that the current system works well. If this proposal is approved I will have to choose between groups that I have been hunting with for many years for west river, east river, & hills. I live in Rapid City and my first choice will likely be East River Deer due to the areas I have access too. With this proposal if I choose east river first choice I will likely never have an opportunity to obtain a black hills deer tag which is an area I greatly enjoy hunting. The current system allows me to hunt both seasons when I draw a hills tag every 2-3 years.

If there is going to be a choice I would suggest making it just between east river and west river for first choice. Hills & muzzleloader are different seasons and I believe they should be left as separate applications.

Thank You,
Chris Bailey

Rodney Sather

Vivian SD

bison@gwtc.net

Comment:

support

Steven Frooman

Rapid City SD

sfrooman@gmail.com

Comment:

support

Jamie Hintz
Clear Lake SD
deuelhwy@itctel.com

Comment:

I am all for an elk raffle but do not like the idea of institutions being able to get one and auction it off. If they could get one and raffle it off I am all for it. I am not in favor of someone wealthy getting a tag just because they can. I think it is a very coveted tag and everyone should be on a level playing field and raffle tickets should be affordable to all. Just my thoughts

Deer License Allocation

Dalton Decker
Pierre SD
dddecker@jacks.sdstate.edu

Comment:

support

Brad Reinke
Pierre SD
brad@reinkegray.com

Comment:

My family has hunted at the same ranch in Haakon County for 47 years. We have also hunted the same farm in Potter County for 35 years. Which relationship should I give up? I have always applied for the less desirable any whitetail tag in Potter County so I haven't taken opportunity from those that want an any deer tag. With the reduced number of tags, I'm lucky to get a tag every other year in Haakon County. Not sure how this proposed change will fix anything. I am curious where the genesis of this proposal came from? I can't find a single person that supports the proposed change. Please reconsider this poorly thought out change.

Mike Vanderwerff
Platte SD
deadrun_mv@hotmail.com

Comment:

Please remember that those hunters purchasing multiple licenses are the ones who make enjoying the great outdoors a priority for themselves as well as their friends and families. To me one of the main draws of hunting is the bonds and relationships formed. Many of these traditions will be severed if hunters are forced to choose only one season. Remember to consider the percentage of applications that are placed by multiple season hunters, not just the percentage of hunters.

Duane Lunne
Dallas SD
dlunne@hotmail.com

Comment:

I would like to address to the commissioners voted on the new deer allocations proposal after being revised September 7th. My question once again is why does it seem everyone is so concerned what east river hunters have to say and not what west river hunters say? Only reason i say this is it seems that everyone is so worried about getting multiple tags in every season possible. Why should that be any concern or change in the proposal from the first original proposal? Is it not that this is to add more new hunters or give others a better chance a drawing there preferred tags for preferred seasons? The changes made seem to cater to east river hunters trying to hunt east river and west river all for buck tags. Why not make them choose one buck for either season. If they want family hunt time aka bonus hunts then why not allow if tags available to shoot a doe and still family hunt time? It is very clear that there is more east river hunters that hunt all seasons then there are west river hunters that hunt both seasons. Now on to my other concerns. I am a landowner west river. Obviously i will be able to receive my preferred tag in the west river season. But my concern is now with the new proposal i will not be able to draw my second tag aka a doe tag until the 4 draw? If that is the case me a landowner that feeds this deer year round wont be able to have an extra tag for does to reduce the herd that destroys my crops. The current system allowed me to draw a doe tag the third draw but the chances each year are very slim so tell me how in the 4 draw which is the first time i would be eligible to draw another west river tag that there will be any doe tags left in tripp county? There wont be and since there is no free landowner doe tags for tripp county that would not apply and since i will already have a west river deer tag i will not be eligible for the landowner only tags either. So the new proposal you need to take a serious look into how it will be better for the landowners of any seasons east west or hills to draw more than one tag for there own land that they feed and raise these deer for the state of south dakota and the hunters to harvest. Right now landowners have zero say or choice in how the herd is managed and it is there land that the deer grow and flourish on. It is not the publics who are having more say or input into the deer proposal. I would suggest allowing the landowners in every county a chance to draw a doe tag even after they have already drew a buck tag in first or second draw. Why should we be penalized for getting our preferred first choice tag aka usually a buck tag in our county but then possibly having to wait till fourth draw after the east river hunters have submitted multiple tags for west river counties in the third draw. That would make make east river hunters possible to draw preferred east river buck tag in draw 1 and 2. Then be ellible to draw possibly even a buck tag west river in draw 3 and also draw doe tags west river. Mean While this the west river landowner has to sit back and wait till fourth draw to even think about getting a 2 tag in his season and county. That is not fair and needs to be addressed and looked into. Landowners should not have to sit back and wait and hope they get a chance at a second tag while non landowners from other counties much less other side of the river swoop up there tags just cause they are available. You will loose many landowner corporations and many west river hunters if this shall be the true case to the newest proposals so please look hard into how that is handled. The GFP needs the landowners on there side to control and go about deer management and other things. We the landowners need more choices and chances to draw multiple tags in our own home land counties rather than worry about hunters drawing multiple tags in all seasons and sides of the river. We need a change and im all for a new prospal for getting more hunters there preferred tag choices in counties but we also need to take care of the landowners who feed and raise 90% of the deer population in south dakota. They need to be able to have multiple tags within the same season and same country as they live work and enjoy the outdoors. Thanks and hope you take a serious look into this.

Justin Wheeler

Sioux Falls SD

wheeler.justin@hotmail.com

Comment:

I agree 100% that there needs to be some changes I think that anytime there is going to be change there are a certain amount of people that are going to throw a fit and a good portion of them only hunt about 2 weeks a year I don't think there is another state out there that splits there state in half like we do. I think at one time it was just fine but in South Dakota today there a lot more hunters too many for the amount of public land there is to hunt on and it is very hard to have quaility hunts people are walking on top of people. We are also one of the only states that doesn't have any trophy units I think that the grass lands areas could easily be trophy units that are managed. I definitely think that there should only be one first choice for rifle deer permits for the entire state so all these county drawings don't get so diluted. Look at the western states and how there drawings work and how long it takes to draw tags. How many other states can you go to and get multiple rifle deer tags in one year nebraska is the only one and even they limit you too two buck tags a year and there gfp is worst in the US.

So that is also an option where people could be limited to 2 buck tags max so they could draw a rifle tag and get a bow tag or however but a max of 2 buck tags is good also another way to keep drawings from being so diluted.

Also I think that the drawing needs to happen in the spring non residents are able to put in for every other state then see if they draw a tag and if they don't draw in other states then they put in for SD.

I think that landowner tags should only be for landowners however I feel it is important that non residents should have to apply for that county like every other non resident to keep non residents from buying good hunting land just for hunting and being able to hunt it every year or 20 guys buying large chunks and all being able to buy tag every year.

There is a fair amount of public land that is worthless there is nothing at all on it I think that the money used on the worthless land could be used to put efforts towards finding better land or more land for the public I have hunted or been on a high percentage of the public in western South Dakota.

We hear about the state wanting to get more kids involved and take kids hunting ect.. I agree with that but what fun is it to take a kid out hunting when there is a orange vest on every hill and people are walking past you so you don't see anything cause it's all ran out of the public and now there on private land we don't have too many deer buy any stretch.

I understand there a lot of obstacles when trying to make changes as my brother is game biologist in Montana and I hunt about every week all winter and in several states and I think the western big game states programs are not too bad.

Thanks

Justin Wheeler

Ed Hiller

Arlington SD

Comment:

most people apply for multiple tags and have preference for several different seasons. Leave it as it is.

Harrold Sherman
Goodwin SD

Comment:

Lately its been brought to my attention by friends, and a article in the paper you're thinking about changing the drawing rules for deer hunting. If I understand correctly, you'd have to put in for one main season, (like East River Deer) and all others on the possibility of left over licenses. If your name was drawn, it would be the only license you would get. If it wasn't drawn, you'd have almost no chance for one of the other left over licenses. So if you put in for E.R. deer, roughly (for Deuel Co.) a person would get a license for deer maybe once for every 3 or 4 years in a row, and nothing for the years you didn't draw a E.R. license. I do not like that set up. Currently, I put in for 3 season's, Black Hills, Sand Lake and East River. They all seem about 1 chance in 3 or 4 to... You having meetings to discuss this important change, one at Yankton, and one at Deadwoo, at 2:00 in the afternoon on workdays, when most people are working. You should be having meeting's at all the major towns in S.D. (like Watertown, Aberdeen, Pierre, etc) and at a time when people can attend to give their opinions. Please take your time on making this decision, and talk to more people. Why not send out a questionnaire to all deer hunters and see what they think.

Jeffrey Hofer
Sioux Falls SD
jatobefree@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Shawn Lambertz
Groton SD
fshalot@nvc.net

Comment:

everyone has the same chance as the next person right now and the current system has worked for ages. why do we need to change? if more deer need to be harvested or more opportunity given to hunters add more licenses.

Steve Flock
Sparta WI
flock.steve@gmail.com

Comment:

Leave the tag system as it is. You have the best option for residents and non-residents. Hunter numbers are declining across the country, I'm not sure that SD should start a draw system. Besides, I'm guessing the proposal is driven by firearms hunters and residents wanting less pressure. Anon-resident pays a substantial increase in license fees and it would take a large increase in resident hunters to offset that difference. Please leave well enough alone. Thanks

Marc Moore

Custer SD

Carrieknows02@goldenwest.net

Comment:

In reviewing the proposed restructure of the deer hunting license drawing process and the supporting data from previous deer hunter surveys, I believe this restructure action is worthwhile and well thought out. Many ills of the "current" process would be cured. Obviously, with any new approaches, this new drawing process may have some "bugs" in it, but these can be corrected.

Tim Wartner

Sioux Falls SD

tim@hydraulicworld.com

Comment:

I strongly oppose this change for those of us that have limited hunting land. If I use my first choice West River and do not hit which is very possible, I am not likely to get drawn for any deer on my second draw. This limits my chances of an any deer tag.

George King

Spearfish SD

gdkinzion@icloud.com

Comment:

I believe it is the intent of SDGF&P to create a better opportunity to draw tags in their area of preference. Not too many other states that I'm aware of that allow hunters to apply for multiple first choices for the same species. This will be a big change but if reason is well articulated it should be much easier to understand the advantages. I applaud you for taking this to the next level.

George King
USFS Retired

Corey Haaland

Warner SD

corey.haaland@gmail.com

Comment:

I am strongly against this proposal. i have begun to build points so that i will have the opportunity to hunt both east and west river deer. i have 4 small children i am trying to get into the outdoors so having multiple hunting trips where they are able join me is very important. my opposition is not rooted in wanting to harvest more deer in the state, but more so to be able to enjoy the outdoors in the state i live in and further introduce my young children into the outdoors of South Dakota. my core hunting area is brown county but there is nothing better than having the opportunity to get out of your comfort zone and explore additional areas of the state while still being able to hunt your home ground. we have family hunting trips every year to our hunting camp which is what it is all about. spending time with family in the great outdoors and i do not want to have to choose between hunting with my family or going west. i will always hunt east river deer and have begun to build my preference points to be able to expand and extend my hunting seasons within the state. i do not want to take my money to other states to hunt when we have such great hunting here but may not have an option if i am not able to hunt whitetails east river and mule deer west.

Chad Mosteller

Pierre SD

Comment:

I believe these changes are catering to a select few. I routinely apply to hunt deer both sides of the river. Sometimes I am not selected and will get a preference. I am fine with that. This proposal will significantly decrease my ability to hunt deer in different locations. This will also hamper traditions where family and friends will apply together to hunt specific seasons. For example, a group of us hunt in the black hills every two years. Some of us hunt east river deer. Some hunt west river deer. If approved, we will never be able to hunt together as a group in the hills. There is nothing wrong with the current system with preferences. Please do not change this system. Thanks.

Adam Carroll

Rapid City SD

Adamgc3@hotmail.com

Comment:

if we are truly going to change the entire drawing system why don't you cut back on nonresident tags and up the success for residents? You could do what you do for bighorn sheep and auction off a few non resident tags to make up for your profit loss? I'm sure ranchers and others who only put in for one unit are pulling for this to get more non residents or (residents who pay to hunt) in state so they can pull down more money to allow them to hunt (\$500+ per deer, some even 1000 we'd) how about opening those lands to public so they can hunt units that are mostly private grounds? And stop renting walk-in that are over grazed and flatter then North Dakota with little to no wildlife on our around them. Allow access by foot to landlocked public to up the success rate? I think this plan is a joke and I hope it is left in the hands of the public since our taxes fund this And we are the sportsman who pay you. I do appreciate your time and effort put into this but seeing the times and dates you pick it's easy to see the public's opinion isn't in your agenda.

Barry Seyer

Pierre SD

sapiatpap@yahoo.com

Comment:

Absolutely against this proposal also. Don't think the commission gets it. I have applied for hard to get units for years, I understand the time it takes to draw these units but am able to hunt each one with managing my preference points. I have accumulated 8 points combined and would have to lose them all next year. With this new proposal I probably wont be able to hunt but one of these units every 2 or 3 years. Of all the things that are wrong with GFP you would think the one thing that has worked and people understand you would leave alone. GFP is testing my patients as an avid hunter and fishermen. I already do most of my fishing in ND and can also do my hunting elsewhere.

Dustin Brinkman

Watertown SD

brinkerman@hotmail.com

Comment:

I believe this is a mistake in the making. Everyone should have an equal chance to hunt any given season and not be forced to pick a most desirable season at the expense of losing an opportunity elsewhere. I can understand if you want to combine chances for the two main seasons of east and west river, but the other special bucks, muzzle loader, and custer state parks should be left out. A hunter should not have to give up their chance at a regular season tag in order to draw a practically once in a lifetime tag for custer state park. With the proposed method of drawing it will be an unreasonable gamble to ever apply for something so limited as the custer state park tags or muzzle loader tags. How about instead letting everyone have an equal chance at the very limited custer state park, special buck, and muzzle loader tags, and then those successful are held out of the first drawing for the more common east and west river tags.

Respectfully,
Dustin Brinkman

Max Pravecek

Freeman SD

max1232008@live.com

Comment:

According to the proposal as it appeared in the Press and Dakotan it would seem that to draw a license in the first drawing you need to have a preference point which costs \$5 to obtain. this is just another way of getting more money or a very poor communication on the part of GFP. Which ever it is you are not not helping your approval rating with the general public

Sallie Doty

Pierre SD

sscollins1989@gmail.com

Comment:

I strongly oppose changing the deer application from the way it is now. I tried to call the Commission Chair and he has yet to call me back so there is little reliability there. Also, there appears to be NO difference between what was axed last week and what G, F and P is proposing now. Again, leave the system the way it is.

Randy Kludt

Winner SD

Comment:

Keep as us

Steve Tweet
Wentworth SD
STEVET@HIROLLER.COM

Comment:

oppose

Nathaniel Mortensen
Sioux Falls SD
Nathaniel.mortensen@hotmail.com

Comment:

I am 100 percent against changing the current deer tag system in anyway. The way it is set up now is perfectly fine. Yes, I may not get every tag I apply for and I may not get a tag every year but that is fine. I understand that and I am okay with it. But I have the opportunity to apply for multiple counties and multiple types of hunting right away and that is what matters.

G. Dale Mathey
Kansas City KS
g.dalemathey@gmail.com

Comment:

Leave it like it is.

Chris Gerber
Delmont SD
chrisxfpsgerber@gmail.com

Comment:

Just leave it alone. Get some biologists that can count deer. Come up with tag numbers to keep heard numbers. Maybe propose a Trophy unit in a area that has a lot of public access. Limit tag numbers, increase size and develop it into a premier area.

David Hatwan
Mitchell SD
Dhatwan@yahoo.com

Comment:

Deer hunting in South Dakota needs to stay the way it is. I grew up just hunting west river. When I reached the age of 18 I started hunting both sides of the river and continue to do so to feed my family. We live off of deer meat all year long.

Jamez Martz
Castlewood SD
sdwhitebuck@yahoo.com

Comment:

Leave the license allocation currently in place.

Randy Weber
Sioux Falls SD
Rdweber1@hotmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Tyler Fredekind
Rapid City SD
tfredekind@gmail.com

Comment:

Leave it the way it is!

Gordon Pierson
Columbia SD

Comment:

Why can't you leave things the way they are ? Why try to change something that works just fine for everyone . if you want to change something for the better limit the number of tags these slob hunters get no one person needs more than 2 tags period !!!

Brian Odde
Mound City SD
brianodde@gmail.com

Comment:

Please don't change the current deer tag draw process. If your in need of producing more funds, maybe raise the preference point costs from \$5 to \$10.

Mike Pardy

Utica SD

windageandelelevation@gmail.com

Comment:

I would urge the Commission to vote against this proposal. The proposed change is not an improvement for the majority of average sportsman. It offers no improvement for the average Hunter. Further it only reduces opportunities and further complicates and lengthens the application process for everyone involved. In short, it's a solution in need of a problem. Please vote against this proposal.

David Wagner

Rapid City SD

huntifican@yahoo.com

Comment:

There are already plenty of opportunities to hunt deer in many different units/counties. Mainly the biggest complaint that I've heard is because the so called applicant/hunter is too lazy to apply to more than the first draw and unwilling to drive to a different unit than where they reside in. They are also trying to apply for very sought after "any" deer tag units that have slim chances of drawing within a couple of years. Many of us sportsman spend a lot of time and money scouting and doing our homework to find out which units we prefer with the understanding that certain areas may take several years to draw but are willing to sacrifice our time to hopefully draw a coveted unit. My only suggestion for change would come to raising the cost of the nonresident tag to start matching prices like Colorado, Wyoming, and Kansas. If we were to go out of state and hunt we would be charged a pretty penny for their tag and we in return need to treat them the same.

Jeremy Heisinger

Sioux Falls SD

jheising@ur.com

Comment:

I oppose any changes to our current drawing system.

Levi Kuipers

Edgerton MN

levik@swmch.org

Comment:

I'm a former South Dakota resident and have most of my family in South Dakota and believe the system is good the way it is and in not in need of change

Matt Mckenzie
Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

I support leaving the current deer tag allocation as it is in SD.

Matt Mccarthy
Sioux Falls SD
Mccarthy2069@gmail.com

Comment:

I would like all deer tag allocations to remain the same as they have in previous

Faren Barber
Watertown SD
farenbarber@yahoo.com

Comment:

Leave system how it currently is

David Beynon
Watertown SD
ddbeynon52@gmail.com

Comment:

we believe that the rule being proposed is not a fair one for the elderly that may not be alive in 3 or 4 years, please reject the proposal as stated.

Craig Linn
Crooks SD
cnrlinn@alliancecom.net

Comment:

I do not feel that out of state hunters should have the same priority for deer tag draws that residents have, I know that brings in more out of state money but also dilutes the drawings to penalize resident hunters. Out of state hunters should not be able to attempt to draw for a buck tag in same lottery as residents.

Todd Waldow

Lake Preston SD

toddwaldow@gmail.com

Comment:

Adopting the deer tag allocation process would not allow hunters more of an opportunity to draw first choice in a season the hunter would already possess. It will be more like the elk drawing allocation process, as limited hunters would draw a tag. Making hunters pick one of six seasons for first choice is by no means a resolution. I have yet to draw a statewide muzzleloader tag. That muzzleloader tag allocation number is 1000 statewide and antlerless muzzleloader is limited to one per person who applies. How would they ever continue to have that number so low ? If people want to really use a muzzleloader they can use it in rifle season.? Really, some of the seasons are set up with horrible tag numbers. The problem rests more in the area of poorly assessed numbers of tags than having too many applications in first round. The numbers of leftover tags are usually gone in second drawing if not just the first drawing. If a person doesn't draw a tag in the first drawing, there likely will not be leftover tags and they will not be able to hunt deer that year. I have spoken with various people who believe that GFP has too much power already and this allocation would result in people not even applying and the number of people poaching deer will greatly increase. The allocation process that is proposed is not a positive problem solver, but more of a problem maker.

Matt Bones

Hartford SD

mjbones2007@yahoo.com

Comment:

I am strongly opposed to any change to the current draw system!!!!

Delbert Hoffmann

Huron SD

dhoffmann@hur.midco.net

Comment:

Changes to the current system will curtail our hunting practices. We are always trying to encourage more hunters to experience what South Dakota has to offer. Limiting hunters choices would not encourage more people to try the sport or expand on what they currently do.

Julie Hoffmann

Huron SD

erivernursery@hur.midco.net

Comment:

oppose

Andy Carlson
Brookings SD
andycarlson12@yahoo.com

Comment:

I oppose a change to the current system. I feel survey questions were slanted wording. The fact that a new plan is now being address and the old proposals scrapped is a sign there needs a lot of thought and consideration prior to a proposal consideration by the commission.

Jim Godfrey
Brandt SD
jimg0424@gmail.com

Comment:

I didnt draw east river coddington county this year...2018 with one preference....with that in mind...new proposal I first choice east river coddington with only 250 tags which half are held for landowner....how does this improve my chance to draw???

You are taking g away my freedom of choice to apply for season I want to apply for on a first choice!!!

Craig Hargens
Millwr SD
Hargens34@gmail.com

Comment:

Leave as is, those in support are going to find out they are right back where they were in 2-3 years from now once preference pts play in?

Kent Wells
Burke SD
kentjwells@gmail.com

Comment:

I as an individual oppose changing the deer tag allocation system

David Olson
Brandon SD
davidolson@alliancecom.net

Comment:

leave our application alone NO changes are needed listen to the hunters of South Dakota!

Marvin Bouska
Rapid City SD
jmbo@midco.net

Comment:

I would propose managing for improved big game populations and hunting opportunities rather than introducing and promoting predator species to manage big game.

Logan Martin
Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

If anything changes I believe the number of tags should stay the same, but the price for out of state licenses should go up to what the other states charge for out of state prices. South Dakota has, by far, the cheapest out of state prices. This way, the in-state people still can get the tags they want like right now, and the state would make a bit more money from the leftover tags the out of state people apply for.

Gary Larson
Lead SD
GLarson@sanfordlab.org

Comment:

Dear Commissioner:
Please vote yes to change the deer license allocation procedure in your upcoming October meeting. When I first read the proposal I thought that everyone should be in favor of this. I past this on so there will be more support coming from this area for a yes vote.
Thanks,

Gary Larson
Facilities Maintenance Foreman
Sanford Underground Research Facility
630 East Summit, Lead SD 57754

Steve Moses
Rapid City SD
jdslr@rushmore.com

Comment:

The changes are not needed you have said your self you will not draw your first choice all the time so people will have to expand it if the units they want to hunt. Why don't they just do that now there were buck tags available for the third drawing go there if this change goes through I will then become an out of state hunter I will no longer support south Dakota Wyoming and Montana has great hunting and I will support there game and fish over this stupid ass plan you clown came up with

Mark Peterson
Aberdeen SD

Comment:

While the updated proposal is a vast improvement upon the original I am still against it. There is not enough change to the current system to warrant the wholesale change to the application system being proposed. In our family we apply for a lot of different tags. If we don't get any elk licenses we look at west river deer, if we don't get that we look at antelope and we always apply for east river deer. It still appears to be a backdoor attempt to get more west river licenses into the hands of non-residents to foster more pay hunting operations along with a pacification attempt to a select few hunters that think it is there right to have a buck tag every single season. It also doesn't address archery hunting, which should be vastly more limited and have a severe reduction to non-resident hunting whereas now it basically has no limits. Leave the system alone if you aren't going to address it to the benefit of resident hunters.

Greg Schweiss
Rapid City SD

Comment:

I think the minor changes to the proposed deer license application process are a very small a step in the right direction. I still believe there is nothing wrong with the current system and no changes should be made. Under the proposed system

Clark Baker
Sioux Falls SD
clarkbaker27@yahoo.com

Comment:

Still to confusing...Leave it alone!!!!!!!!!! It has worked fine for years.....

Nathan Fossell
Sioux Falls SD
fosselln@hotmail.com

Comment:

Our current system is excellent. Modifying this is a not a good idea and i do not support this proposal.

Drue Schroeder
Rapid City SD
drue.schroeder@bldr.com

Comment:

Great changes by taking out refuge deer, Custer State Park, and special buck. You'll never satisfy everyone, but it's clear your moving in the right direction by getting deer hunters in the field in their desired season/unit year in and year out. We can't afford to have hunters sitting on the sidelines multiple years and eventually leaving the sport.

Dave Potts
Toronto SD
david.c.potts@centurylink.comDa

Comment:

Do not change the current system. You will be forcing hunters to choose one season. You will be breaking up years old reunions of hunters who try to hunt together whenever the draw allows. I have not yet spoke to anyone in favor of the new system. Some people may just need to find other areas to hunt instead of taking opportunity away from those of us who want to hunt as many as possible.

Andrew Krier
Harrisburg SD
andrewckrier@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose the recent proposal. I suggest removing muzzleloader season making this its own drawing. Eliminating non residents from the first draw, allowing them to apply in the 2nd draw as first opportunity (along with raising the cost significantly). And allowing residents to apply for one tag in both the first and second draw regardless if they have drawn a tag in the first. With your proposed changes I (east river hunter) would like to shoot a Mule deer buck but I wont give up my east river tag to do so, and with your proposal by the third drawing there will be no any deer tags left for counties that have much public land to hunt. I get the objective of limiting tags to people but atleast give the residents a good chance to shoot two different species of bucks.

Randy Albright
Piedmont SD
randyalbright2011@gmail.com

Comment:

The current draw system we have is fine the way it is. The people I feel do not support a change to the system unless they simply do not understand how it works. Randy Albright

Cory Kostboth
Sioux Falls SD
cory.kostboth@gmail.com

Comment:

I like the draw system as is and do not support this proposal.

Vicki Gray
Custer SD
Vplooster@hotmail.com

Comment:

I simply cannot express how much I OPPOSE this proposal. It makes absolutely no sense to combine drawings. The deer populations are plentiful in all areas, more and more are being killed by cars every day. I would rather they go to feeding people than wasting on the roadways. Those of us with preference in multiple areas trying for a chance at 1 tag per year are going to lose all the time and consideration for years and years of applying and paying to purchase preference points with no return whatsoever. Instead of worrying about combining drawings and making odds of drawing more difficult than ever, you should re-structure the drawing system to apply logic to those with the most preference points instead of making it a complete lottery. What's the point of the points if you continue to do it the old way? I agree a change is definitely needed, but this new proposal is NOT the solution. I would strongly urge you to apply some more common sense and consideration to a new proposal that the population can get behind.

Douglas Traub
Rapid City SD
traub@rap.midco.net

Comment:

I have read the newest suggested modifications to the deer hunting proposal, and it does seem reasonable to remove those smaller seasons out of the new proposal. However, the main thrust of the proposed changes are still misguided. 1) We are turning the deer season draw upside down, because some hunters want a particular license and don't want to accumulate enough preferences to draw that special license? The new proposal is going to help only because it is going to make the draw so frustrating, that many will just quit applying. Even with the new proposal, there are still more applicants than deer tags, so how has it helped? 2) I would again warn everyone that projections can often not predict human responses accurately. The proposal will supposedly increase the chance of drawing that "special tag", but IT DOES NOT ASSURE IT. Every one is not going to be pleased when they can no longer hunt in more than one unit for deer season, because of this proposed change. It is far better to stick with the current system. Doug Traub Rapid City

Brandon Deffenbaugh
Mitchell SD
dbaugh3@yahoo.com

Comment:

Stop this proposal and other variations of it. There is nothing wrong with how we have been operating up till this point, so why would we change it? And when I say stop this, I don't mean rewrite it and submit.

Victor Rapkoch

Britton SD

HEYVICTOR07@GMAIL.COM

Comment:

I like the system as is. I can plan on going to different areas of the State for different years. I can also shoot multiple bucks. I know I will get a tag every other year where I live, and so if I plan it right, I can go every other year to West River or other hunts. Now, I would just get a tag here in Marshall County and have no other great hunting opportunities. By the time the third draw is here, there will be no tags left in the areas most people want to go. Keeping it the way it is guarantees that we get a tag every other year. Also, it encourages us to buy preference points for refuge hunts so we can get it once every 5 years. There is no need to change the system we have.

Herb Benne

Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

Who the heck is responsible for making all these stupid changes?! The current system has served us well for many years and we do not want a change. I only apply for East River Deer and I'm telling you I do not want a change. If other support this, where the heck are those people. Every single person, about 35 people, I have talked to does not support any changes. Please let it alone.

Dean Sternhagen

Tabor SD

dntsternhagen@hotmail.com

Comment:

I'm totally against the new proposal, it appears you are catering to the novice hunter that wants to hunt once a year and not the true hunters. We are the ones that buy our preference points and spend a lot of money hunting. Right now everyone has the same chance, I'm more than happy to wait my turn because this way it's fair. They guy that applies for one tag a year can wait too! You also need to consider who is driving the most money into the GF&P and the economy, my bet is on the guy who applies for 20 tags a year, not the one and done guy. Thank you for the consideration.

Daniel Kuyper

Madison SD

dan.kuyper@kibbleeq.com

Comment:

please again I say LEAVE THE DRAW AS IS - why are you not listening to the people that have gone to the meetings and wrote letters to leave the draw alone the majority of hunters want it left alone it makes no sense to change it now after dozens of years making friends with farmers and ranchers for hunts - you people want to HURT those relationships, I have personally spoke to dozens of hunters and they all to a man want the draw left alone - your new proposal is all BS 99 PERCENT OF THE DEER HUNTERS DONT USE THE SPECIAL BUCK - CUSTER OR REFUGE TAGS - QUIT THE DOUBLE BACK TACTICS - YOU WILL BE A HERO INSTEAD OF THE ENEMY OF EVERY SPORTSMAN IN SOUTH DAKOTA. DO THE RIGHT THING AND DROP THE CHANGE PROPOSAL

Joe Lenz

Kimball SD

Lenzjoe12@gmail.com

Comment:

Unless I miss understood the reason behind this change, I thought it was to make it easier for people to get selected for a deer tag. If that's the case, for the first time in my memory I was denied a tag this year for my 1st and 2nd choice as a land owner. My son was also denied on both choices. Seems to me like it became more difficult. In the mean time I did not put in for west river on the first draw because I couldn't.

Tim Fliehs

Conde SD

fliehsco@nvc.net

Comment:

You should not change the current lottery system. I have not found one person that i have asked that is for this proposal. I do not know how is for this idea but they are in the minority. I think the people who buy licenses should vote on it.

Joe Arbach

Hoven SD

joe.arbachins@venturecomm.net

Comment:

Leaving the three units as separate has zero effect on how I feel about the proposed change. Please leave drawings as is. I am willing to wait until I get enough preference points to draw. Are you listening to the SD Deer Hunters here?

Jeremy Nettifee

Sioux Falls SD

jerenet1341@live.com

Comment:

oppose

Matt Field

Brookings SD

matthewjfield78@gmail.com

Comment:

Leave the deer draw system the way it is. Those that complain are the same ones that don't put in for preference points every year anyhow.

Ryan Rothenberger
Sioux Falls SD
ryno1213@hotmail.com

Comment:

I am opposed to the initial deer drawing proposal, and the modified one as well. I don't feel we need any changes made to the current system we have in place. The system we currently have in place works just fine, and I enjoy having an opportunity to draw a tag in all the different seasons. Why are we trying to 'fix' something that is not broken?

Don Hantzsche
Summerset SD
TLWDAH@GMAIL.COM

Comment:

This modification does absolutely nothing to remedy the harm the commission is trying to do to the current draw system. If this proposal goes through hunters will be lucky to get a tag every other year. You should educate people on the current system and make them understand getting a tag in your favorite unit every year is not practical. Changing to what is proposed won't. Do it either. The other issue I have is the lumping muzzleloader season in with rifle seasons. That just eliminates another season I can hunt. I started muzzleloader hunting after a shoulder surgery many years ago because I could no longer Draw a bow. If you are dead set on combining muzzleloader with another season then group it with bow season. I personally can not afford to spend \$1'500 on a cross bow that I physically would be able to cock a bolt in. The cheaper ones take more draw poundage then drawing a bow. I beg the comission not to implement any change to the current system. All that will be accomplished is penalizing hunters to satisfy a few. The few will realize they have been harmed after the first draw cycle. So please leave things the way they are.

Eric Bauer
Brookings SD
ebauer40@gmail.com

Comment:

Muzzleloader should not be included in this. It is difficult enough to obtain a muzzleloader tag with the very limited number of licenses. Additionally, having to choose muzzleloader as one's (practically) only option means making the choice to

Jarred Burleson
Lead SD
Jburleson13@gmail.com

Comment:

This would benefit me because I only send in for black hills tag. Tired of waiting 2-3 years to draw.

Dan Griesse

Pierre SD

Birddog@pie.midco.net

Comment:

Strongly opposed. Among fellow hunters, I have gathered that no one wants this change. The only people that support this, are people that hunt in units with very few tags. This change will not help them draw that special unit. This change would cause me to spend less money on preference points, therefor it will more than likely cause others to do the same. This will result in less income for the state.

Jeff Sorensen

Viborg SD

Sorensenfam01@gmail.com

Comment:

Please leave the current allocation in place for a couple more years so that the cubing of preference points can have a chance to work as designed.

Then take another look at the allocation process to see if any changes are actually necessary.

Thank you!

Darrell Schroeder

Brandon SD

atischroeder@yahoo.com

Comment:

Pass this bill so some of us who only have time to hunt one weekend can possible get the license we APPLY FOR!

Tyler Haddix

Pierre SD

tyler.hadx@gmail.com

Comment:

Deer Drawing Proposal, what the hell would you literally bring up an identical proposal that was just "axed" by public comment....Oh i know, now that people didn't draw, because they didn't research and put the time in.

Also, Way to use the emotions of a draw that just happened, to push an agenda that the majority of the public does not want.

Terry Schutz

Eureka SD

tschutz@valleytel.net

Comment:

I believe that the process is working very well under the current structure.

Scott Johnson
Fort Pierre SD
Stnn1@pie.midco.net

Comment:

I am completely against any changes to the current application process. Thank you.

Craig Pugsley
Rapid City SD
pugsley.craig@gmail.com

Comment:

I like the new concept as outlined above.

Joshua Nygaard
Beresford SD
nygaardlivestock@hotmail.com

Comment:

Just stop changing stuff. Nobody I've talked to wants any changes done. You guy wanna change stuff shut down the antelope firearm season for a couple years to along the antelope populations to come back because they are ridiculously low and have been for years. Other than that change leave stuff alone!!!!!!

Ryan Bjerke
Clear Lake SD
Rbjerke2012@gmail.com

Comment:

This new proposal is 100% not fair to us hunters that hunt both sides of the river and the different seasons. The hunters like myself that are hunting multiple seasons are bringing revenue state wide versus the guy that wants to just hunt one spot. The current method allows those hunters to still do that and still allows hunters like myself hunt more that one spot per year. Yes there is still a chance with the proposal to hunt more than one of the seasons but not likely. With the number of tags given out there are very few counties that make it to the third draw, which in turn would make us decide where to hunt and stick with that one option. This would bring our revenue to just that one spot versus multiple spots per year. There has been instances I have had to wait 3 years to get my east river rifle tag and I am completely fine with that because with the current draw I can still go west river. I see absolutely nothing good with the new proposal.

Kurt Rahlf
Mobridge SD
starky069@yahoo.com

Comment:

This is against what the sportsmen of SD want. It bears no scientific reason and with a chance at a net negative for funding of the GFP even this being on the table is crazy. Taking the opportunity away for the many for the few that wont take advantage of the great system we have in place already is not the right thing to do.

Justin Boynton
Aberdeen SD
boynton.justin@yahoo.com

Comment:

Leave the drawings situated as they are now. Make out of state hunters wait to apply till the 3rd drawing for all, like has been done East River. Also make landowners apply in the separate land owner applications. Remove the land owner preference then from the regular draw. If a land owner doesn't like it they can apply as an equal then to everyone else. I have talked with many of people and 90% have been alright with these suggested changes compared to everything that has been proposed.

Charles Bot
Brookings SD
charles.bot@jacks.sdstate.edu

Comment:

I oppose changing the deer season draw structure as proposed. If any change is made it should be to eliminate preference points altogether and have a truly fair draw, where everyone has an equal chance of drawing each tag.

Jason Haskell
Aberdeen SD
j.kr@nrctv.com

Comment:

I am mostly in agreement with the proposal. I think it will achieve the desired outcome of allowing people to hunt their most highly desired unit more often. My only concern is with including Muzzleloader in with all other modern firearms. I feel that SD should keep muzzleloader season separate. It should be a highly desired tag which allows you to hunt longer. In order to maintain its status it should be given time afield prior to, congruent with and a little after rifle season. As a primitive weapon it should be allowed some freedoms that aren't allowed with rifle. It should be drawn less often than rifle but you should be allowed to apply for both modern and primitive weapon hunts in the same year. You shouldn't be forced to choose one over the other. Thank you for listening to my concern.

Bud Shearer
Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

Leave as is!

Garrett Cameron
Yankton SD
airwolf79@live.com

Comment:

Leave the deer tag drawings alone. The Preference point system is how people can get their tags and it should be changed so whomever has the most points gets tags and on down

Philip Neuharth
Menno SD
pneuharth@hotmail.com

Comment:

I support the change in deer drawing structure. I would prefer all 6 seasons to be included, but this is a good start. Thanks

David Mines
Yankton SD
davidmines4831@gmail.com

Comment:

I am still completely against the new deer tag allocation proposal even with the changes. The system we have works great. It appears this new system will punish hunters who want to go on multiple hunts each year and put money in GFP coffers and small towns all across South Dakota all to appease a group of hunters who want one deer tag in their back yard every year. Leave it as is.

Pat Malcomb
Sioux Falls SD
pmalcomb@sio.midco.net

Comment:

I see there was an update for the proposal. And I still oppose this. The new proposal does nothing more than to help the GFP recoup preference point money but still does not make it easier to draw a tag. the system is not broken leave it alone!!!!

Jeffrey Flood

No. Mankato MN

jflood@hickorytech.net

Comment:

Big Question - Why is there no allocation for Non-Resident East River Deer License? Even with the Proposed System - Non-Resident East River Hunters have zero chance of drawing a BUCK tag! The forth drawing will only offer Antlerless Deer License as in the current system. The 8% Non-resident you offer does not include East River. Please reconsider your Non-resident allocations and include 8% to East River Deer License too!!

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey Flood

52944 Deerwood Trail

No. Mankato, MN 56003

507-380-7529

Judy Dahl

Madison SD

ddjsdahl@gmail.com

Comment:

We spend a lot of money on license knowing we will not receive license each year.. we depend on the meat to feed our family. If you think there will be more than 2nd draw,your dreaming.....the licenses will be gone. I have applied for Black Hills any deer for many years to have a dream come true to hunt for a mule deer....now your making me choose and have less meat to eat.

David Del Soldato

Rapid City SD

sheyanne97@yahoo.com

Comment:

did the majority of hunters go for this or is this another satisfy the minority of hunters

David Buck

Mitchell SD

bucks_2005@hotmail.com

Comment:

Please leave the season application process as they are now with no change. This has worked as is not broken. I hunt both east and west river. I do not want to have to choose one over the other. This has been a long tradition for my family.

James Buteyn

Sioux Falls SD

jnbuteyn@siouxfalls.org

Comment:

This is a permanent fix to a temporary problem. Deer numbers ebb and flow. You do a good job maintain the population, but there are people who hunt all over the state. This allows several opportunities a year. Please do not take this away based on a few who want select tags. I wait for Lincoln County tags for years before drawing. That is my choice. I wait for Mule deer and antelope the same way. It is not an every year thing. We have not drawn every year since some of the problems with the herds. But this will change as the numbers change like they have in the past. Support the hunters who do it right and wait. Not the hunters who need it now. This does not solve the issue, only caters to a few who complained about waiting. I have waited 4 years for a tag in my area. It happens. I can get a tag every year if I want to. You are catering to the easy route. THIS IS WRONG...

Brett Hartmann

Viborg SD

bretthartmann88@yahoo.com

Comment:

I support the change! I hunt public land wr and the units with a lot of public are getting harder to draw. Hopefully it will alleviate some pressure in sought after units. I bet most of the people opposed to the change have land tied up in units where it's fairly easy to draw a tag. We're lucky in SD I mean how many states can you apply for as many licenses as we've been able to. I wouldn't oppose to archery tag holders at least have to wait til second draw. I think the sdgfp does an awesome job managing our deer herd!! Thank you very much!!

Jeff Wiedow

Hot Springs SD

jwiedow@gwtc.net

Comment:

I am strongly opposed to any change in the current deer drawing structure. I like to be able to apply for multiple tags with the hopes that I will draw one or more. I have been applying for different tags and accumulating preference points for different seasons. By changing the drawing structure, if I want to get a tag in one of the seasons I will now have to BUY MORE points. All this will do is hurt the dedicated sportsman.

Bob Woerman

Brandon SD

drbobw@alliancecom.net

Comment:

To Whom It May Concern: 1) What about land owners? We feed the deer our corn, soybeans and hay products. The buck fight in the fall during pre-rut in our corn fields, knocking down the standing corn. It is difficult to harvest in these tangled areas. We as land owners and operators plus our family members should be compensated by allowing us to hunt on our own property or property we farm or ranch. 2) What you describe for the 2019 season is essentially how the 2018 Deer Tag Application worked when I applied by computer. I applied for and received a Black Hills Deer License. When it was time to apply for East River Deer Tags, I was not allowed to apply. I went to the GFP Office in Sioux Falls, they told me it must be my computer. Draw 1 was just submitted so I was too late but they said come back and they said they would assist me. Also for Black Hills my Visa card had not been processed and had to submit the card again. Was it my computer? A friend of mine had exactly the same problems I had, could not apply East River and Credit Card had to be reprocessed. I have used the computer for years to apply for a deer license and it was flawless. What went wrong? On the same line, the computer system does not work. Hunters cannot receive tags. 2019 appears to be a mangled up mess. South Dakota will have less deer hunters than ever, at least from South Dakota. I do not hear one statement about getting young folks out in the field. This continues SD will be a state without hunters or a total hunting season dedicated to commercial hunting. We can watch the hunting channel on TV and listen to the very wealthy from other areas of the USA having fun in South Dakota. They won't be concerned about deer population management. All they dream about are antlers. I hope you use common sense and science to develop a new deer season.

Derrick Nedved

Spearfish SD

Derricknedved@gmail.com

Comment:

I am totally against the proposed changes to deer applications. I love to hunt deer (black powder or rifle) and these changes will greatly decrease my opportunity to hunt deer in different areas with different weapons. The current process is fair to all.

Nick Buckman

Vermillion SD

Comment:

This is a terrible idea! I am a sportsman that likes to hunt more than one season.erd, wrd, muzz, archery. I am also fine with the fact that I usually wait every 2 years to get a wrd licence, 4 years for a erd license and 4 for a muzz licence. What seems to be the problem with the current situation....in Minnesota and nebraska residents can go buy multiple season any deer tags over the counter and a heck of a lot cheaper than our \$40 per tag fee. And there system seems to be working just fine and people still get to hunt the seasons they choose. I have spoke with prob 30+ deer hunters and I have not heard one positive thing about this proposed change. I just don't think this is a good decision by the gf&p.

John Isaacson
Newunderwood SD
Welikeike@hotmail.com

Comment:

This program really sucks as it is. The proposed changes I believe will make it worse. I currently have more preference points than some friends do and they have tags to hunt this year. Seems to me this new process will muddy the process even further. I agree the process needs to change but I don't believe in the direction it's headed.

Gene Brockel
Mobridge SD
ebrockel@abe.midco.net

Comment:

Needs to stay the way it is now

Daniel Garvey
Watertown SD
dgarvey@wat.midco.net

Comment:

I strongly oppose the changes to the current deer draw system. I do apply for both WRD and ERD as I enjoy doing both. I typically get WRD one year and ERD the next. I disagree with the assumptions made in the detail behind the FAQ's sent out. This change will not allow more people to get their first choice. Rather than being able to get a deer each year I will now have to go multiple years waiting. I see you've now brought CSP, Refuge, and Special into the mix, so just bring them all back. This is an unfair way to approach this situation.

Shane Muller
Crooks SD
SHANEMULLER543@GMAIL.COM

Comment:

oppose

Gavin Muller
Crooks SD

Comment:

oppose

Brian Mueller
Rapid City SD
Mueller@pennco.org

Comment:

My family includes 8 individuals who are residents and one nonresident who all have hunted in various big game seasons in SD. We all strongly support this modification and the overall strategy GFP is proposing in changing this structure. Good work.

Ricky Johnson
Rapid City SD
ramdjohnson@gmail.com

Comment:

Leave a sleeping dog sleep, leave the opportunity for hunters to enjoy what they love to do. I do not want to make a choice for just one tag or season! !! This is a bad proposal.

Dave Vaughn
Rapid City SD
dvaughn@hughes.net

Comment:

I support his change so I can have the first choice to hunt where I live. (Black Hills) I do not think it is fair that I have to compete with all the West River and East River hunters who have a separate drawing to hunt where they live.

James Zirbel
Aberdeen SD
jim@zirbelfamily.com

Comment:

I think that the GFP has done a wonderful job at designing and educating the public about this system. That being said the the fact that the game commision made the decision to remove the Special Buck tags from the latest version this late in the game tells me the commision is backing down from people that benefit from the Special Buck tags. Apparently we are not ready for change. For that reason I am voting to leave the season and applications as they are.

Louis Vaughn
Rapid City SD
Invaughn@rap.midco.net

Comment:

My position is that the commission leaves the deer drawing process the way it currently is and makes no changes

Riley Steffensen

Madison SD

Riley.steffensen@southeasttech.edu

u

Comment:

It would be dumb to combine it, it would make it so there are more out of state tags. What about all the money we spend on preference points every year? Will we get our money back?. I get more deer tags every year because I spend 100 dollars on preference points every year. Those who complain don't buy preference points, they just expect to get a tag every year. Thank you

Doug Furness

Brandon SD

doug.furness@spartanmotors.com

Comment:

I think this is a bad idea for several reasons. The system that is in place now is fair and is working. This new system seems geared more toward helping the guide service industry than it does the individuals who hunt on small farms and ranches on both sides of the state. I strongly oppose this change.

Lisa Meyen

Rosholt SD

Rosholt@venturecomm.net

Comment:

There is a petition with over 7000 hunters that are opposed to this change and many more that have not signed it. I have seen very very few people that are in favor of this change. If people would use the current system as it is, there would not be a problem. It is no ones fault but their own if people that don't pay the extra \$5 for preference point and don't get drawn. The system in place works, there is no need to change it based on a very generic question that was asked 8 years ago. It is dumb to change a draw system that works now this drastically. If its not broke, don't fix it.

Jeffrey Albrecht

Brookings SD

gopack@svtv.com

Comment:

I oppose the changes to the drawing proposal. I see this as losing opportunities to hunt SD.

Chris Podoll

Columbia SD

ccpodoll@nrctv.com

Comment:

I do not support any change to the current draw system. Our system works great the way it is.

Corey Gall
Hurley SD
cgall@msb-sd.com

Comment:

At this time I am opposed to the proposed changes to the deer hunting lottery system.

Ronald Sckerl
Brookings SD
rsckerl@yahoo.com

Comment:

How does the change affect group applicants who may have different 2nd choices. Ex: 1st WRD group but 2nd ERD non-group in different counties?

Shane Voss
Hurley SD
shane.voss@k12.sd.us

Comment:

oppose

John Almont
Sioux Falls SD
jalmo6@sio.midco.net

Comment:

can an east river land owner apply for west river and east river deer in the first draw

Kevin Holter
Estelline SD
kevinholter62@gmail.com

Comment:

There should be a third choice to leave the system the way it is now. This all started on a survey. That asked if you would like to get your first choice tag. Well if I was asked that question. I would have answered yes. But it did not know that I would only have one to choose. The question should have read. Would you like to get a first choice tag if you only you had to choose one option East river, West river etc. I apply for all areas and this make me want to not hunt at all. If something isn't broke don't try to fix it!!!

Terrance Dosch

Pierre SD

tladosch@dakota2k.net

Comment:

The recent adjustments by the Commission do not mollify or reduce my concerns. Based on the units that I apply for, I will not have a reasonable chance to draw a South Dakota deer license for a very long time if draw restrictions are "stacked" in this manner. All I'll be doing is purchasing preference points. If you intend to move in this direction, the least you can do is provide "no fee" preference points in relationship to unsuccessful draws.

Keith Amundson

Colton SD

Comment:

I thought that South Dakota was promoting Hunting as a Family Outdoor sport but this new Proposal would make it imposable for Myself and brother to Hunt together in the Black Hills. I'm grow up in Clay County where my brother still Farms we have very good hunting on the farm. My brother will send in for a Landowner tag and would send in for the Black Hills for his First choose. I can only pick one or the either. As it is know we apply for East river and Black Hills together if we don't Draw Tags then may Brother sends in for his Landowner Tag. I Strongly Oppose the New Proposal. I'm 58 Years old and back in the 70's you could only apply every either year and that cuts the Poll in half. I think someone need to Rey Think this.

Lonny Kracht

Sturgis SD

lonzo@rushmore.com

Comment:

I supported the change until it was decided to remove the Special Buck and Refuge seasons from the first choice draw. Out west it is a popular choice to send in for the Slim Buttes area and the Black Hills. Public Land hunter--- I have no choice but to choose between the two seasons (Black Hills or West River) as my first choice.

Private Land Hunter--- I have the option of sending in for the Black Hills as my first choice and also sending in for a Special Buck tag that I can use to hunt Private Land during the West River season. Essentially I can possibly be successful in drawing a Black Hills deer tag and a Special Buck tag in the first draw giving the private land hunter both a West River (Special Buck) and a Black Hills tag in the first draw. I will support this proposal if the Special Buck and Refuge are returned to the first choice draw. This unfairly penalizes the the Public Land hunter. Thank you

Bruce Brttmeng

Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

You are making this so complicated nobody can understand it. This Change you are recommending makes zero sense. If it's not broke don' change you are recommending makes zero sense. First, if you are not a hunter you have no business deciding what hunters do. Second, I have read this proposal several times and can make zero sense of it. Don't ruin hunting furthet

Ben Doty
Pierre SD

Comment:

If people would take time to understand the current system they can get buck tags every year. It's the fault of the people not making an effort to understand the system that causes others who know the system to get multiple tags.

Andrew Sorenson
Mitchell SD
asorenson.precisionag@gmail.com

Comment:

I was in support of this change, but strongly oppose this modified version of deer draw structure. I feel strongly that there should either be no change whatsoever, or that all the original seasons discussed should be included in the structure, along with ability to apply in every draw after the first drawing. This is PREFERRED tag, not ONLY tag structure.

Tyler Schaeffbauer
Mobridge SD
Schaeffbauer24@outlook.com

Comment:

Leave it the same! Just because people have shitty counties to hunt in doesn't mean I should have to suffer only getting one tag. Just because North Dakota does it doesn't mean we have to follow. This hurts every body that has the opportunity to hunt both sides.

Greg Parrs
Wilkes Barre PA
gregparrs@gmail.com

Comment:

open the last two draws of all tags to all hunters resident and non-resident.

Todd Peskey
Iroquois SD

Comment:

Looks to me GF&P is chasing the money (nonresidents & city folk) who can afford to pay to play. Deer hunting will be the same as pheasant hunting having to "buy" your way onto private land. LEAVE IT ALONE !!!!

Karl Knudsen
Salem SD

Comment:

The preference point system is in place to help ensure people draw a specific area or tag on a fair basis. If you put in routinely and purchase a preference point if unsuccessful, you draw your deer license on a regular basis - that may be a few years, but by applying for other areas such as East and West river, it balances out so you get a good hunt regularly. This is a proven method across the western United States. From my experience, the people that don't purchase the preference points or don't apply every year are commonly the ones complaining about not drawing a tag. I hope you leave the system in place so avid hunters can have an opportunity to enjoy our various tags and seasons. Then I would suggest a promotional/educational series to help people understand how to best utilize the preference point system.

Zachary Knox
Spencer SD
Zknox97@gmail.com

Comment:

Please do not change anything about the tag Allocation!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Gordon Pierson
Columbia SD
elkhornracing@yahoo.com

Comment:

Leave the drawing system alone , why try to fix something that's not broken , surely there's more important things that need fixing , guess your trying to force our deer hunters to go to other states

John Emick
Piedmont SD
tjsd2@hotmail.com

Comment:

All this does require us the hunters to pay a submission payment each time with little return and limiting the hunting for in-state hunters. It seems to me that the game fish an parks are managing a budget and not the wildlife!

Eric Bauer

Whitewoo SD

Ericbauer@hotmail.com

Comment:

LISTEN TO THE HUNTERS OF SD WE DO NOT WANT THIS CHANGE. I could go into more details on why I don't want it but what's the point you have heard it all already and still insist on wasting time and money on something we don't want or need

Greg Geiszler

Brandon SD

gbgeiszler@gmail.com

Comment:

More truck hunters means more people getting hurt, too, and ultimately less people wanting to hunt. How about a proposal aimed at deer quality AND hunt quality?

Eric Bauer

Whitewood SD

Ericbauer@hotmail.com

Comment:

I have already submitted one of these saying I oppose the change. If you really wanted a public hearing why don't you hold them in Rapid, Aberdeen, Sioux Falls, Pierre, and Mitchell at like 7 in the evening so people can attend.

Deadwood at 2 on a Thursday is a joke who do you expect to attend? I work at Cadillac Jacks and still will not be able attend because I will be WORKING like most people. I openly invite any one of you to come to the poker room and chat with me while you are on location

Gonzalo Sanchez

Fort Pierre SD

Passagyrs@hotmail.com

Comment:

GF&P's own "research" (in quotes because it is far from scientific or statistically legitimate) has shown AT BEST a 50/50 split on the topic of change. The overwhelming majority of attendees at the commission meeting came out in opposition to changing the current deer application process. So, why is GF&P still pursuing this? If you can't listen to your EMPLOYERS (the public) and you can't justify any changes based on Biology or revenue (neither of which apply here in any way), then what justification can you possibly have to make any changes to the current structure? Why do you keep giving us new choices, when you turn a deaf ear to the choice most of us have made, which is NO CHANGE? You are clearly trying to get what YOU want by modifying the options repeatedly to see if you can garner more support. There is no support. I write again, NO CHANGES. Thank you.

Chuck Lebeda
Humboldt SD
clebeda@siouxvalley.net

Comment:

I have been hunting both WR and ER deer for thirty some years. I have received a WR deer tag every year for either Any deer or Any WT. Established a 23 year hunting relationship with a WR rancher, whose land I now may not get to hunt because of the new proposal. We live and also hunt ER in Minnehaha County; hunting our own land, but we do not have enough land to qualify for a landowners tag. We get an ER Any Deer tag every other year; buying the Preference Point. So we have been getting an Minnehaha ER tag with one PP. If the new proposal goes through I will most likely select WR first. There will never be any left over Minnehaha deer tags by the third draw and if there are, they will be antlerless only. So I most likely will have to choose NOT to hunt my own ER land and apply first to WR. I am opposed to changing the current system. If the change is required, I can NOT see including the ANY deer Muzzle Loader tag in the first round of applications. There are only 1,000 tags; it should not be included in the ER, WR, BH group. Thank you for hearing my comments.

Mark Phelps
Sioux Falls SD
pointer_2001@excite.com

Comment:

I do not support any change to the current deer tag draw system. I ask the commission to leave the current system in place.

Gabe Ellerton
Rapid City SD

Comment:

the new plan is just as bad as the last one please leave the draw alone. hunting in SD is very important to me which is why I apply for so many tags. my question is, for those that only want that one tag how important is it to them? I guarantee its not a high priority to them or they would apply for more. but yet we need to change something that works to please a few. It makes no sense for muzzleloader to be in this plan only 1000 statewide tags, and now you exclude special buck? nothing here makes sense. please just leave things alone. people seem to forget the reason we all cant get tags and that's to support a desired population. which I believe SD has some awesome quality and quantity deer. if we did not limit the tags it wouldn't be. but lets ruin it for the people that love hunting all over, for some folks that like hunting 1 spot. how is this fair? wait your turn for that tag just like the rest of us.

Brooks Goeden
Yankton SD
bcbgoeden@gmail.com

Comment:

I could support this change if the muzzleloader season was not included.
Thank you

Darrel Reinke
Ft. Pierre SD
darrel@reinkegray.com

Comment:

oppose

Harold Bickner
Kimball SD
BICKNER@MIDSTATESD.NET

Comment:

oppose

Christopher Carlson
Pierre SD

Comment:

Current system is not broken. Stop trying to make things worse.

Charles Oppelt
Elkton SD

Comment:

oppose

Tiffany Sanchez
Fort Pierre SD
Gyrmama@hotmail.com

Comment:

Even though this is revised, it does not address the public's opposition! Give it up.

Matt Fries
Langford SD
matt.fries@hortonww.com

Comment:

What is the purpose for limiting residents to only one opportunity for Deer license? Please explain. all you have listed in writing is your proposal, not the reasons behind the proposal.

Mark Smedsrud

Sioux Falls SD

Maksmedsrud@msn.com

Comment:

I have seen this proposal change over the summer. It seems like champ he's are uncertain. I have been happy over the years with the draw. I receive a deer tag every year by using preference points in different units. The demand for tags exceed the number of opportunities. Everyone must realize this and be realistic in the fact you won't get s buck tag every year. Please don't change a system that has worked for generations. Get a surgery sent to all hunters and take a true poll of everyone's attitude before implementation of a drastic change. Most people I talk to are adamantly opposed. Thank you for considering my opinion.

Roger Scheibe

Sioux Falls SD

Rkscheibe@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Shannon Coyle

Pierre SD

shannon.producers@midconetwork.com

Comment:

These changes that are now part of the new idea does not fix what is wrong with the whole proposal. I hunt with other people and we base our licenses on our points and what season we are most likely to be drawn for. We can apply for the first drawing and may or may not get a license. If we do not we will not get a license for that year at all. As we hunt Black Hills, East River, and West River and all three units are the harder ones to draw so there will never be a license available in any of these units in any of the other drawings so if we do not get drawn in the first draw we are screwed for the rest and may go a couple of years without being able to draw any license. This is a terrible idea and do not understand why anything needs to change. I strongly oppose these new ideas. They do not fix anything and makes some things worse. I do not need to even have more than one license but would like to at least have a chance at one and with these proposals I may not get any for a couple of years.

Douglas Carlson

Mitchell SD

noslrac@mit-tel.net

Comment:

Being 70 + years and having enjoyed So Dak's wonderful hunting opportunities I believe the proposal is not in the best interest of South Dakota's hunters.

Scott Rabern

Pierre SD

Scottrabern@yahoo.com

Comment:

oppose

Peter Sanchez

Fort Pierre SD

phsanchez16@ole.augie.edu

Comment:

I oppose changing the current system in any way. You just proposed a list of options that have already been talked about in a meeting and the public opinion was given, all changes were opposed. These included the major change, minor change, and no change to the current drawing system. The overwhelming majority of the public agreed that no changes should be made. So with no biologically necessary need for change nor a monetary need for change, it is clear that this change is what the SDGFP wants for their own personal interest. But as state employees, you are supposed to follow the will of the people, especially when no logical reason has seeded this thought for a change. So with the public calling for no change, it seems illogical that instead of agreeing that no change should be made at the last meeting, your entity decided to propose another change to see if the people would agree with you then. It is clear that you are not accepting the will of the people and trying to meander your way around it.

The current system is fair and everyone has to wait the same amount of time to get tags using the preference system. No one is at a loss. The system is fair and allows equal opportunity. Sure some people may have multiple tags but odds are that means several years following they might not have any tags. If you want people to have higher draw odds remove non-resident options and push those tags to the resident pool.

Benjamin Brown

Pierre SD

Brown.BenjaminJ@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose the modifications to the deer drawing proposal. The majority of the public opinion opposes any change. Please keep the deer tag allocation process the way it is.

Cougar Sanchez

Ft. Pierre SD

Comment:

oppose

Landon Badger

Pierre SD

hockey.dude40@hotmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Dustin Adams

Chamberlain SD

Pugs440@hotmail.com

Comment:

I like it the way it is.

Patricia Nauman

Oierre SD

Panauman@yahoo.com

Comment:

All are totally different big game hunts and should not be catagorized as just a deer hunt. Many include travel and lodging in different parts of the state, please do not group these together.

Jim Brewer

Pierre SD

jim.brewer09@gmail.com

Comment:

Each big game season and license application should be handled as independent events. I should be able to assign 1st & 2nd choices to each season (East River Deer, West River Deer, Black Hills Deer, Antelope, etc.), just like we could before this idiotic new proposal came into existence!

Daniel Kasuske

Milbankdeer SD

boonekasuske@hotmail.com

Comment:

oppose

James Klinger

Mitchell SD

Jikl@mit.midco.net

Comment:

Leave the deer season application system alone!!!

Russell Overbay

Mitchell SD

Overbay @ santel.net

Comment:

I feel that as a land owner we should never be denied a permit to hunt on my own land after all we help raise them

Aaron Klinger

Mitchell SD

Comment:

oppose

Jason Evans

Pierre SD

jasondevans1999@gmail.com

Comment:

I am writing in opposition to the current version of the deer drawing proposal. I previously provided comments in opposition but the proposal has been modified since my previous comments. I want the commission to know that I am still opposed for all the reasons stated in my previous comments. I would also like to challenge the commission or department to release statistics regarding the number of commenters in favor of the change to the deer drawing structure and the number of commenters opposed to the change. This information should be provided regardless of the commission's final decision. Thank you for your consideration. Jason Evans

Sara Farstad

Hayti SD

Amor.patriae08@gmail.com

Comment:

Leave out Black Hills deer and muzzleloader. I support restrictions on east versus west river. But then also enforce land owner tags are only good on their own land and they are not eligible to draw for public land/general hunting.

Molly Sittig
Baltic SD

Comment:

Wanting to change the deer drawing odds is not a good idea. It will not benefit any hunters, and if anyone makes the argument that they need the meat there are plenty of doe tags to be had. The current system is fair and allows equal opportunity for every hunter. If someone is worried about getting a tag every year this change will likely make the "good counties" more competitive and less likely to have reasonable opportunities to draw. I, as with the majority of South Dakotans, oppose the proposed change, as we did before the first commission meeting.

Matt King
Pierre SD

Comment:

oppose

John Wilson
Gettysburg SD
Jwilson@venturecomm.net

Comment:

oppose

Christine Wilson
Gettysburg SD
jwilson@venturecomm.net

Comment:

oppose

Jim Wolfgang
Sioux Falls SD
jwolfgang@midco.net

Comment:

Instead of applying for three licenses it is forcing me to choose one. with slim to no chance of getting more than one license that I want in the counties I want, in any given year. at least with the current system I did have a chance. I have yet to hear the detailed reason behind this change and how it possibly makes sense! This is the thing you could have dreamed up!

John Kirsch
White Lake SD
tkirsch@midstatesd.net

Comment:

I am 67 years old and have never seen the commission propose something so detrimental to our hunting system. I have yet to hear the real reason for this change. If over half of the people are happy with the current system? Doesn't that tell us something? Please do NOT adopt these changes. Thank You

Ethan Kirsch
Platte SD
tkirsch@midstatesd.net

Comment:

I have enjoyed going out to the Black Hills hunting with my dad and family, if this passes I won't be able to go out there anymore. I hunt around home with friends and if passes will have to choose. Please consider me and my family in your vote. Thanks

Charles Carlson
Mitchell SD
charlie.carlson@tessiersinc.com

Comment:

I feel that the current system is effective. My honest feeling is the reason for the change is to provide more opportunity to out of state deer hunters wishing to obtain a license in SD and less opportunity for in state hunters to have opportunity to hunt within the state. I and many other families in SD hunt in more than one region of the state currently during deer season. Changing the draw will not allow myself and others to hunt and maintain family traditions of hunting deer in South Dakota. I strongly oppose the new draw system as designed which restricts in state hunters from applying for more than one season during the first draw in South Dakota. If this season is changed expect to see a large drop off of hunters within state purchasing licenses just as you did when you changed the road hunting rules in South Dakota to benefit for profit hunting businesses. Some of my fondest memories of hunting as a youth were road hunting. Due to the change in the road hunting rules for pheasants many of the individuals I hunted with stopped hunting all together. It is a shame! So now you want to further restrict deer hunting? This proposed change is bad business for GFP and the State of SD. I am an avid deer hunter and have applied for multiple seasons for many years. I wish to continue this tradition of hunting and spending time with my family throughout SD. Please reconsider changing the deer license draw system, or at least give the many South Dakota hunters the choice to apply for at least 3 seasons in the first draw. If this proposed change to the deer license draw system goes through without modification GFP should expect to see an immediate downturn from license purchases from instate hunters. My honest feeling is why would avid hunters in South Dakota support SDGFP if we have no support from SDGFP. I and many others may chose other hunting and fishing opportunities in the future. Please support your in State hunters and either leave the deer hunting draw system as is or modify to support your faithful South Dakota Hunters. Thank You

Dan Buehner
Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

I strongly oppose the proposed changes to the deer tag allocation process. The premise of the proposal is to increase "opportunity" - in actuality the proposal eliminates way more opportunity than it provides. With the proposed system, since East River rifle is my "preferred" tag, I'll never have the opportunity to use my muzzleloader preference points and never have the opportunity to shoot a muzzleloader buck . I'll never have the opportunity to hunt Black Hills or West River, both which are completely different hunting experiences due to the diverse nature of our state. Non-residents will never have the opportunity to hunt east river. Some hunters will always complain about the deer tag system - let the recent preference point changes work for a few years. Don't take away the opportunities the current system provides. Vote NO on this proposal!

Jason Taylor
Fort Pierre SD

Comment:

To SD GFP and Commission, I am against any changes to the deer license allocation. The current system works well and is not broken. SD deer tags are allocated in a weighted lottery system and not a participation tag system, where everybody wins. Just because someone applies for a tag, which is in a hard to draw unit and gets a tag every 2 to 3 years, doesn't mean that the system is broken and everything needs to be changed. If someone draws 3 to 4 tags in one year, then they are considered lucky, then next year they might only draw 1 tag. The preference point system was just changed, so why not wait and see if that helps, before making major changes and messing everything up?

I listened to the September Commission meeting and heard Secretary Hepler say that this topic is not a public majority vote, but this is not a biological issue, it is a social issue. So why doesn't the commission, listen to the public and their social piers on this issue? The people have made their point very clear, through public comments and signed petitions that they are totally against any change to the license allocation process.

The current deer population across the state is low (due to high predator population, bad winters, diseases, and over harvesting in certain units), which means fewer # of deer tags for hunters and a lower draw success rate. When the deer numbers come back up, the number of tags will go up, and then the draw success rate will then go up.

I have hunted WR and ER for 25 years with family and friends, which I have made many memories. But I also really enjoy the December muzzleloader season. So if a change is made, I (along with many other sportsmen) will have choose between applying for WR and ER to hunt with family and making more memories with my kids (who just started to hunt) or apply for muzzleloader and hunt the muzzleloader season which I really enjoy.

Many landowner relationships that have been built over the years, will now be lost, due to being successful in the 1st round and having to wait for the 3rd round to apply for a tag and none are left in that unit. In the ER unit that I hunt, a person can get a tag in the first round, in the 2nd round there are only a handful of tags left, and by the 3rd round the tags are always gone. So under the new proposal, if I apply for and get my WR tag, there is a very good chance that there won't be any tags left for ER, or vice versa, where my family and I have built relationships with landowners for over the past 25 plus years. Now we can say goodbye to all of that work and relationships that were built over those years.

I remember going through the Hunt Safe course when I was a kid and I also sat through it when my son took it. The instructors and GFP personnel kept preaching about building landowner/hunter relationships. Which I totally agree with, but now a lot of those relationships will be gone. Those that have put in the work to do so know how hard it is to gain those relationships, and that it is getting harder year after year.

I keep hearing about hunters that have been turned down with 2 or more preference points, so I went through every license option that has a buck tag. Every unit that is a highly sought after unit is either along the Missouri River (public land along the shore) or has a large amount of public land throughout the unit. All of the other units a person can get a tag with 1 point or 2. If a person has their mind set that they really want a buck tag then, they might have to do some research and see where they have the best chances of drawing a tag. The same for those hunters that are complaining, because they have 5, 6, or 7 preference points and can't get a BH Any Deer tag (which there are only 100 allocated). If the BH hunters wanted a buck tag that bad, they could do a little research and apply for an Any Whitetail tag, and get one every 2 years (where there is around 3500 tags instead of 100 Any Deer tags). The proposed system is going to punish those of us sportsmen that have done our unit research and have put in the time to build the relationships with the landowners.

There is no reason for muzzleloader deer to even be in this conversation, they are "bonus tags". The GFP took the other "bonus tags" out of the conversation, but yet left muzzleloader in. The majority of the hunters are fine with getting a bonus tag every 4 years. There is such a small number of these tags (1000 STATE WIDE) that they shouldn't even be talked about in any of these conversations. No one should expect to get a muzzleloader tag every year.

Thank you for your time and listening my thoughts. My vote is to leave as is, No Change.
Thanks Again,
Jason Taylor
Fort Pierre, SD

Aaron Holguin

Corsica SD

wheelwrightsales@gmail.com

Comment:

We need to eliminate the GFP commission, they DO NOT have the public's best interest in mind. The deer draw should be one draw per season with everyone having the same odds. If the GFP disregards the will of hunters and makes the system even more complicated to the point its a game I'm out. I will no longer deer hunt in South Dakota because it will be easier to draw a tag out of state.

Greg Peterson

Clear Lake SD

petegang@itctel.com

Comment:

While I appreciate the spirit of the efforts on this one, the revised proposal still seems too complicated and unfair to those who have diligently applied for multiple seasons.

Larry Crawford

Sturgis SD

toww@q.com

Comment:

This is another scheme to help those with the money be able to buy a special Buck license while restricting the average hunter to one choice in the drawing. Good way to turn more people off when it comes to applying for a deer license. Due the rich spend enough on license to keep the Game fish & parks funded. If not you may need a new job in the near future!

Larry Sexton

Mitchell SD

larry@sextonconstruction.net

Comment:

From what I've read, I see no reason to change anything in the application format. My group have never had any problems with getting licenses.

Jeff Blankenfeld

Aurora SD

blankenj3@hotmail.com

Comment:

I have not talked to one person, other than gfp staff that are in favor to proposed changes. I am skeptical, in particular why you want to change. My opinion is I will not have a higher probability of drawing my first choice permit unless one or two things occur. 1. Fewer people apply for the same permit, or 2. There is an increase in permits. I have the sense that you are harvesting all the deer you dare to while maintaining the current population. The deer numbers are definitely down in my area of residence. One way possibly to enhance opportunities is begin archery hunting by permit only. Archery hunters have gotten preferential treatment for years. The other change I think should be considered is to do away with the lottery system completely. This would place everyone on an equal playing field. The last suggestion is consider no out of state participation in big game hunting. Thank you for this opportunity.
Jeff Blankenfeld

Reid Holiday

Sioux Falls SD

Reid.holiday@gmail.com

Comment:

Leave it alone. Allow residents to apply for all seasons.

Harley De Velder

Harrison SD

hjdevelder@siouxvalley.net

Comment:

oppose

Steve Koistinen

Watertown SD

imsakoi@hotmail.com

Comment:

I have been very satisfied with the current system. It has worked well for my family to hunt ER and WR quite often though not always consecutive years, but we usually have success on one of our first choices. Keep the system we now have.

John Koenig

Chamberlain SD

Comment:

Don't change the format, it is working now. More any deer for non-landowners would be welcome.

Larry Ritter
Sioux Falls SD
larryr@sio.midco.net

Comment:

I am sure that we are not alone. A group of friends have hunted the Black Hills for 35 years. Many of the group also hunt East or West river also. This proposal will likely be the end of our Black Hills hunting group

Philip Steckley
Geddes SD
trapperman@midstatesd.net

Comment:

the old saying "if it ain't broke don't fix it" really applies to the situation that gfp is playing with. read roger wiltz daily republic column of sept 19. study his numbers and tell me where the rules need fixing. leave every thing the way is. MOST people who hunt sd have been satisfied with current program. you can not satisfy everyone but you must go with the majority of sd hunters.

Joshua Klinkhammer
Brookings SD

Comment:

It is my opinion of the whole proposal is a convoluted attempt at reinventing the wheel. Lottery drawings are by definition chance, you can weigh it with preference points but it is still chance. If someone just applies to one unit or one tag and doesn't draw is not the responsibility of those who apply for more than one tag/spot. The process is bring most down to satisfy some. I believe it will decrease the excitement and passion of South Dakota hunters in the perceived notion of "fair".

Conrad Carson
Brandon SD
conradcarson42@gmail.com

Comment:

Existing structure already provides a fair chance for everyone draw a tag. The proposed change will make it much more difficult to hunt in both E and W river seasons. My family group has been fortunate to have hunted together for the last 18 years. The units we hunt are not high demand but if forced to the second draw there will not likely not be tags left. The proposed change will result in one season being dropped and a tradition ended.

The proposed change will discourage more existing hunters than it will encourage new. If you want to provide more opportunities for first time SD hunters take the non resident tags in the first draw and make them available only to those that have not had a tag before. I have questioned every sportsman i have encountered and have yet encounter anyone that is for the proposed change. Not sure who or what is pushing for the change but it is not SD sportsmen. Please leave as is.

Bruce Haines

Mitchell SD

brucehaines@qwestoffice.net

Comment:

Do not change the process!

Cory Dosch

Dupree SD

cory.dosch@gmail.com

Comment:

I believe the muzzleloader deer season drawing should remain separate from the firearm seasons because the muzzleloader season doesn't run simultaneous with the firearms deer season. I do believe that it would be very favorable to have the firearm seasons drawings simultaneously.

Jeremy Doohen

Sioux Falls SD

Jrdoohen@yahoo.com

Comment:

I understand that the SDGFP believes this change will benefit the majority of hunters. However, the overwhelming majority of those voicing an opinion don't want the change. Instead of being an unbiased, objective group the SDGFP continually defends this change. Please stop defending a position that your own group studies have revealed is an unpopular/unwanted change.

Dan Cudmore

Harrisburg SD

cudmore81@gmail.com

Comment:

the current system is not broken so let's not fix it

Paul Muth

Mitchell SD

paulmuth@muthelectric.com

Comment:

oppose

Nate Schmitz

Elk Point SD

nate_schmitz@yahoo.com

Comment:

Dear SD G,F,&P, I am voicing my concern for the proposed change of the current deer license process. Like the majority of the hunting population, i am highly against the change. I believe the way the system is run currently is working fine and is not broken, so i don't think it needs a change. I do not draw a tag every year and i am fine with it. I also own ground i can hunt every year, but not enough to justify applying for landowner preference, and im fine with it. Limiting the public to 1 preferred tag a year is going to force our local residents that hunt both East & West river to look outward to other states around us. I myself am going to Wyoming deer hunting this year and the odds of drawing the unit i am going to is almost 100% every year. I would rather hunt my own state, but if i am forced to pick east or west, i will look elsewhere for my out of town hunting trip. I have to believe others will do the same resulting in less \$\$ spent in state. For people like my dad who has been leasing a ranch in Butte Co. with 4 other friends for over 30 years, this will force them to make a tough decision because they also hunt personal ground here East river. This change will not make it any easier for the people who want this change to draw in a tough to get county like "Union" because there will be the same amount or more people applying for this tag, same with the people in the tough to get Counties West River, people have been going there will still apply for the tag. As a lifetime, responsible, dedicated SD Hunter, I ask that you please listen to the majority of the public and decide to make NO change to the current run system. Do whats right, not what a few are pushing you to do. Thank You for taking the time to read this.
Nate Schmitz -Concerned Union Co Hunter

Dan Stengle

Raymond SD

dstengle@comcast.net

Comment:

As a nonresident landowner of a quarter section of ground in Clark County, I am not eligible for a landowner deer permit, and am not entitled to hunt deer on my farm under any drawing proposal. My wife and I both grew up in South Dakota and plan to retire there. For the time being, however, we must reside in another state for business purposes. We spend a great deal of time at the farm, and we have a great many deer on our property, which is largely restored tall-grass prairie. The farm is not actively farmed -- neither crops nor livestock -- because we value the land as it is, providing great cover and value for wildlife. Year round. It seems to be that it would not be asking too much for someone who pays taxes to the state, who buys nonresident pheasant licenses, and who shops locally in Clark, to get to shoot one deer on their own private land once a year. Or once every two years. Please consider this request. It would do not harm to the resource and would not inconvenience anyone or impact the hunting rights or privileges of anyone else. It's our land. Why can't I put a little bit of venison in our freezer?
Thank you for your consideration.

Dale Weber

Salem SD

daleweber@triotel.net

Comment:

I am a family hunter with 4 sons and 9 grandsons. The proposal would kill us. 8,000 signatures in opposition was gathered within 36 hrs. The current system works fine. Please vote this down.

Greg Rothschadl

Tabor SD

roachlg@hcinet.net

Comment:

I feel the new tag proposal will hurt big game hunting in SD. It will limit the amount of tags the normal hunter can get.

Benjamin Spaans

Corsica SD

sledneck84@hotmail.com

Comment:

I strongly oppose this proposal. It merely caters to the people not willing to try to secure a tag outside their 1 area. In turn it strips thousands of avid hunters of their chances at securing more than one tag in a preferred area. The facts are in, and majority does NOT approve. For once do something for the sportsmen of this state and hear our voice. Thank You.

Jason Ramsdell

Flandreau SD

Comment:

oppose

John Deneui

Sioux Falls SD

jdeneui@sio.midco.net

Comment:

I fail to see what benefit this will provide for the majority of deer hunters. Is it just to appease hunters who will only hunt in their preferred area? This has allocation proposal came to light the last year or two. Has it been taken into consideration the heavy hit our deer herd has experienced the last x amount of years due to EHD? The county I hunt took a serious hit. Would this proposal even been thought about if our deer herd was what it was 5 years ago? I am 70 yrs old have been deer hunting for 55 yrs, minus years in the Marines and Nam. Our current system has worked all those years. Why all of a sudden it is thought not to? I plead that you leave as is. Thankyou for your time.
John

Austin Earley
Brookings SD
earleyaustin@live.com

Comment:

This is the definition of governing against the will of the people. The first meeting proved you have nothing but lies for your numbers. I have easily secured \$100,000 in my little town witch will turn to millions across the state. This will be a huge class action law suit. And the stealing of public waters will be revisited also in this lawsuit.

Neil Waldera
Alexandria SD
neil@spencerquarriesinc.com

Comment:

I see know reason to change the current system.

Curtis Kempf
Aberdeen SD
Cclkempf@nrctv.com

Comment:

I strongly opposed the changes proposed by Game and Fish. The only change that I can see that needs to be made is that it become the true lottery system that we've been led to believe it is.

Daniel Nefzger
Lake Norden SD
dannefzger@icloud.com

Comment:

We have been very fortunate in Sd with the deer hunting opportunities. We have had youth participation above most other states. The current draw system provides great opportunities for anyone passionate about deer hunting. Changing the current system would not only hinder those opportunities but would also hinder landowner / hunter relationships that have been acquired over decades and generations. It's also sad to see our officials wanting to change to a system to be more like other states that are of which are driving their youths away from being involved in hunting. Hopefully our commissioners are also considering all the gains and losses before they make their decision. As of now I am able to spend all the fall weekends outdoors with my children. With the proposed changes I will still spend those weekends outdoors it will unfortunately be in another state along with the money in my hunting budget.

Justin Thomas
Pukwana SD

Comment:

I have hunted the same units since I was old enough to hunt now my kids hunt with me we don't always draw tags for the units we like to hunt I don't think that any changes need to be made to the draw system it works fine it's not broke so don't fix it and if it does get changed are you going to refund all the money for the preference point's we paid for that will do us no good any more

Tim Davis
Huron SD
tdavis.midland@santel.net

Comment:

oppose

Bill Perkins
Sioux Falls SD
billperkinsj@yahoo.com

Comment:

Strongly oppose the changes

Robert Winter
Yankton SD
bcwinter@vyn.midco.net

Comment:

I am opposed to the proposed changes in deer hunting applications. The overwhelming response at meetings I attended, petitions signed, and at the Yankton meeting personal responses all are solidly opposed. I do not believe the new changes really

Bryan Krier
Hartford SD
kriermechanical@msn.com

Comment:

I believe this is a plan with very little fore thought. I also feel that a small group that are based in the Black Hills area is the root of this. I am middle aged and look forward to hunting with my sons.....the new proposal is going to take that away from me and many other hunters. Thanks for taking the time to read this.

Marty Seppanen
Lake Norden SD
Martysepp@gmail.com

Comment:

I strongly appose a change to the deer tag application process.

Scott Kuck
Aberdeen SD
kucklaw@nvc.net

Comment:

Dear Commission Members: I have previously submitted a written objection to the proposed changes in the deer license drawing system. The "new" proposal is still a solution to a problem that does not now exist and has never existed. I remain 100% OPPOSED to the changes recommended. I should not have to choose whether to hunt with my two teenage daughters in the ER season or apply for a Black Hills or WR tag! The public opposition to this ridiculous recommendation by the G,F & P has been overwhelming! Listen to the people who buy the licenses! WE DO NOT WANT AND DO NOT NEED THIS CHANGE! LEAVE THE SYSTEM ALONE! IT IS NOT BROKEN, SO STOP TRYING TO FIX IT!

Marlyn Heckel
Mitchell SD
mrheckel@hotmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Chris Larson
Vermillion SD
cjlarson@nrctv.com

Comment:

I believe the changes made at the last meeting make things even more confusing. I also take offense to comments made that people against the proposed process are being closed minded and just don't understand. We do understand that changes don't need to be made to the current system. It will break friendships and still not make every one happy. People still may not draw their first choice in popular areas. It will drive a bigger wedge between the eastern and western side. Please listen and leave the drawing process alone.

Dave Drew

Madison SD

dtdrew@q.com

Comment:

I love deer hunting in this state. I look forward to hunting whitetails in the hills with my family. Mule deer out west with my life long friends. Sometimes it's the only time I see some of those guys. East river deer is my time to go out, sit and enjoy nature. They are all equally important and I don't want to have to make a choice of one over the other. I thank you for your time in considering this.

John Groce

Madison SD

misha1467@yahoo.com

Comment:

I understand the proposal and the reason I do not support it is because it would limit my ability to draw Any deer tags in the state. I am one of the hunters who applies for 3 of the 4 hunting units in SD (Black Hills, WR and ER). This proposal will hurt my chances to draw an Any deer tag in each of those units each year. If the goal is to get more people into hunting and specifically deer hunting, the key isn't to give them opportunities to draw a tag in their preferred area. The key is to give hunters access to land where they want to hunt. You can't have 50 people hunting a 180 acre public shooting area and 1 person hunting 1000 acres right next door. This is what gets people frustrated and why they are leaving hunting. Opportunities are drying up for average people. And this proposal will NOT fix that.

Derrik Boomsma

Wolsey SD

Boomer5569@santel.net

Comment:

The lottery system should stay in effect. If there should be changing of anything. It should be required to lottery system archery tags. Way to many archery tags just given out. They should have to go in lottery also.

Shaw Loiseau

Flandreau SD

shaw@loiseauconstruction.com

Comment:

I feel the current system we allocate tags works well in South Dakota

Wayne Dullerud

Worthing SD

wdullerud@gmail.com

Comment:

The current system gives everyone the opportunity to get a deer tag.

Dale Knuth
Hartford SD
dale.knuth@gmail.com

Comment:

the new proposed "draw" or "allocation" is not good for SD HUNTERS. I oppose any changes.

Milo Hansen
Mitchell SD
hansen5@mitchelltelecom.net

Comment:

Keep system the same

Layne Krier
Kimball SD
laynekrier55@gmail.com

Comment:

I am against this because I feel that it is setup to help guides and outfitters. Now I'm all for someone trying to make a living but to me it seems like it will interfere with the family aspect of the hunting culture in South Dakota.

Steven Johnke
Garretson SD
stevejohnke@gmail.com

Comment:

Please keep the current system.

Adam Glover
Elk Point SD

Comment:

I write to you regarding the new deer tag proposal. As an avid east river and west river rifle hunter & archery hunter, I am concerned about how this will affect me & others like me's chances of hunting both east and west river in the same year in preferred counties. We hunt at home in Clay County and pay to lease ground in west river. If getting a tag in only one side of the state becomes reality, we most likely would stop spending the money west river. In turn, spend less money on tags, preference points, fuel, food, and lodging, hoping the state & small business owners. I really have no issue with the possibility of missing a year one place or the other every now and again, but consistently having to choose one or the other is discouraging. I also feel that if this does go through, muzzleloader deer should still be a separate drawing altogether as it's a whole different time of year as the others. Archery and muzzleloader separate east river west river and hill together. I have faith you will come up w/a system to benefit everyone & appreciate you taking the time to read my concerns.

Dr. Daniel Krause
Brown Valley MN

Comment:

I am writing in response to the deer license draw proposal. I am adamantly opposed to the changes. Why change something that has worked so well for so many years. My wife & I love the deer hunting in South Dakota. We live in northeast South Dakota but have spent countless weeks big game hunting in western South Dakota and have left thousands of dollars for the tourist industry. With this new proposal it appears that our deer hunting in the black hills and west river would come to an end because we would make our first choice at home in Roberts county. The proposal should probably be named "the hunt at home deer draw system" because it looks like that is what would happen. No hunters in the field just less hunting opportunities. It is not clear what would happen to existing preference points or how one could accumulate new points. All in all the proposed system is confusing and complicated. Keep the current working system in place.

David Kayser
Emery SD

Comment:

Please do not change the resident deer hunting opportunities. it would hurt a lot of hunting traditions. Thank you

Josh Adams
Elk Point SD

Comment:

I appreciate you taking your time to read my concerns on the new deer proposal. My family never hunted or fish and I guess I was the odd one. Now I got my dad hunting and both parents fishing! Here are my concerns for the new proposal. I feel we are going to lose money as a state as we lose money on preference points, motel stays, groceries, and gas. It's still going to take preference point in populated counties. There is going to be a loss of time spent out doors with friends and family with less oppertunities to get tags. I know there are a lot of people against this as i hear very little for it. If you have to do it please take muzzleloader out of it like Special East & West & Archery! Thanks for keeping are state fun and safe.

Re Krause
Brown Valley MN

Comment:

We love every portion of South Dakota. Consequently, we often spend our vacations in the fall in western South Dakota where we enjoy the people, the scenery and the wildlife. Since we love to hunt deer we apply for licenses in the areas allowing us to explore the different landscapes and enjoy the wildlife. When we obtain licenses we are happy to pack up and travel to other parts of the state. Otherwise we stay home in Roberts County. Under the new proposal, we would will spend little time and little money in western SD area. Like many others we will hunt close to home. It would appear that someone decided that change is good. Change for change's sake benefits few. Those who really wish to hunt deer will happily pay for points to obtain licenses in different area in the hope of one day getting a license there. Dedicated hunters like us gladly support the sport in this manner. Of course, there are those who feel they should get a license just for applying. However, as you examine comments please consider the benefits that the economy reaps under the current system in mind. Keep the current working system in place. South Dakota is to be commended for developing this outstanding system. It's a great one that benefits all of South Dakota. Furthermore, it encourages residents to enjoy the state and spend their money in other areas rather than staying in their home county.

Doug Boer
Madison SD

Comment:

Strongly appose, please leave a good thing alone, our current system in drawing tags to hunt deer is the envy of many neighboring states. By reading all of the comments on this subject it's obvious what the overwhelming majority of South Dakota's deer hunters want, please listen.

Richard Hanson
Gettysburg SD
dhanson@venturecomm.net

Comment:

I propose leaving it as is..if something isn't broke don't fix it...

Daron Peterson
Humboldt SD
daronspanh@siouvalley.net

Comment:

My personal opinion is all this chance is going to do is increase the leasing of hunting land east river and take away opportunity for a lot of hunters. I have already been called on leasing out some of my ground in Brown county.

Kale Skogen

White SD

Kale.skogen@gmail.com

Comment:

I strongly oppose this modified bill!

Lance Gerth

Brandt SD

lancegerth@outlook.com

Comment:

A watered down proposal is still unacceptable. The only good choice here is a vote for "no change". Please remember that changing the system we have now will not increase the number of tags available as a whole, but will definitely limit the opportunities of many people. After reading the comments sent in and attending the meeting in Yankton it can be seen that there is very little public support behind this proposal. I believe that a vote of "no change" is the most appropriate at this time. Thank you, Lance Gerth

Tyler Heiberger

Hartford SD

tylerheiberger@hotmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Steven Chilson
Watertown SD
chlsn4ssc@aol.com

Comment:

the modified proposal does nothing to change my opinion. You cannot connect the east and west river deer drawings together without taking a persons chance to huntaway. You are TAKING FROM SOMEONE. The current system GIVES EVERYBODY AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TO DRAW A PARTICULAR LICENSE. It doesn't take away anyones opportunity to hunt. It just depends on how they want to apply for the tags. It is THEIR decision. It is fair and non biased (aside from the landowner tags). The proposed changes are biased (if you have a west river deer tag you can't apply for an east river tag on the first drawing and vice versa.) East and west river deer are 2 SEPARATE SEASONS (just like pheasant and waterfowl). You might as well just combine east/west deer into one season if you go ahead with this proposal, because that is what you are essentially doing. Why don't you connect the pheasant and waterfowl seasons and say you can only hunt one? ITS THE SAME THING!!!!!!!!!! That is basically what you are doing to the deer hunters. YOU WILL BE TAKING AWAY A HUNTING SEASON. In my case you will be taking away 50% of my hunting. The stated reason for this is to "give everyone a better chance at their 'first choice' of tags." (meaning buck/doe and county). Why then can't a resident who drew a tag in the first draw apply for a tag in the second draw???? The residents who did not draw in the first draw can, but now they are not applying for their first choice. (this does not help achieve the stated goal). Why don't you be honest with the sportsmen and women of SD and tell them the real reason: You want everyone that wants a deer buck tag to have one before anyone can have 2. This is essentially what this is doing, along with giving small parcel landowners (ex. 40 acres) in eastern SD a better chance to get a tag every year (land owner preference for 40 acres). thanks for letting me express my opinions. Steve Chilson watertown sd

Michael Deakins
Mitchell SD
Sdbobcatkelly@gmaim.com

Comment:

I believe that this is messing with the natural order. This gives power to game lodges and out of state hunters

Curtis Pansch
Sioux Falls SD
cjpansch@alliancecom.net

Comment:

I and my entire circle of hunting friends are opposed to the "one choice" deer application. I have preference points for several seasons and repeatedly lose out on the draw. Maybe some day before I die?? I'm a disabled Vietnam vet and don't have many years of hunting left. I didn't get drawn for a first or second choice in six apps and had points in all but one. Got one second choice. If the changes go through I will lose everything, except one.

Steve Ford

Miller SD

fordsteve56@gmail.com

Comment:

Just leave thing alone

Heath Siemonsma

Humboldt SD

siemonsmaelectric@yahoo.com

Comment:

I think we need to leave the drawing process for deer as is and also make out of state bowhunters have a draw for a tag to reduce the numbers flooding our public hunting areas for deer!

Steve Ingram

Ft. Pierre SD

Bugsbgone@pie.midco.net

Comment:

oppose Only first choice in one location.

Curtis Pansch

Sioux Falls SD

cjpansch@alliancecom.net

Comment:

I'm a disabled Vietnam vet and senior hunter. I didn't get drawn for muzzleloader again this year but that isn't my complaint. Every state seems to have different rules for muzzleloader hunting. I've hunterd in SD, NM and CO. Some allow scopes. I believe you would find nearly all muzzleloader folks would agree.

Bradley Taylor

Fort Pierre SD

bradtaylor40@hotmail.com

Comment:

There is nothing wrong with the present application process. Leave it as is.

Halle Kuck

Aberdeen SD

Smkuck@abe.midco.net

Comment:

Please leave the deer tag system in place the way it has always been. There is no need for a change. Thank you

Hannah Kuck

Aberdeen SD

Smkuck@abe.midco.net

Comment:

I would ask that you please not change the deer tag system. It is fine the way it is. Please leave it alone.

Brian Jenson

Aberdeen SD

1bjenson@gmail.com

Comment:

If the proposed changes are implemented, I would like to see more of the ERD "any deer" or buck tags made available to MZD. I hunt rifle and muzzleloader and if I had more of a chance to get a MZD tag, I would rather apply for that. I would also like to ask about start dates for the seasons...if applicants are choosing between ERD and MZD, I would like to see those two seasons ran together so everyone has the same opportunities to bag a deer at the same time. There are people who strictly hunt for horns (It doesn't really matter to me...its more about being outdoors), but I'm sure there are people that would be more apt to apply for the MZD if the season dates started the same and there were more "any deer" tags available. I have been applying for the MZD tag for a few years and yet to be successful

I know this is going to be a tough topic, but is there any reason that bow hunting season is not also included with these changes? I realize there is not as high of success rate with a bow and arrow, but I know that there are people that prefer bow hunting but still also rifle hunt. This would also make more of those licenses available if they got a bow tag and were not applying for a rifle tag on the first few draws. I can see why you are proposing these changes. Please consider my above comments about the changes and feel free to contact me if you would like more thoughts.

Thank you,
Brian Jenson

John McGrath

Brandon SD

john.mcgrath@firstpremier.com

Comment:

I'm opposed to the change that has been proposed. Currently individuals are able to accumulate preference points which allows them to build "access" to the season preferred yet still allows the possibility of drawing another tag. For example I like to hunt both East River and BH Deer. I know the chances of drawing both are slim however I can build points towards one and normally draw at least my second choice in the other. I don't like the idea of basically having to choose only one I want to hunt. The current system isn't broke ... so don't try to fix it! Thank you for your consideration.

Jerald Smith

Alexandria SD

Jerryfrog1@gmail.com

Comment:

This system has worked for the 40 yrs I have been applying for deer tags. It's the luck of the draw and you know that when you apply. South Dakota deer hunting is a family tradition just like pheasant hunting so why would you change something that has worked for many years to please a few hunters that are complaining when you have a majority of hunters telling you this is a stupid idea.

Steve Doyle

Colman SD

bs33doyle@gmail.com

Comment:

I cant see where all of a sudden the license draw method has become such a big deal. It works great just as is. EVERYONE has a chance for tags in multiple areas of our state. Its a lottery system we all kno that. Thats why sportsmen apply for other options. Its not a one and done deal. There are other oportunities out there. Get out the maps, use the phone, use some leg work and find a spot. IF you want to apply in a highly populated area or highly desireable area and you dont draw, there are plenty other places to apply for and hunt.LEAVE THE SYSTEM ALONE. Keep the large majority of the South Dakota sportsmen happy and dont change it for the few who only apply for one tag and one tag only, and are mad cause they cant hunt deer.

John Roelofsen lii

Toronto SD

johnny.roelofsen@gmail.com

Comment:

I am writing to you today to discuss the proposal to change the current deer tag system. I am a life long south Dakotan and avid outdoors man. I spend much of my free time hunting, fishing, and hiking. it's very seldom that I ever vacation outside of the state. I have always used hunting as a vacation. The current system works well. This new proposed system would greatly inhibit my ability to enjoy my state to the fullest as I have since I was old enough to draw a tag. I have gotten to not only hunt at home but I would also get the chance to experience the western prairie every couple years. I shouldn't have to choose between staying home to hunt or taking a trip to get away. I know for a fact that this new system will make myself and many other South Dakotans less likely to support our states GFP department. I have seen the statement "If it ain't broke don't fix it" wrote out a lot when it comes to this topic. the current system has always worked why change it? Please do the right thing for our state and for our wildlife and retain the current system. Thank you,
John R Roelofsen III

Scott Jamison

Wentworth SD

sjamison@dakotacare.com

Comment:

I've commented previously, perhaps to no avail, but thought I would recap before this next meeting. I don't feel that you have demonstrated that there was a strong mandate for this change, simply because a subset of people who have deer hunted advocated for it. Also, the change to take out Special Buck, Custer State Park, and Refuge is fairly meaningless; they never should have been included previously. The Special Buck license, by definition, uses different rules, since it was created for benefit of West River landowners/outfitters. Proposing the change, then removing it, appears to be a preplanned attempt to show compromise. The odds of drawing CSP deer tags are so astronomical, with or without this change, that including them in this proposal was ridiculous to begin with, and again it appears they were initially included and then removed as a negotiating tactic. Refuge tags are an extremely small part of the overall deer license allocation. They are similar to Muzzleloader, which is going to be virtually eliminated if this misguided proposal is implemented. Who in the world would invest 5-10 years buying preference points for any deer MZ and then take a chance that one year they could draw, at the expense of giving up all other chances, for the privilege of hunting with a muzzleloader in a December blizzard? Muzzleloader preference point purchases, along with all other ER, WR, and Hills preference point purchases, will drop off drastically once hunters realize the implications of the change. The odds of drawing will only increase incrementally, contrary to what your video stats show. They certainly won't change to a degree which would incentivize someone who wasn't already interested in deer hunting to begin, as you claim in the proposal. Rather, this change would be the reason many current deer hunters; hunters who want the opportunity to apply for several tags across the state and take their chances to draw; will quit trying in SD and simply go to another state. This is a slap in the face to those hunters who have supported the current system.

Thanks.

Scott

605-270-1869

Brendan Gerth
Clear Lake SD
brendan@itctel.com

Comment:

the only proposal i support is no change

Mark Smith
Sioux Falls SD
mark@seasd.com

Comment:

oppose

Justin Murphy
Lyons SD
justintmurphy@outlook.com

Comment:

Commissioners, I urge you to reconsider changing the current deer tag application system. The system currently in place is working. There are thousands of people who oppose your proposal. More than 6,600 individuals signed just one of the many petitions that oppose the change to the current system. Please listen to the people you are appointed to work for.

Justin Murphy

Shawn Pliska
Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

I oppose any change to the deer allocation process system, NO Change is needed. Don't take away South Dakota resident opportunities. I respectfully disagree with how this proposal has been pushed. It seems the data that has been gathered was cherry picked to favor a change. With the majority of the deer hunters (89%) from the 289 pages of GFP public comments want no change from the September 2018 meeting. Majority of the deer hunter never wanted to change the current system in-place at any time during this proposal, but it is still being pushed. South Dakota motto is "Under God the People rule". Please listen to the people

Aron Martz
Rapid City SD

Comment:

I wanted to take a moment to express my opinion on the suggested changes to the application process. Initially, I bristled at the idea. Why change a good thing? We have very liberal seasons and it is very possible for a hunter, such as myself, with many preference points built up to draw 2 or even 3 coveted rifle antlered tags in a given year. After contemplating this and discussing it with fellow hunters we eventually decided it will be very positive for the future of hunting in SD for one primary reason. Our children. My son is now 15. This was his third year applying for BH deer, West river deer, and muzzleloader deer, and he has not yet drawn any of them. There is only so many years a young sportsperson will apply for something that he apparently can't have. I for one am willing to have a better chance of myself, and especially my son drawing at least one tag per year, than having the possibility of drawing multiple tags in any given year. I hope you and your fellow council members can see this to fruition. Thank you for your time.

Dan Schulte
Geddes SD

Comment:

After much discussion with employees, truckers, farmers and ranchers; I feel that most (if not all) are against the new format for drawing for deer tags. Most feel it is best left alone.

Dean Theisen
Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

I oppose the change. The Traditional system has been in place and working for many years. I cannot support the commission due to there is not factual information only a few people voicing their opinion. You are there to represent the majority and by what I have read the majority does not want any changes. Respectfully Dean Theisen

Anna Howard
Sioux Falls SD
xachoward@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Tim Wenz

Alpena SD

Tim.wenz@pioneer.com

Comment:

COMPROMISE! I strongly oppose your current proposal but rather than go on and on about why I would rather offer a compromise. Why do we need to go from four individual seasons (BH, WR, ER, and muzzleloader) and lump them all into one season. How about we compromise and say that an individual can send in for first choice on two of the four but then would have to wait until third draw for left over tags in the other two seasons. For example someone in the hills could send in for first choice BH and first choice WR but would then not be eligible for ER or Muzzle until third or fourth draw. This compromise would allow most people to still send in for their yearly traditions but would limit those people who potential draw all four as first choices in a year. I know you have a lot of comments coming in but thought I would offer up a potential compromise as a suggestion. Thanks

Jon Stuefen

Brookings SD

Jon.stuefen07@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Mike Nemitz

Brookings SD

Comment:

oppose

Andrew Dahl

Brookings SD

Andrew.dahl@gmail.com

Comment:

oppose

Thad Smith
Pierre SD
tjsmith72@gmail.com

Comment:

In regards to the general proposal, I strongly disagree with it. There is nothing wrong with the way it is set up now. I think there are things that can be done before making such a drastic and unwanted change to the draw. I think more effort should be put into habitat and deer management. By doing that it will increase the deer numbers allowing more tags to be filled. Also I think if you want our residents to have better success at drawing tags then don't release any to out of state hunters until the deer numbers are increased. In regards to the revision to the draw, I think if any of the seasons should get special treatment from exception it shouldn't be the special buck tag. It should be the muzzleloader tag. I work with the public for a living and I can honestly tell you that I hear far more people complaining about the price of a deer tag than I do about not drawing one.

Gary Brune
Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

You want some reasons that this proposal does not work.. Our hunting group will no longer be able to hunt together as we all have different preferred seasons. I have wasted a great deal of money purchasing preference points as I only wanted to hunt Muzzleloader and BH Deer if I was lucky. Now I have a bunch of points and will never apply for those seasons because I will have to select only one first choice. For me it will have to be East River Deer. No one in GFP can tell me with any degree of certainty if I have one preference point and want to apply for Lake County if I will be able to draw my tag in the first draw. The fact is they do not know. How can you make a change when no one knows how it will work or not work. This is terrible government in action. The current system is not broke. The majority of hunters do not want a change.

THE MAJORITY OF HUNTERS DO NOT WANT A CHANGE.

If the GFP Commission is not going to listen to the overwelling majority of comments and hunters and vote this thing down, we are prepared to take this to the legislature. We're already spoke to 11 legislators and they are more than willing to take this on and keep the current system in place and judging by the numbers we have on petitions, we have more than enough support to get this done. Some commissioner said this wasn't a vote, well it will be when we take it to the capitol this winter because you people can't listen. You want names of the legislators we've talked with? Too bad, you don't listen anyway. Thank you GFP Commission, but we'll take it from here.

Darrin Christensen
Watertown SD
Livetohunt@wat.midco.net

Comment:

The system is not broke don't mess with it!

Ethan Christensen

Brookings SD

Ethanman1111@gmail.com

Comment:

The system is fine the way it is! It's fair!

Ryan Martenson

Watertown SD

martensonr@fcsamerica.com

Comment:

I am definitely opposed to this consideration of changing the deer tags. I am unable to find anyone that agrees with it. Please do not move forward with this plan.

Ryan Wendling

Beresford SD

Wendl26t@yahoo.com

Comment:

I am not in favor of this . I have been hunting my entire life. I do not see why this change will help. This is all about the math. The way they figure this could easily be swayed if the same people do not apply at all next year or if a bunch more apply next year. I do my homework and if I have to get a preference preference tags that's fine but leave it the way it has been.

Thomas Harnois

Pierre SD

Tharnois888@gmail.com

Comment:

Keep it the way it is, we need to focus on a more simpler solution. By making sure that if someone draws say west they cant get one unless its a left over the following year. Eliminate land owners from getting a hughes tag for owner and a east also for another county.

Tyler Richardson

Black Hawk SD

Comment:

Even with the new changes I do not support the new deer tag proposal. There is ample opportunity to draw tags of different seasons in the current set up, and there is no reason to sacrifice the opportunity to hunt throughout the state for a barely noticeable change in drawing odds for a particular county.

Matt Bones

Chancellor SD

mjbones2007@yahoo.com

Comment:

Do not change the current draw system because of a few people and old misleading surveys.

Dan Doyle

Colman SD

icefisherdan@yahoo.com

Comment:

I've attended the state fair forum and watched SD Focus on sdptv. From what I understand this proposal is to improve, not guarantee, the odds of Jon doe drawing a tag in the one county he wants to hunt and that's all he's interested in hunting. Now there's me. I'm willing to travel all over this state to hunt deer, it's what I love to do. Last year I had ER, WR, black hills whitetail and two archery tags. This year I drew WR and I purchased statewide archery. I believe it was three years ago I drew no rifle tags. I'm ok with all of those years results. It's how the system works and I'm perfectly fine with it. Before I go on I realize the proposal doesn't effect archery, I was just stating which tags I've had in years past. So with all that said, why am I being forced to pick one tag out of all the seasons for the first round and hope some decent units are leftover for the second round, all because Jon doe isn't willing to travel out of his home county? You all say hunter satisfaction is your priority. Is it?? I have not talked to one hunter in the counties I work in, the state fair forum, coffee shops, etc, who is in favor of this proposal. Petitions have been turned in with thousands of signatures against it, yet you're still pushing this on us hunters. Is that hunter satisfaction?? I strongly oppose this proposal and think it's time the gfp commission not be a hand picked good old boy club, instead be an elected board with honest interest in hunter satisfaction for years to come. Thanks for your time.

Scott Guffey

Rapid City SD

Guffeyscott@gmail.com

Comment:

I fully support the deer drawing proposal. I did not draw a rifle deer tag this year. My preferred choice is a black hills deer, since I live right next to them. I drew my hills tag last year with 2 yrs preference, so I had no chance at drawing this year and probably won't next year with one preference point. I had two years of preference points for west river deer tag this year and did not draw my preferred unit and did not a leftover tag. I do not have a place to hunt east river. Please pass this proposal, so everyone has a fair chance of drawing their preferred deer tag.

Greg Voller

Bison SD

Comment:

support. This proposal will allow more people to deer hunt each year and make it easier for the younger generations to draw tags so they are more likely to stay in the sport.

Jordan Miller

Canton SD

Jordan@run2gun.com

Comment:

Do NOT change anything with our current deer application system. The sportsman of SD did not want a revamp or new proposal after the 2 months of extreme backlash you received from the original proposal. We want no change!!

Amy Miller

Canton SD

Amaemilla11@gmail.com

Comment:

Do NOT change anything with our current deer application system. The sportsman of SD did not want a revamp or new proposal after the 2 months of extreme backlash you received from the original proposal. We want no change!!

Mary Hieb

Murdo SD

Hieberbeeber@hotmail.com

Comment:

I oppose the change on deer application proposal, no change to current system.

Brent Roth

Bison SD

Comment:

I support this, I hope to have better draw results from it in units around me. East river hunters get too many tags in our area.

Robby Beyer

Winifred SD

Comment:

I feel the current system is the fairest way to do it. I see people complaining they don't get a tag for what they put in for. Then when you suggest to them to apply for a tag in another unit they complain and say if I am going to do that I just as well go out of state. So the way I see it they are not serious enough about hunting if they won't consider other options. Plus by changing the system you are destroying family traditions that span over 60 plus years to satisfy a few. Plus follow your data from the surveys that you have recently done. When I watched the public TV the percentages you gave were less for these proposals than for. If I recall like 43% for and 57% against it. There was another survey that had the same numbers. So you are going against the majority. So please listen to the people that don't want this.

Robby Beyer

Winifred SD

Farmerbob65@hotmail.com

Comment:

I feel the current system is the fairest way to do it. I see people complaining they don't get a tag for what they put in for. Then when you suggest to them to apply for a tag in another unit they complain and say if I am going to do that I just as well go out of state. So the way I see it they are not serious enough about hunting if they won't consider other options. Plus by changing the system you are destroying family traditions that span over 60 plus years to satisfy a few. Plus follow your data from the surveys that you have recently done. When I watched the public TV the percentages you gave were less for these proposals than for. If I recall like 43% for and 57% against it. There was another survey that had the same numbers. So you are going against the majority. So please listen to the people that don't want this.

Daniel Meseberg

Watertown SD

Comment:

Why, with new license proposal, does the GFP insist on alienating and punishing those hunters that have been so loyal for decades? The application as is, seems fair, to get your license with preference points.

Roger Johnson

Pierre SD

Johnsonrogera@yahoo.com

Comment:

The new proposal takes away the opportunity to apply for both an east river license and a west river license of my choice.

Jamie Olinger

Rapid City SD

Jamieolinger@yahoo.com

Comment:

I support the proposed deer drawing change. I like the idea of better odds of drawing my preferred deer tag. The way it is now I have to wait 1 to 2 years to draw a tag.

Nathan Jagim

Spearfish SD

Comment:

I'm so frustrated that I can't draw a hills deer tag. I prefer to only apply for a hills tag but am only successful every third year. Other friends draw multiple tags while I sit at home and wait to draw my first choice.

Steven Haugen

Tracy MN

shaugen@iw.net

Comment:

I started hunting in South Dakota when I was in my 20's. I'm now 66 and have not drawn a West River firearms deer license in four years yet I keep trying. The changes being proposed by GFP in my opinion will make it even harder for a non-resident to obtain a deer license in South Dakota. First, you reduced the non-resident licenses available so we were seldom able to draw the license desired. When we were not successful in the drawing, we used to be able to purchase remaining resident licenses after the drawings. My hunting group did this a number of times even though we didn't get to hunt the area we wanted. This is how much we enjoyed hunting west river South Dakota. Your latest proposed change would seem to take this opportunity out of reach. It seems your license regulations have switched from population management in favor of managing who can obtain a license. I read you loud and clear, you really don't want non-residents in your state.

Marty Wilcox

Rapid City SD

Mwilcox1947000@yahoo.com

Comment:

Support the deer draw change. It's frustrating and disappointing not to be able to hunt my preferred area.

Joshua Hagemann

Mission Hill SD

jghagemann@hotmail.com

Comment:

I stand behind all of my previous statements from the first incarnation of this proposal. The data sets presented were incomplete and misleading. The 2010 and 2014 survey questions were purposely vague. There has not been one survey for this proposal that is representative of the population. Let's cut to the chase. Some folks complained because they couldn't draw an anydeer tag out there back door every year. GFP heard from them and looked into it. GFP came up with a plan to address their concerns and brought it to the public. The majority of hunters that have spoken out are against the plan. Now you have to decide if the opinions of the few in favor of this proposal are more important than that of the majority. I've heard several times now that this isn't a popular vote. But, I'm having a hard time wrapping my head around how the people shouldn't have a say on something that will affect them. Again this proposal has nothing to do with game management. This only affects the people. Everyone that this will affect pays taxes, buys licenses, and contributes Pittman Robertson funds. Currently EVERYONE has EVERY opportunity to apply for ANY and EVERY deer license offered by SD. This proposal will now limit a portion of that population, simply because another portion is too stubborn to take advantage of the several opportunities that they already have.

If this passes I will find myself asking a few questions.

-If the opinion of the majority doesn't matter, whose does?

-Why have I been filling out surveys for years when it doesn't seem to matter?

-If it's not a popular vote how are the people supposed to have any say on what happens to them?

There have been 'tweaks' to this proposal as Mr. Robling would say. There has been a lot of emphasis on changing parts of this proposal, all while ignoring a larger point. You don't have to have this proposal at all. I know GFP has put a lot of work and effort into this plan. I know they don't want it to feel wasted. However, just because you work hard on something doesn't mean it's a good idea. Please listen to the people and vote NO to this proposal in ANY form.

Craig Hagemann

Winfred SD

Comment:

I am still opposed to the proposal in its new form.

It will end over 60 years of tradition of Black Hills deer hunting that our group has taken part in. I don't see how to get everyone to agree to apply for one season in a group if this passes. We have people that live in several different counties that send in as a group. Now they will have to choose whether to hunt at home or with the group in the Black Hills. Nobody will be on the same page.

Goodbye hunting traditions...

Mykel Glowcheski
Black Hawk SD
mykelg@outlook.com

Comment:

I support the proposal with the exception of special buck. Special buck should be included in the proposal draw and not its own draw.

Clifton Stone
Chamberlain SD
cstone@midstatesd.net

Comment:

While the modification at the previous Commission meeting was an improvement. I am still currently opposed to the proposal. If an individual's goal is to simply draw a buck tag, they could do that with fairly regular success by studying the draw statistics. I believe what most people want is to draw a buck tag in their preferred unit. I believe that the cubed preference point system will accomplish that goal for most individuals.

Lisa Hagemann
Mission Hill SD

Comment:

The data used to validate the proposal is not statistically significant, and is in conflicts with the reasoning in the deer management plan in regards to the numbers increase or decrease. This deer management plan states applicant numbers increase or decrease based on the number of licenses available.

Wesley Bouska
La Crosse WI

Comment:

I have religiously hunted South Dakota deer seasons every year since I was old enough and still come back as a nonresident. I do not see how the proposed changes, help anything. I do not want changes in the deer licensing system!

Bryan Goeden
Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

Proposed changes are unfair to Hunters who have worked to build relationships with landowners in both West and East River. Muzzleloader deer in no way should be included with the rifle drawing it is a separate season which is why muzzleloader hunters are not allowed to hunt with magnifying optics.

Steven Frooman

Rapid City SD

sfrooman@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose the deer allocation changes. Honestly, I oppose any changes. I don't support the stated goal for the change (allowing people who only want to hunt one unit in one season a better opportunity to get what they want), I don't support the blurring of the lines between the different seasons, and I don't think it's fair to ask multi-season hunters to be satisfied with whatever's left in the fourth drawing for all seasons but one when they won't receive any benefit to make up for their sacrifice. But, if the Commission feels it must combine the deer rifle season drawings somehow, in particular I oppose three things about the proposal up for finalization:

1) I oppose including the Black Hills season with the East River and West River seasons. Given the limited number of units, the high number of applicants relative to available tags, and the spike in applications for BD113 and BD213 tags in 2018 over 2017 as a result of preference point cubing making younger/newer hunters realize there's no point in wasting their application on BH101 or BH111 tags, I think the Black Hills season should be considered more like the Custer State Park season, as a once-in-awhile luxury season, than like the East River and West River seasons where it's reasonable to expect a tag more or less annually as long as you're smart about where you apply and are willing to travel (speaking of which, I realize there's significant differences between here and there as far as climate, terrain, human population & land use, whitetail size, and other the presence of other species but I grew up in Georgia where to this day an over-the-counter hunting license comes with 12 deer tags usable more-or-less statewide so the idea of people being able to get 5 or more tags in one year here in South Dakota strikes me as a long-term goal for the GFP Commission & Department to work towards everyone achieving, not the abomination some of this proposal's supporters have suggested in their comments that it is when someone achieves it currently), so I think people who've saved up the preference points for a reasonable chance of getting a buck tag in the Black Hills shouldn't be asked to give up their regular East River/West River hunt to take advantage of that prize.

2) I oppose including antlerless tags in the combined drawing. The whole point of combining drawings seems to be to mollify people with a strong sense of entitlement to their preferred tag. I assume those people are only interested in antlers.

3) I oppose making anyone successful in the 1st drawing wait until the 3rd drawing to apply for additional tags in other seasons. I think that's asking too much of the people who want to hunt in multiple parts of the state. I don't think the current system should be abandoned at all, but if you must make it so that nobody can obtain multiple first-draw tags, I think it's a fair compromise to leave people who used to do it with the opportunity to at least get a second-draw tag as long as it's not in the same season as their first-draw tag (so a person who was successful in the 1st drawing would be able to apply for any other rifle deer season's limited-draw tags in the 2nd drawing).

Corey Dillavou

Rapid City SD

CDILLAVOU@TRAFFICSERVICESCOMPANY.COM

Comment:

I support this proposal if all firearms deer tags are pooled together. My personal opinion is if you leave out the special buck tag, CSP, and black powder we will end up with the same results we currently have.

Ross Swedeen

Rapid City SD

reswedeen@yahoo.com

Comment:

Esteemed SD GFP Commissioners, First off, I would like to thank you for tackling this very contentious topic. I

thought you had your hands full with the amount of public comments (400+) you received on the cubing of the preference points. This deer license allocation proposal has blown the top off of that. I would bet you have all had some very interesting discussions! I believe you were awarded the Commission of the Year Award because of your willingness to discuss these kinds of topics, as well as the outcomes of those same topics. Secondly, I would like to thank those of you that took the time to personally talk to me today about this topic. I want to give you a little background on myself. I consider myself familiar with our current drawing structure. I consider myself familiar with this new proposal as well. I was fortunate to have the opportunity to participate in one of the focus groups. I have been involved in the South Dakota Big Game Coalition from its start up. I first heard about this topic from the South Dakota Big Game Coalition when the deer stakeholders were discussing it during their meetings reviewing the deer management plan. I have given public testimony at three separate Commissioner meetings in the last year and half on this topic in one shape or another. I apply for every deer license available with the exception of the special buck licenses. I also hunt exclusively on public land for deer. I have applied for roughly 10 years for all the different licenses. This year is only the second time I have drawn multiple first choice licenses. I drew WR, ER and Muzzleloader this year, all first choice units. Which to be honest with you, I am kind of bummed about. First and foremost, two of those licenses could have gone to someone that didn't draw a license this year. Secondly, I am a blue collar working man with two young children at home. My time for "leisure" activities is rather limited. Unfortunately, I will not be able to dedicate all the time I would have liked for each of these licenses. As I now have to divvy up that limited time between the three. I have multiple years and money vested into each one of those tough to draw licenses. However, that is nobodies fault but my own as I am the one that applied for them all. In full disclosure, I apply for tough to draw units as a first choice. I know that going into the drawing. I apply for those units for the amount of public land, as well as for the increased quality of hunt those units provide. I am estimator/project manager for a construction company. I make my living off of crunching numbers. I always apply for second choice licenses that I have a high probability of drawing. This ensures I get to spend additional time in the woods each fall with a rifle in my hand. There has never been a year that I have not drawn a deer license.

Here are some factual numbers from 2017 that show a change to our current system is warranted and plainly overdue. Our current system increased the number of applications (78,961) in all the different firearm deer seasons by 50% over unique individual deer hunters (52,633). At the same time 7.6% (3,985) of the 52,633 total deer hunters drew multiple first choice licenses. That is large percentage of double dipping for not much of a return, so to speak. This double dipping absolutely tanks the drawing odds. I fully supported the original proposal 100%. That proposal would have allowed a greater number of individual deer hunters the opportunity to enjoy the great outdoors each fall. While at the same time undoubtedly increased the drawings odds for all of the different seasons, some of those seasons substantially. I am in support the current proposal as well, with one exception. That exception is that I would like to see special buck added back into the mix. I understand why CSP and Refuge were pulled out. By doing so, I don't believe it will necessarily hurt the drawing odds for those two seasons. However, this will certainly not help them either. CSP and Refuge could be considered a "bonus" license or a "Christmas" license, in my opinion, based on the nature of the hunt and/or the very difficult drawing odds.

However, I think it is far fetched to consider the special buck licenses a "bonus" license or "Christmas" license or even a "heritage" license. First off, by removing the special buck licenses from the proposal it will still allow those that apply for those licenses to double dip. A person with WR special buck license would still be able to apply for a BH license or ER license as a first choice. Or a person with a ER special buck license would still be able to apply for BH license or a WR license as a first choice. Double dipping is what got us into this whole mess to begin with! Secondly if the special buck licenses were to remain out of the proposal, I would foresee the number of applications increase for those licenses. Therefore decreasing those drawing odds. I would predict the dedicated deer hunters that have access to private land that do not currently apply for special buck would start applying for it. As it will allow for them to have multiple first choice licenses in any given year, similar to our current system. I strongly urge you to reconsider adding the special buck licenses back into the mix. Or at the very least allow a person to apply for ER special buck and WR special buck while excluding them from applying in the ER/WR/BH/ML drawing. To my understanding, this can still be accomplished at the meeting next week before the vote for finalization happens.

I would venture to say that there is a lot of "double dipping" happening in the units with the most/best public land. I believe that is evident from the drawing odds in many of those units, at least in part. It seems those drawing odds get worse and worse each year. For example; 35L (Custer National Forest), Fall River County, BH Any Deer and many units along the Missouri River. By eliminating the double dipping we increase the frequency in which hunters will draw licenses for those units. The SDGFP model projections show that WR and BH drawing odds would see an increase (12% and 26% respectively). I used those seasons as an example because that is where a large percentage of South Dakota's public land deer hunting occurs. Those increases may not seem like much, but multiple that increase of frequency in drawing a preferred license across a persons lifetime. Reducing the amount of years to draw a certain license from every 3 years to every 2 years over the course of 50 years equates to 25 licenses (50/2) versus 16.7 (50/3).

That is a very important piece of the pie, in my opinion. Not only because I myself am a public land hunter, but the surveys and studies I have seen show "not having a place to hunt" is one of the main reasons people give up hunting. (<http://www.backcountrychronicles.com/why-hunters-quit-hunting/>). Additionally, this is critical to recruit and retain our youth hunters. As a public land hunter, my children are/will be public land hunters. Trying to keep a 12 year old's interest in hunting when they have to wait 2, 3, 4+ years to draw a buck license in the better public land units is a very difficult task. The other option is to apply for the units with sub par public land. That too has it's difficulties (IE: lower game densities, less areas to find solitude, etc.). Last but not least, the other option would be to find private land to hunt. That is no easy task either. That is getting more and more difficult with each passing year. Both my grandfathers spoke of being able to hunt anywhere they wanted growing up in South Dakota. Without having to ask for permission to boot. My uncles tell the same tales. Understandably, that is no longer the case. This proposal will allow a increased number of individual deer hunters the opportunity to enjoy the great outdoors each fall in South Dakota. This proposal will not guarantee anybody their preferred tag every year. However, this proposal will absolutely increase drawing odds, as there will be less "names in the hat". A savvy and dedicated hunter will still be able to draw multiple deer licenses in any given year with this proposal. This proposal does not change the supply (# of deer licences) or demand (# of deer hunters). It only changes the total number of applications in the first go around. Once all the emotion is pushed aside, the numbers and statistics clearly show a change to our deer tag allocation process is warranted. The defense of our current system can only come from pure selfishness. In my opinion, this proposal is for the greater good of all deer hunters in this state. Please prove yet again why you were awarded the Commission of the Year by supporting this proposal in it's current form, or even better, with a few modifications. Thank you for taking the time to read my book.

Pat Malcomb

Sioux Falls SD

pmalcomb@sio.midco.net

Comment:

Not needed

Matt Lavin

Vermillion SD

davispharmacy@davispharmacy.com

Comment:

I would like an explanation as to why there is a push to change the current deer season tag/application process. I have seen nothing in print that explains this satisfactorily. As an avid hunter, I have a hard time coming up for a reason that there would need to be a change that would restrict the number of tags that I would be able to initially apply for and or even receive. The current system requires a small amount of diligence on a hunters part to actually remember to apply, but beyond that the preference point system takes care of the rest. If I want to hunt multiple season in multiple areas, the sole restriction should be my preference point total. If the current recommended changes go into place, a hunter will have to continually be applying for left over tags. I personally see this as a move in the wrong direction. It seems like the steps being put into place are leading up to a more commercialization of our deer hunting seasons! As a hunter/family that apply for and kill multiple deer each year I see this as a huge negative for hunting in our state. If this process goes forward, the likelihood of me taking the extra time and effort to get the extra tags that we use, will push me to find other places to hunt. For being an institution that is in place to help manage our wildlife for the residents of the state of South Dakota, this in no way will help do that. I have enjoyed being able to raise my children with the ability to take a fall and hunt our great state. These trips have allowed me to show them parts of our state that they would have otherwise have never seen, much like my father did with me. Limiting the number of tags will do nothing to help manage our deer herds and if it leads to more commercialized hunting, I personally will choose to take my business (hunting) out of this state. That is not what the GFP were put in place for, as a state entity, you are there to represent the hunters of South Dakota. How is this change going to help me?

Roger Wiltz

Wagner SD

rwiltz@charles-mix.com

Comment:

I am strongly opposed to the propose change, as are everyone I've talked to. Don't fight the wishes of the majority

Andy Vandel

Pierre SD

andyvandel@yahoo.com

Comment:

I supported the September proposal but feel that removing the special buck will lose the effectiveness of the whole idea. Someone will now be able to draw a special buck any deer tag then compete with everybody else in the first draw for another hi demand tag. Change it back to the original proposal or scrap the whole thing.

Calvin Burger
Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

Please leave the drawing system the way it is. Most of us with any common sense knows that you must use preference points or put in for less popular units. What will this really solve? Maybe a few will quit complaining. I doubt it. Many many of us the try to hunt or at least put in for multiple units are good about taking kids, ext hunting. We do not need any more people out there that just want the "big buck" and think that the landowner owes it to them to let them hunt. Most of us have cultivated over the year good landowner sportsman relations. I too, was a landowner once. Now I'm an older man, retired, handicapped person that would like to get out a little more in my life and hunt and would like to see my kids and grandsons hunt. Your proposal would severely limit these possibilities.

Charlie Carlson
Mitchell SD
Charlie.carlson@tessiersinc.com

Comment:

oppose

Frank Warner
Hot Springs SD
warnershome@yahoo.com

Comment:

The more I think about it the more I disagree with this. Why is we used to have over the counter license and no problem but the last 25 years of gfp we are worse off getting a tag. Each year the license quota keep dropping and we continually have to buy points in hopes of getting a tag. I think better (less) management would go along ways. Have several license set aside for landowners on the first draw and then roll those over for the next drawing or no quota for landowners and they check s box which allows them one. But shouldn't go against non landowner quotas. Keep areas separate hills, wr,er and archery. Get rid of special seasons, except antlerless could be extended.

Ken Krieger

Burke SD

oakcanyonranch@goldenwest.net

Comment:

Nonresident deer hunters have a difficult time drawing South Dakota tags with the current system. Why penalize nonresidents and make it more difficult for them to draw tags with a new draw system? No one single person in SD needs 5-6 deer tags per person when a nonresident can't draw a tag. If drawing changes need to be made ... open up the second draw for both residents and nonresidents to apply. Don't penalize nonresidents with fewer deer draw opportunities when all the tags are gone by the fourth draw.

Why does the SD GFP love nonresident pheasant hunters so much, but hates nonresident deer hunters and wants to penalize them with fewer draw opportunities?

Blake Lupkes

Utica SD

Blake_lupkes@hotmail.com

Comment:

The change of the drawing structure is stupid. I want to hunt west river and east river But if they change it. I can't hunt my favorite place to hunt?? Witch is stupid and I don't like them adding a bunch of new rules witch the game fish and parks don't even know.

Jason Smith

Pierre SD

Jasons@pie.midco.net

Comment:

Strongly oppose

Fish Limits

Travis Blum

Bennington NE

Comment:

The Missouri river system. Please get rid of the no length limit in July and August on fransis case and sharp. And make it 15 inch minimum Year round.

Robert Zimmerman

Rapid City SD

sszimmerman06@gmail.com

Comment:

Over the past few years, we have enjoyed very trout good fishing at Deerfield lake. There are many hold-back or wild trout over 14" and have very good body size and mass. We really enjoy going to a lake close to home and having opportunities to catch nice trout.

The trout fishing at Deerfield lake is unlike any other lake in the Black Hills in terms of quality and size.

Further, many of the trout in the lake are wild hatched, the F&G 2015 creel survey stated that that 47% of the trout caught at the lake were not of hatchery origin. This is the only lake in the Black Hills where rainbow trout reproduce in large enough numbers to provide opportunities for anglers to catch nice sized wild-hatched fish.

Removing the length limit at this lake is a bad idea because it would significantly degrade the fishing quality at the lake and likely would result in the lake becoming another put-and-take fishery where most of the trout caught would become small planted hatchery fish. There are already many put-and-take fisheries in the black hills and opportunities to catch hatchery fish.

Second, if the big fish are removed from the lake, the breeding stock of fish in the lake could be significantly reduced, significantly decreasing wild trout numbers in the lake and the overall number of trout in the lake.

Please do not change the rainbow trout regulations on Deerfield lake. Please allow at least one lake in the Black Hills to provide an opportunity for anglers to reliably catch numbers of quality trout.

Do not turn Deerfield lake into just another put-and-take fishery.

Robert Zimmerman

Rapid City SD

sszimmerman06@gmail.com

Comment:

I do not support the universal removal of the length limit of Black Bass.

I often fish lakes, such as Sheridan Lake in the Black Hills for Bass, which receives extremely high fishing pressure. I catch many bass up to the 14" limit, and very few over 14". Many of the bass already have hook marks, indicating they have been caught and released before.

Changing this rule to allow the keep of every bass would decimate the bass fishing in these high pressure lakes from over harvest. It would also harm reproduction rates and allow the rock bass to completely dominate the fishery.

Regulations should be crafted to insure that on lakes that receive high fishing pressure that some of the larger, reproducing black bass can be maintained in the fishery.

Patrick Zimmerman

Rapid City SD

pzimmerman2010@gmail.com

Comment:

Please keep this regulation! My family and I love to fly-fish Black on Hills lakes. We have spent thousands of dollars on boats, equipment, gas, lodging and restaurants in the Black Hills area because of the chance to catch and release large fish. If this regulation is eliminated we will fish in neighboring states instead.

I have fished all over the world including places renowned for the opportunity to catch big fish using fly fishing gear. The Black Hills now provides little recognized opportunities for quality fishing that exceeds those of New Zealand, the Amazon, and Africa. Elimination of this regulation will turn all of the Black Hills lakes into "put and take" fisheries of no interest to those who just want to fill their freezers.

These regulations work! Word of the fabulous fishing opportunities in the Black Hills will spread! The economy of the State will benefit. Please do not eliminate this regulation!

Nathan Clark

Watertown SD

Comment:

So, rather than do the right thing and open "private" Long Lake for all fisherman, the GFP are going to make the trip to that area more exclusionary? BTW I am not even allowed to park, let alone fish from the public road County 36 into Horseshoe. Get the signage taken down and I would be more impressed than reducing the fishing limit. Most fisherman with ethics would throw the 28" back anyway.

Jamie Hintz

Clear Lake SD

deuelhwy@itctel.com

Comment:

No biological impact ? I would be interested how those tests were conducted. From what I can see, a lake can definitely be fished down from over harvest and people not obeying the possession limit. I think that anybody who has the privilege to fish every day also has the responsibility to practice ethical sportsmanship. With my job I put on a lot of miles around the county and get a good look at what goes on with fishing and hunting. I see the same boats with the same locals on these lakes when a bite is on and they fish it everyday until the fish quit. I get to here stories like "I dont keep too many cuz I trade them for beef ", or " I have a freezer at my sons who doesnt fish so they wont check Him." Some of these small lakes wont take this and even the big lakes wont. Catch and release is a phrase seldom heard anymore, and the days of supplying the neighborhood with fish should be over. Some say that catch and release kills too many fish but the figures that I have heard, I disagree with. maybe some die during hot days when they pulled from deep water but we have small ponds and have caught the same fish numerous times. One thing is for sure, when they hit the fillet table, then they are dead. Thank You. Jamie Hintz. Clear lake, SD .

Clay Boyum
Sioux Falls SD
Clayboyum@gmail.com

Comment:

There is no reason to change the 15 inch walleye regulation. The resource needs to be protected, that's your job!

Jason Adams
Watertown SD
Jason Wayne Adams@
hotmail.com

Comment:

We cannot build a walleye population up if everyone's keeping small fish. This will only ruin many lakes that can produce nice sized fish naturally when the bait fish are readily available in that lake system

Tim Larson
Centerville SD
Beaverskinner484@gmail.com

Comment:

I'm against removing the size limit, I would rather see a 15 inch minimum state wide year around. Removing the minimum will only lead to a lot of small walleyes being harvested to only lead to a fished out lake we can't have this happen under any circumstances

Robert Kolhoff
Sioux Falls SD
robk@cleanandgreen.com

Comment:

Removing size limits invites taking and killing of important female spawning females that helps to maintain populations. Many anglers have observed plenty of anglers willing to kill such fish, when this is allowed on marginal or pressured bodies of water populations suffer for years at a time.

Jonathan Kludt
Mitchell SD
jonnyf11@yahoo.com

Comment:

Removing size limits on bass and walleye at Lake Mitchell doesn't make sense with the current fish populations. I am sure there are a lot of lakes this would be true. Not a fan of simplifying regulations. More of a fan of conserving the resource and protecting overharvest. I would like to continue to see bass over 17 inches protected on a few select fisheries to create a unique fishing opportunities.

Rodney Brase

Omaha NE

rodney@braseelectrical.com

Comment:

As a tourist that fishes in South Dakota 5 times each year, I come for the good bass fishing they have. I practice catch and release which helps keep good fishing. Please keep your restrictions on large & smallmouth bass. Thanks Rodney Brase

Kenneth Hallstrom

Aberdeen SD

khallstrom@abe.midco.net

Comment:

The number of Asian fisherman, many coming from Minnesota, who cover the roads on Waubay, Rush and many other lakes has made me aware that many don't even have a license, much less honor limits anyway. If you frequent the roads and shorelines especially, in the spring, you will see what I mean. Making the fish a "rough fish" seems foolish. It's really a great fish.

Dennis Schmoker

Council Bluffs IA

deschmoker@cox.net

Comment:

Small mouth are very slow growing!!!

Timothy Dooley

Vermillion SD

doolz6664@gmail.com

Comment:

Removing the 15" size limit would be a horrible mistake. South Dakota fisheries already have a depleted walleye population if anything we should be more vigilant with the size and possession limits.

Douglas Mitchell

Pierre SD

Comment:

This seems to go against good fish management in some of our lakes.

Mark Zacher

Rapid City SD

zachers2@rap.midco.net

Comment:

I think removing the size restrictions on Bass and walleye would be a mistake, I do a lot of Bass tournaments and catch a walleye or two now and then as well, and allot of our lakes I have seen the trophy fish size increase very nicely, opening this up would destroy this, What about the future for young anglers ? we need to protect this especially in lakes where these fish produce on there own. I have seen many shore fisherman fishing on restricted lakes keep fish that should have been released, but when you say something it creates allot of friction so I go about my way. But please don't remove this on these great trophy fish, you have done a great job in the past lets continue to do so...Thank you.

Bradee Beard

Rapid City SD

bradee.beard@yahoo.com

Comment:

I am opposed to the possible changes to trout regulations to the extent that they would treat self-sustaining trout fisheries the same as put-and-take fisheries. The Black Hills has only a few, small, trout fisheries with natural reproduction but they are of very high quality and removing the daily limit of one trout more than 14 inches long would greatly and negatively impact these sustaining fisheries. Trout of 14 inches or longer are the prime spawning stock in these fisheries and removing the 14-inch limit would undo many of the inroads GF&P has made into keeping natural reproduction in these fisheries. Remove the 14-inch regulation on put-and-take fisheries if you must, but PLEASE keep this regulation in effect for trout fisheries with natural reproduction. Thank you.

Kenneth Kochel

Spearfish SD

BigReid@gmail.com

Comment:

I support the elimination of the one trout more than 14 inches long because I see numerous dead trout in that size range. They were caught & released because the fisherperson already caught their "one 14" or larger" fish. This is a terrible waste.

I also support the elimination of the domicile possession limit.

Respectfully submitted,
Kenneth Kochel

Greg Johnson

Lead SD

wefish@rushmore.com

Comment:

support. Please allow a more reasonable trout limit in the black hills. The current limit is far to restrictive and often only allows 1 fish to be taken home in a day.

Paul Trontvet
Rapid City SD
sventhenorskie@aol.com

Comment:

I approve of the changes from only one trout over 14 inches to 5 of any length. I also approve of dropping the possession limit at one's home. Too many nice trout die after being caught on bait and released.

Charles Loftis
Rapid City SD
chuckloftis@gmail.com

Comment:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Has anyone complained about the larger trout stocked and growing in our Black Hills lakes? No, of course not. Obviously, some anglers' only complaint deals with the limit number. Please consider these suggested changes, and that they be implemented concurrently: one, do away with the size restrictions in daily trout limits and, two, designate two (2) lakes in the Black Hills trout management area as "special regulation." I suggest the following:

1. Relocate resident pike to nearby Stockade Lake and manage Lakota Lake STRICTLY as a trout lake.
2. Designate each lake as water with the same regulations as those of the first three miles of Rapid Creek below Pactola Reservoir and Spearfish Creek from Pump House No. 2 to Maurice Intake (catch-and-release, flies and artificial lures only) .
3. Putting Lakota Lake into this management plan would offer a Hills experience to resident and touring anglers wanting to catch quality-to-trophy trout (16-24+ inches), while those desiring to keep trout have four (4) other lakes to choose from within relatively few miles of Lakota (Legion, Sylvan, Horsethief, and Center). Lakota has a history of growing sizable fish after their stocking, given the meaty forage base of baitfish and crayfish.
4. Putting West Mirror Lake or Coxes Lake into this management plan offers an additional outer-Hills experience to resident and touring anglers who desire catching and releasing quality-to-trophy trout (16-24+ inches), while those desiring to keep trout have three (3) other lakes to choose from within relatively few miles of either (East Mirror, Coxes or West Mirror, and Iron Creek lakes, respectively).

I believe this suggestion would work to keep all trout angling fans happy, as those wanting to keep more fish would go one way, while those wanting to keep none, yet catch and release large trout, would go the other. The beauty is that each will be happy. If GF&P will not consider the management change for Lakota Lake and West Mirror or Coxes lakes, respectively, please consider only increasing that new trout limit to two (2) fish over 14 inches in order to maintain a quality trout fishery in the Black Hills. Thanks again for the opportunity to comment and keep up the good work.

Steven Frooman

Rapid City SD

sfrooman@gmail.com

Comment:

I support the elimination of the 1 trout over 14 inches rule on lakes in the Black Hills management area. However, I think the rule should include rainbow trout in the portion of Rapid Creek immediately upstream of Pactola Reservoir, through Silver City (and possibly similar portions of creeks feeding other lakes) for two reasons: 1, to maintain flexibility in fishing different areas in any order the same day (otherwise legally keeping 2 or 3 >14" trout caught in Pactola would make it illegal to then fish the upstream part of Rapid Creek that day) and 2, since they're probably the same "pool" of fish.

Dustin Muters

Rapid City SD

Dcm6861@gmail.com

Comment:

I very much enjoy the taste of properly prepared rainbow trout. But I do find it discouraging when only one fish above 14" may be harvested.

My enthusiasm for trout fishing would be greatly increased if lakes like Pactola Reservoir would have modified size limits. You cant hardly catch them smaller then 14" throughout most of the lake.

I think a modification allowing two fish over 14", while restricting only one over 18" would dramatically improve the overall satisfaction of a fishery comparable to Pactola. Hopefully, this wouldnt have too dramatic of an effect on the fish population.

Richard Roden

Belle Fourche SD

1jimmyshilo@gmail.com

Comment:

I believe we should be able to keep the 5 limit no matter the size, please change the 1 over 14" rule in the hills

Charles Curry

Rapid City SD

gunguychuck@gmail.com

Comment:

We have been catching much bigger trout since the one over 14 inches, or 16 as in the past. However we always come home with one trout apiece, because we haven't caught any under 14 inches. I don't need to catch my limit, but would like to come home with maybe 2 over 14 inches. Also I wonder how many of the over 14 inches released live. Some of the ones released have damage from the hooks. If you bait fish almost every fish swallows the hook. I like catching the bigger trout. I think there should be maybe a limit of 2 over 14.

Chris Horsley
Black Hawk SD
Horsley7127@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please do away with the only 1 over 14" law

Jim Thompson
Madison SD
thompsji.69@gmail.com

Comment:

Does the science support the change? Do what is right for the fishery. Don't make a change just because a small group complains. The majority of anglers want to catch fish, one or two over 14 inches is sufficient.

Fishing Season Methods

Craig Bowman
Madison SD

Comment:

I think lifting the possession limit in a permanent resident is NOT a good idea ,cuz I have seen and known of people that limit out wether it be walleye, perch, crappie etc..... go home clean or have cleaned the fish already put them in the freezer and go back for more to limit one again. I DO believe that if u lift this rule it'll only get worse and WILL harm the fishery for LOTS of other anglers.

Marc Schmitz
Pierre SD
marcdec22@yahoo.com

Comment:

Perhaps possession limits do not have a biological impact on fish populations but it does deter the ' go everyday' fisherman from loading up his freezer. The current regulations encourage, however minimally, fisherman throwing a few back because their freezer is at its limit. I believe this is a serious miscalculation and will result in an even great waste of our public resources.

Ronald Hubner

Sioux Falls SD

R.ghubner

Comment:

I don't understand why a game dept. You've just about got rid of all regulations. All you think about are out of state people. You could just as well allow every one use. Nets. Oh yes I forgot we can't use nets for minnows. ??

Terry Narum

Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

dumb rule to begin with

Jim Dawson

Sioux Falls SD

72771@msn.com

Comment:

GF&P should look at doing the same for waterfowl and upland game birds.

Marcus Hicks

Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

This leads to unnecessary taking of fish and would almost be impossible for GFP to enforce daily possession limits and other types of investigations if the trick is to simply get the fish home, cleaned and in the freezer.

Eric Pederson

Warner SD

taznbenelli@gmail.com

Comment:

Possession limits are a good thing!!! Getting rid of them invites double bagging or people taking fish home and going back out to catch more. Don't mess with it. If I run out of something fish or birds then I need to wait until the following year to get more. At least it isn't wasted in a freezer somewhere.

Dave Boerger

Milbank SD

david.boerger@k12.sd.us

Comment:

Pike use these areas to spawn, or go through these areas to spawn for one thing. Pike numbers are down, and so is their ave. size. Not just a little mind you. It was easy to catch a pike in the double digits 10-20 years ago. Spearing, out of staters, large limits of 6 in my opinion have been a major contributor. People leaving pike on the ice, slitting throats, I have seen all this for I have always fished for this water wolf as it has been called in the past. I will retire soon, and I know restraint is better than opening it up to more human predation. I went fishing last week for pike at Rush lake over the weekend, and did not catch one pike. That is not at all like it was. I talk to my taxidermist who mounted my 21lb 15 ounce pike I think three years ago, to which we just have not seen the big fish remotely close since then come in unless it was out at the river. Please take care to protect our pike, and consider taking the limit down to perhaps 3 with one over a set length. Thanks for your time and understanding!

Adam Golay

Sioux Falls SD

adamgolay@yahoo.com

Comment:

What really hurts our walleye lakes is when out of staters mostly MN come over here & fish the heck out of our lakes during the spawn. We should not allow MN people to come over here & fish if they're seasons are closed, We should not allow them to fish SD until 3rd Saturday in May when theirs is open otherwise they come over here & keep female fish 1 over 20" every day. They aren't smart enough to release them. We also need a true slot where fish need to be released immediately. Size for walleye for that should be in the range of 20"-27" or so.

Leonard Spomer

Pierre SD

lspom@mncomm.com

Comment:

I could understand increasing the possession limit at the angler's permanent residence to perhaps 4-6 times the daily limit. The possession limit is another tool that law enforcement can use to prosecute known violators of our fish and game regulations.

Jamie Hintz

Clear Lake SD

deuelhwy@itctel.com

Comment:

An increase in the possession limit would not be a bad idea but I dont think eliminating it would sit well with most who dont get to fish as much as some people. Its too valuable of a resource just to see a privileged few fill their freezers.

Doug Ries

Watertown SD

squibbler213@gmail.com

Comment:

I support this action of removing the possession limits for fish.

Weyland Anderson

Rapid City SD

weylandrsn@mac.com

Comment:

support. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Joseph Leshuk

Rapidcity SD

jgleshuk@rap.midco.net

Comment:

The size limit should remain year round, except July /august. The slot limit needs to change @ orman. This slot limit is too restricted. Change to 16-18.. there should be a size limit on crappies / white base. By removing size limit people will take smaller fish which in my opinion is unethical.

Doug Ries

Watertown SD

squibbler213@gmail.com

Comment:

This is the first decent idea the GDP has had in a very long time

Gregg Yonkovich

Aberdeen SD

gjyonkovich1@mmm.com

Comment:

support

Gerald Wickstrom

Chamberlain SD

none

Comment:

What is the problem? Don't change if it's not broken. A lot of fishers will become greedier without possession limits for their homes. A lot of the resource will be wasted and discarded from freezers.

Douglas Mitchell

Pierre SD

Comment:

I don't think anyone needs unlimited possession. It probably works well for guides to keep a lot in their freezer to fill out their clients if they need to.

Jeffrey Trapp

Milbank SD

jeffrey.trapp@k12.sd.us

Comment:

I disagree wholeheartedly that taking away possession limits wouldn't effect fish populations. I am an avid pan fisherman. If there weren't possession limits people would be able to sit over bluegill beds every day of the spawn and fill their limit. If a lake would get hit hard just one year it would ruin the size structure of the lake for longer than most of us will be alive. They would also be able to do the same to crappies during the spawn. They could limit out daily in walleyes in the spring and fall from shore. Where are we going to get the fish to replenish all of the biomass we are taking out of the lakes? Who needs more than two limits of fish in their freezer? It angers me when I hear people talk about all the fish they had to throw out because it was freezer burned. We would in essence be encouraging want and waste by allowing people to fill their freezers with no intent to eat the fish. Angling is supposed to be about having fun and enjoying the outdoors. This will turn some people into meat hunters who will keep a limit just because they can and not because they want the fish to eat. I also believe that it opens up the door to fish poaching especially during the winter. Conservation officers have it hard enough but how are they to know if someone has been in their shack for 3 days with 3 limits or if they just caught 3 limits of fish that day. The SDGFP is beginning to scare me with some of the proposals that people don't support and local CO's don't agree with. Please listen to the anglers who are actually concerned with the fish and not their freezers. Thank you.

Zach Busch

Mankato MN

hardwaterhero5@gmail.com

Comment:

Being a SD native who regularly returns to the state to fish I am beside myself that this proposal has even gotten this far. What good would come from this? Out of staters, like myself, will travel to enjoy the fisheries South Dakota has to offer with the current slots and limits. If the idea is to bring in more money by selling more licenses due to no limits on fish I can't begin to imagine what else you have in store for us. PLEASE kill this proposal and save the fisheries. Individuals will hammer as many fish as they can and keep EVERYTHING, and this won't be hard during the spawning period. There's absolutely no good that would come from this.

Mark Bellum

Watertown SD

yote1963@yahoo.com

Comment:

I am not in favor of the 'no possession' changes. Nobody needs that many fish in freezer. This applies especially to the out of state fisherman. They are already getting a huge break with the 'dirt cheap' season license.

Off the subject, but that should be doubled or tripled in cost. You charge your own residents money for a big game preference point, you give the Reetz family \$8,000 for what should be a normal fishery, and you let the out of state fisherman practically fish for free? You must have a bottomless account. So NO to a change in possession limit.

John Ramsey

Pierre SD

Ramseykar@aol.com

Comment:

Making it legal to have as many fish in your freezer. Is just as bad as throwing them away when they get freezer burned! Our officers are tasked enough now they will have to keep track of anglers returning multiple times a day ! This change will bring out the greed and encourage bad behavior . Maybe you should start small and only increase the possession limit to a three day total first and see how it goes. What this commission does next will decide the impact on one of our most valuable resources.

Barry Schmoker

Lincoln SD

bschmok@gmail.com

Comment:

Speaking for 19 other anglers from the Lincoln and Omaha area that visit the Missouri River Reservoirs and Glacial Lakes area multiple times each season, nobody is in favor of this proposed change. Our recent visits to the Glacial Lakes over the past four years have seen a dramatic decrease in the size and total catch numbers of bass. The recruitment of young bass has also shown steady decline. None of this is a sign of a healthy population of bass in the coming years. Every bit of research that I have read shows no adverse relationship on walleye populations with an increase of bass. The same could not be said for northern pike or carp. In summary, fewer quality bass fishing experiences mean fewer visits from out-of- state clients. We vote with the dollars we spend! Please reconsider and value the bass fishery you have in SD.

Other

Alex Schaeffer

Aberdeen SD

ajshaef@gmail.com

Comment:

Moving the reopening of antlerless deer season to the week right after it closes doesn't do the hunters any good at all--the success rate will be very poor--at that time they are all scattered and pheasant hunters are still walking every bit of cover available as people seem to be hunting later in the season more than they used to. At least in January it gives them a little time to regroup and settle down--if you see one the week after the season they will most likely be running before you ever get near them

Phil Marvin

Onawa IA

prmarvin@ymail.com

Comment:

I'm confused as to what part of the lake will be closed effective October 10

Donna Peterson

Sisseton SD

joep@venturecomm.net

Comment:

Pickereel Lake has never had a issue of campers parking on the grass. we don't destroy grass. This idea of back in campers must come from someone who doesn't have a camper. please forgot these two rules. Leave our parks for Lori to take care of I would say she has done a great job in past YEARS.

Jim Gruber

Estelline SD

jgruber148@yahoo.com

Comment:

i listened to the rapidly run through of the indian springs closure.. first by gfp telling us that all is calm on the nonmeandered waters issue, and then that it is a good compromise.... i ask for who? today you voted to close indian springs for 1000 or more acres, used by hundreds of sportsmen throughout s.d. for one man... you should have let him shut it down, and then live with it .. instead you sacrificed all, with the pretense of , a good alternative.... pathetic.. again all it did was push more and more of us into tighter hunting and fishing areas like dry lake number 1 and 2... one has to ask, why for all these years was the antelope lake refuge good enough,, and now all of a sudden this particular land owner is concerned about scaring ducks and geese..... the answer is no... what he really wants is better opportunities to make more money leasing and providing private hunting area for him and his clients... that 3000 acres closed now increased to over 4,000.

Charles Clayton

Huron SD

clayton@hur.midco.net]

Comment:

I find it interesting that the GF&P, the state legislature, and the Governor just shut down access to all public water above private land
---- and now they want us to "adopt a lake"???? Why, so they can turn it over to private hands/landowners????
You folks have not only not opened any of the closed lakes, you have paid a private landowner and let them set the fishing rules above their land, that they do not have to obey in the winter --- on public water with public fish and wildlife!! What the hell is wrong with you people??

Curtis Pansch

Sioux Falls SD

cjpansch@alliancecom.net

Comment:

Horses have been a part of South Dakota history for the last few hundred years. I would propose to release six or eight neutered horses from the horse ranch in the southern hills. Have various colors and ages. They would be a wonderful addition and draw as much interest as the burros. You could even release a couple bred mares but stallions would have to be removed or gelded at some point.

Michael Venable

Monroe, LA

mike.venable@nutrien.com

Comment:

support. Need extra Waterfowl permits for my Hunting party in Bennett County, for dates of Oct. 22-24th, need 7 more permits for those days, Four of us already have & paid for them, now we are spending \$ in your state, and the Landowner we are hunting with,

Rob Fines

Pierre SD

Comment:

I wanted to visit with the commission for a couple of reasons. The past two years I have been very fortunate to draw archery cow elk tags in Zone H2. Both years I hunted I was unsuccessful in harvesting an elk. Each year I spent 18 days in August and September spotting and hunting. I am 58 years old and have hunted all my adult life. I have had some very good times hunting and fishing but these two hunts were incredible. I camped in the trees and did a lot of walking/stalking sitting over waterholes. I seen elk everyday and even named a few of them. It was an experience every hunter should have an opportunity to participate in. Both years I hunted I felt I had the area to myself. After the opening weekend I very seldom ran into any other hunters. It was great for me but I wonder why more hunter couldn't be added to the season. I know there is a problem for hunters to get a licenses and have to wait many years in some cases over 20 years to get a tag. So I would propose that there be a change to the current season. Why not cut the archery season in September into two seasons. The first season could be for two weeks and the second season could be last two weeks all in September. The number of licenses could be increased. The number of elk harvested would not increase that much. You could also move some of the late season cow tags into the archery season to cover increase in licenses. It's a shame to have this type of resource and very little opportunity for hunters. Keep in mind I know I'm not able to hunt elk for may years so my proposal is not to help me but to help other experience this hunt.

My second proposal is concerning landowner tags. I'm confused why the rules are so different for landowners in the Black Hills and landowners in the rest of South Dakota. I understand elk can eat a lot of grass and it may cost them money but that does not explain why the rules are different.

So I propose that we do support the landowner in a more fair way for both sportsman and landowner. We start by requiring landowner tags to hunt their land only. Extend landowner season from September 1 to Jan 31. If they really have elk using their land they will have 5 months to fill their tag. In addition the only tags they may receive would be cow tags. I think the tags should be given to the landowner. If a landowner wants a bull tag they must apply in the general drawing like all other hunters. If it is truly a grass issue this proposal will cover their needs. It is not right that a select few get to hunt elk every year and compete with someone that has been applying for a tag for 20 years.

I plan to pursue this issue very aggressively over the next year. I think both proposals are fair and responsible for both landowner and sportsman. I have visited with other sportsman, east river landowners and GF&P officials and they all agree these are good proposals and should be reviewed and taken seriously.

I look forward to hearing from you on these issue. Thank you again for providing such a great experience

Spearing and Archery

Paul Trontvet

Rapid City SD

sventhenorskie@aol.com

Comment:

The spearing or harpooning of game fish such as N. Pike is shameful. You ought to not allow it.

Douglas Mitchell

Pierre SD

Comment:

support

Andy Vandel

Pierre SD

andyvandel@yahoo.com

Comment:

I support opening all of Lake Sharp and Francis Case to under water game fish spearing. I agree with Mr. Adams that activity from divers will not congest the tailrace area of Lake Sharp. Opening this area to game fish spearing will increase the opportunity for the small number of folks that take part in this sport.

Jesse Flottmeyer

Pierre SD

Jesse.Flottmeyer@state.sd.us

Comment:

This would allow more locations for spearing of game fish for residence of Pierre. Would also bring in out of town dollars to our community. I feel there would be minimal impact with boat fisherman.

David Coley

Pierre SD

Comment:

I support the proposals to increase spearing opportunities.

Steven Frooman

Rapid City SD

sfrooman@gmail.com

Comment:

support

**GAME, FISH AND PARKS COMMISSION ACTION
FINALIZATION**

10

Camping Permits and Rules

Chapter 41:03:04

Commission Meeting Dates:	Proposal	October 4-5	Deadwood
	Public Hearing	November 1-2	Sioux Falls
	Finalization	November 1-2	Sioux Falls

COMMISSION PROPOSAL

1. Create a definition in administrative rule for a new service offering - "Modern cabin – a structure provided by the department furnished with beds, electricity, sewer and water."
2. Establish a nightly fee of \$150 for a modern cabin.
3. Change the nightly fee for the group lodge at Shadehill Recreation Area from \$205 to \$280.
4. Establish fees for use of the Good Earth State Park amphitheater of \$300 for 4 hours and \$600 for all day (6:00 a.m. to 11 p.m. from May 1 to September 30, and 6 a.m. to 9 p.m. from October 1 to April 30).

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION

Recommended changes from proposal: None

SUPPORTIVE INFORMATION

1. A definition is needed in administrative rule to define a new service for which a fee needs to be established.
2. Currently, state park campgrounds offer campsites, camping cabins and group lodges as overnight lodging options. A demand has been expressed for a cabin option having modern amenities (heat/AC, bathroom & kitchen) designed primarily for a family. The proposed fee is \$150 per night.
3. We are currently expanding a popular group lodge at Shadehill Recreation Area by adding another bedroom and a 2nd bathroom. The added capacity warrants a fee increase.
4. An outdoor amphitheater was constructed at Good Earth State Park this summer. The amphitheater has seating for 150 individuals with capacity for up to 500 on the ground. A special event fee needs to be established for public use of the facility.

APPROVE _____	MODIFY _____	REJECT _____	NO ACTION _____
----------------------	---------------------	---------------------	------------------------

GAME, FISH AND PARKS COMMISSION ACTION FINALIZATION

Spring Wild Turkey Hunting Season

Chapter 41:06:13; 41:03:01

Commission Meeting Dates:	Proposal	October 4-5, 2018	Deadwood
	Public Hearing	November 1, 2018	Sioux Falls
	Finalization	November 1-2, 2018	Sioux Falls

COMMISSION PROPOSAL

Duration of Proposal: 2019 and 2020 seasons (only 2019 season dates listed below)

Season Dates:	April 6 – May 31, 2019	Archery
	April 13 – May 31, 2019	Black Hills regular and single-season Prairie units
	April 13 – April 30, 2019	Split-season early Prairie units
	May 1 – May 31, 2019	Split-season late Prairie units; Black Hills late season

Licenses:	Black Hills: Unlimited resident and nonresident one-tag "male turkey" licenses
	Prairie: 5,657 resident and 246 nonresident one-tag "male turkey" licenses
	600 resident and 48 nonresident two-tag "male turkey" licenses
	Archery: Unlimited resident and nonresident one-tag "male turkey" licenses

Access Permits:	Access permits valid April 6-30
	Good Earth State Park: 5 archery turkey access permits
	Adams Homestead and Nature Preserve: 20 archery turkey access permits

Requirements and Restrictions:

1. Turkey hunters may apply for and receive one license in each of the Black Hills regular season, Black Hills late season, Prairie, and Archery Units in the first and second lottery drawings.
2. Turkey hunters may purchase only one regular Black Hills and one archery turkey license.
3. Residents may purchase one late Black Hills late season license.
4. One-half of the licenses in each prairie unit are available for landowner/operator preference.
5. Prairie units adjoining the White River and Cheyenne River also include an adjacent area one mile wide on the opposite side of the river.
6. No person may shoot a turkey in a tree or roost.
7. Rifles are prohibited to hunt turkeys during the spring turkey season.

Proposed changes from last year:

1. Offer residents 55 more one-tag "male turkey" licenses and 150 less two-tag "male turkey" licenses for the Prairie Units than 2018 for an overall decrease of 245 tags. Offer nonresidents 2 more one-tag "male turkey" licenses and 12 less two-tag "male turkey" licenses for the Prairie Units than 2018 for an overall decrease of 22 tags.
2. Modify the season end date for all turkey hunting (Prairie, Black Hills, Archery) from the eighth day prior to Memorial Day weekend to May 31.
3. Adjust hunting season end date for Sica Hollow in unit 48A to end on May 31.
4. Remove the allowance of rifles to hunt turkeys during spring turkey season.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION

Recommended changes from proposal:

1. Clarify that removing the allowance of rifles to hunt turkeys during the spring turkey season applies to rimfire, centerfire, and muzzleloading rifles.




SUPPORTIVE INFORMATION

Year	Licenses			Harvest			Success		
	BH	Prairie	Archery	BH	Prairie	Archery	BH	Prairie	Archery
2014	3,944	7,189	2,722	1,258	3,597	695	32%	40%	26%
2015	3,877	6,961	2,919	1,258	3,565	790	32%	42%	27%
2016	4,056	6,850	3,202	1,575	2,486	885	39%	31%	28%
2017	4,401	6,577	3,847	1,701	3,328	912	39%	45%	28%
2018	4,274	6,510	3,264	1,441	2,733	719	33%	38%	22%

APPROVE _____ **MODIFY** _____ **REJECT** _____ **NO ACTION** _____


*Includes both resident and nonresident harvest statistics.

Season End Date Information:




APPROVE _____ MODIFY _____ REJECT _____ NO ACTION _____

Restricting the use of rifles information:






11,055 unique turkey hunters in the spring of 2018



6.8% of spring turkey hunters preferred the use of rifle = 752 preferred rifles



APPROVE _____ MODIFY _____ REJECT _____ NO ACTION _____




Safety concern by hunter using full body or tail fan decoys:



APPROVE ☐ MODIFY ☐ REJECT ☐ NO ACTION ☐

SPRING TURKEY UNITS



Custer State Park is closed to archery hunting

GAME, FISH AND PARKS COMMISSION ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

Spring Turkey Hunting Seasons – Hunting Unit License Allocations

Commission Meeting Dates:	Proposal	October 4-5, 2018	Deadwood
	Public Hearing	November 1, 2018	Sioux Falls
	Finalization	November 1-2, 2018	Sioux Falls

LICENSE ALLOCATION BY UNITS

See Attached Spreadsheets

APPROVE _____	MODIFY _____	REJECT _____	NO ACTION _____
---------------	--------------	--------------	-----------------

Unit #	Unit Name	Resident		Nonresident		License Totals							
		TomT	2 TomT	TomT	2 TomT	RES	RES	RES	RES	NR	NR	NR	NR
		32	35	32	35	1-tag	2-tag	Licenses	Tags	1-tag	2-tag	Licenses	Tags
01A	Minnehaha	80	0	0	0	80	0	80	80	0	0	0	0
02A	Pennington	200	0	16	0	200	0	200	200	16	0	16	16
06A	Brookings	20	0	0	0	20	0	20	20	0	0	0	0
07A	Yankton	260	0	0	0	260	0	260	260	0	0	0	0
08A	Davison/Hanson	80	0	0	0	80	0	80	80	0	0	0	0
08B	Davison/Hanson	80	0	0	0	80	0	80	80	0	0	0	0
11A	Bennett	30	0	3	0	30	0	30	30	3	0	3	3
12A	Bon Homme	250	0	0	0	250	0	250	250	0	0	0	0
13A	Brule	150	0	0	0	150	0	150	150	0	0	0	0
15A	Butte/Lawrence	350	0	28	0	350	0	350	350	28	0	28	28
16A	Campbell/Walworth	10	0	0	0	10	0	10	10	0	0	0	0
17A	Charles Mix/Douglas	350	0	0	0	350	0	350	350	0	0	0	0
19A	Clay	120	0	0	0	120	0	120	120	0	0	0	0
19B	Clay	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20A	Corson	50	0	4	0	50	0	50	50	4	0	4	4
21A	Custer	150	0	12	0	150	0	150	150	12	0	12	12
22A	Day/Codington	80	0	0	0	80	0	80	80	0	0	0	0
23A	Deuel	100	0	0	0	100	0	100	100	0	0	0	0
24A	Dewey/Ziebach	150	0	12	0	150	0	150	150	12	0	12	12
27A	Fall River	75	0	6	0	75	0	75	75	6	0	6	6
29A	Grant	220	0	0	0	220	0	220	220	0	0	0	0
30A	Gregory	700	0	56	0	700	0	700	700	56	0	56	56
31A	Haakon	0	200	0	16	0	200	200	400	0	16	16	32
32A	Hamlin	10	0	0	0	10	0	10	10	0	0	0	0
35A	Harding	100	0	8	0	100	0	100	100	8	0	8	8
36A	Hughes	30	0	0	0	30	0	30	30	0	0	0	0
37A	Hutchinson	60	0	0	0	60	0	60	60	0	0	0	0
39A	Jackson	150	0	12	0	150	0	150	150	12	0	12	12
40A	Jerauld	10	0	0	0	10	0	10	10	0	0	0	0
41A	Jones	75	0	6	0	75	0	75	75	6	0	6	6
44A	Lincoln	50	0	0	0	50	0	50	50	0	0	0	0
44B	Lincoln	50	0	0	0	50	0	50	50	0	0	0	0
45A	Lyman	100	0	8	0	100	0	100	100	8	0	8	8
48A	Marshall/Roberts	400	0	0	0	400	0	400	400	0	0	0	0
49A	Meade	0	300	0	24	0	300	300	600	0	24	24	48
50A	Mellette	350	0	28	0	350	0	350	350	28	0	28	28
52A	Moody	60	0	0	0	60	0	60	60	0	0	0	0
53A	Perkins	0	100	0	8	0	100	100	200	0	8	8	16
56A	Sanborn	10	0	0	0	10	0	10	10	0	0	0	0
58A	Stanley	40	0	4	0	40	0	40	40	4	0	4	4
58B	Stanley	2	0	1	0	2	0	2	2	1	0	1	1
60A	Tripp	400	0	32	0	400	0	400	400	32	0	32	32
61A	Turner	20	0	0	0	20	0	20	20	0	0	0	0
62A	Union	120	0	0	0	120	0	120	120	0	0	0	0
62B	Union	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
65A	Oglala Lakota	40	0	4	0	40	0	40	40	4	0	4	4
67A	Todd	75	0	6	0	75	0	75	75	6	0	6	6
	TOTAL	5,657	600	246	48	5,657	600	6,257	6,857	246	48	294	342
	Unit	TomT	2 TomT	TomT	2 TomT	RES	RES	RES	RES	NR	NR	NR	NR
		32	35	32	35	1-tag	2-tag	Licenses	Tags	1-tag	2-tag	Lic	Tags
				RES & NR:		5,903	648	6,551	7,199				

SPRING TURKEY
2017-2018 and 2019-2020 Comparison

Unit #	Unit Name	2017-2018 Resident Licenses	2019-2020 Resident Licenses	# Change	% Change	2017-2018 Resident Tags	2019-2020 Resident Tags	# Change	% Change
01A	Minnehaha	80	80	0	0%	80	80	0	0%
02A	Pennington	200	200	0	0%	200	200	0	0%
06A	Brookings	20	20	0	0%	20	20	0	0%
07A	Yankton	230	260	30	13%	230	260	30	13%
08A	Davison/Hanson	80	80	0	0%	80	80	0	0%
08B	Davison/Hanson	80	80	0	0%	80	80	0	0%
11A	Bennett	30	30	0	0%	30	30	0	0%
12A	Bon Homme	250	250	0	0%	250	250	0	0%
13A	Brule	150	150	0	0%	150	150	0	0%
15A	Butte/Lawrence	350	350	0	0%	350	350	0	0%
16A	Campbell/Walworth	10	10	0	0%	10	10	0	0%
17A	Charles Mix/Douglas	350	350	0	0%	350	350	0	0%
19A	Clay	120	120	0	0%	120	120	0	0%
19B	Clay	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
20A	Corson	100	50	-50	-50%	100	50	-50	-50%
21A	Custer	150	150	0	0%	150	150	0	0%
22A	Day/Codington	80	80	0	0%	80	80	0	0%
23A	Deuel	90	100	10	11%	90	100	10	11%
24A	Dewey/Ziebach	150	150	0	0%	150	150	0	0%
27A	Fall River	150	75	-75	-50%	300	75	-225	-75%
29A	Grant	220	220	0	0%	220	220	0	0%
30A	Gregory	700	700	0	0%	700	700	0	0%
31A	Haakon	200	200	0	0%	400	400	0	0%
32A	Hamlin	10	10	0	0%	10	10	0	0%
35A	Harding	100	100	0	0%	100	100	0	0%
36A	Hughes	30	30	0	0%	30	30	0	0%
37A	Hutchinson	60	60	0	0%	60	60	0	0%
39A	Jackson	150	150	0	0%	150	150	0	0%
40A	Jerauld	10	10	0	0%	10	10	0	0%
41A	Jones	75	75	0	0%	75	75	0	0%
44A	Lincoln	50	50	0	0%	50	50	0	0%
44B	Lincoln	50	50	0	0%	50	50	0	0%
45A	Lyman	100	100	0	0%	100	100	0	0%
48A	Marshall/Roberts	400	400	0	0%	400	400	0	0%
49A	Meade	300	300	0	0%	600	600	0	0%
50A	Mellette	350	350	0	0%	350	350	0	0%
52A	Moody	60	60	0	0%	60	60	0	0%
53A	Perkins	100	100	0	0%	200	200	0	0%
56A	Sanborn	20	10	-10	-50%	20	10	-10	-50%
58A	Stanley	40	40	0	0%	40	40	0	0%
58B	Stanley	2	2	0	0%	2	2	0	0%
60A	Tripp	400	400	0	0%	400	400	0	0%
61A	Turner	20	20	0	0%	20	20	0	0%
62A	Union	120	120	0	0%	120	120	0	0%
62B	Union	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
65A	Oglala Lakota	40	40	0	0%	40	40	0	0%
67A	Todd	75	75	0	0%	75	75	0	0%
TOTAL		6,352	6,257	-95	-1.5%	7,102	6,857	-245	-3.4%

Note: An additional 8% of the number of licenses will be available to nonresidents in West River units.

GAME, FISH AND PARKS COMMISSION ACTION FINALIZATION

Duck Hunting Season

Chapter 41:06:16

Commission Meeting Dates:	Proposal	October 4-5, 2018	Deadwood
	Public Hearing	November 1, 2018	Sioux Falls
	Finalization	November 1-2, 2018	Sioux Falls

COMMISSION PROPOSAL

Duration of Proposal: 2019-20 hunting season

Season Dates and Open Areas:

High Plains Zone:	October 12, 2019 – January 16, 2020
Low Plains North & Low Plains Middle Zone:	September 28 – December 10, 2019
Low Plains South Zone:	October 26, 2019 – January 7, 2020

Daily Limits:

Ducks: 6 The duck limit may be comprised of no more than: 5 mallards (which may include no more than 2 hens), 3 wood ducks, 3 scaup, 2 redheads, 2 canvasbacks, and 1 pintail.

2 Bonus blue-winged teal (first 16 days of the season only)

Low Plains North & Low Plains Middle Zones: September 28 – October 13,

2019

Low Plains South Zone: October 26 – November 10, 2019


High Plains Zone: October 12 – 27, 2019

Coots: 15

Mergansers: 5 (may include no more than 2 hooded mergansers).

Possession Limits: Three times the daily bag limits.

Duck Hunting Zones



Proposed changes from last year:

1. Decrease the pintail daily bag limit from 2 to 1.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION

Recommended changes from proposal: None.

SUPPORTIVE INFORMATION

Year	Resident Hunters	Nonresident Hunters	Ducks Harvested
2013	13,456	3,842	240,393
2014	13,471	3,565	221,981
2015	11,994	3,937	213,745
2016	10,533	3,832	185,105
2017	10,557	4,159	189,320

APPROVE _____ MODIFY _____ REJECT _____ NO ACTION _____

GAME, FISH AND PARKS COMMISSION ACTION FINALIZATION

Goose Hunting Season

Chapter 41:06:16

Commission Meeting Dates:	Proposal	October 4-5, 2018	Deadwood
	Public Hearing	November 1, 2018	Sioux Falls
	Finalization	November 1-2, 2018	Sioux Falls

COMMISSION PROPOSAL

Duration of Proposal: 2019-20 hunting season

Season Dates:

Canada Geese (and Brant)

Unit 1: October 1 – December 22, 2019

Unit 2: November 4, 2019 – February 16, 2020

Unit 3: January 11-19, 2020

Light Geese

Statewide: September 28, 2019 – January 10, 2020

White-fronted Geese

Statewide: September 28 – December 10, 2019

Daily Limits:

Canada geese

Unit 1: 8

Units 2 & 3: 4

Light geese: 50


White-fronted goose: 3

Possession Limits:

Light geese: Unlimited

All other geese: Three times the daily limit

Canada Goose Units



Proposed changes from last year:

1. Modify the white-fronted goose season from 86 days (2 bird daily limit) to 74 days (3 bird daily limit).

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION

Recommended changes from proposal: None.

SUPPORTIVE INFORMATION

Parts collection surveys conducted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service indicate that on average that white fronted goose harvest starts in early October and minimal harvest occurs after Thanksgiving.

Year	Canada Geese			Light Geese (fall season only)			White-fronted Geese		
	Resident Hunters	Nonresident Hunters	Geese Harvested	Resident Hunters	Nonresident Hunters	Geese Harvested	Resident Hunters	Nonresident Hunters	Geese Harvested
2013	12,004	2,160	124,156	3,747	641	53,322	1,098	224	1,891
2014	12,130	1,969	103,149	3,572	514	53,815	951	244	1,529
2015	10,228	2,104	78,953	3,096	519	40,758	1,097	275	1,819
2016	9,964	2,046	91,294	3,206	515	45,104	992	295	3,702
2017	9,762	2,428	83,428	4,159	1,013	84,744	1,185	354	2,578

APPROVE _____ MODIFY _____ REJECT _____ NO ACTION _____

**GAME, FISH AND PARKS COMMISSION ACTION
FINALIZATION**

Sandhill Crane Hunting Season

Chapter 41:06:18

Commission Meeting Dates:	Proposal	October 4-5, 2018	Deadwood
	Public Hearing	November 1, 2018	Sioux Falls
	Finalization	November 1-2, 2018	Sioux Falls

COMMISSION PROPOSAL

Duration of Proposal: 2019 hunting season

Season Dates: September 28 – November 24, 2019

Open Area: That portion of South Dakota west of U.S. Highway 281

Daily Limit: 3 Sandhill cranes


Possession Limit: 9 Sandhill cranes

Requirements and Restrictions:

1. Shooting hours are ½ hour before sunrise to sunset.
2. Nontoxic shot rules apply to Sandhill crane hunting.

Proposed change from last year:

1. Modify the open unit from that portion of the state lying west of U.S. Highway 281 to that portion of the state lying west of a line beginning at the South Dakota-North Dakota border and State Highway 25, south on State Highway 25 to its junction with State Highway 34, east on State Highway 34 to its junction with U.S. Highway 81, then south on U.S. Highway 81 to the South Dakota-Nebraska border.



DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION

Recommended changes from proposal: None.

SUPPORTIVE INFORMATION

Currently, Sandhill crane hunting season in South Dakota is 58 days beginning the fourth Saturday in September west of U.S. Highway 281 (see above map) with a daily bag of 3 cranes. From 2005-2017, South Dakota averaged less than 100 Sandhill crane hunters with fewer than 150 Sandhill cranes harvested per year. SDGFP staff receive requests annually from crane hunters in the James River Valley who encounter cranes east of 281 requesting a zone boundary adjustment. Adjusting the crane zone boundary to SD Highway 25 and U.S. Highway 81 would allow hunters the opportunity to harvest cranes in additional areas of South Dakota where cranes regularly occur during fall migration while having a negligible impact on overall crane harvest. The 3-year average (2016-2018) of the mid-continent population (Nebraska photo-corrected portion) is 659,900 cranes, considerably above the objective range of (349,000-472,000) for the population. This adjustment to South Dakota's Sandhill crane regulations is consistent with the mid-continent Sandhill crane management plan use guidelines.

APPROVE _____ **MODIFY** _____ **REJECT** _____ **NO ACTION** _____

**GAME, FISH AND PARKS COMMISSION ACTION
FINALIZATION**

**Waterfowl Hunting Seasons
Chapter 41:06:16**

Commission Meeting Dates:	Proposal	October 4-5, 2018	Deadwood
	Public Hearing	November 1, 2018	Sioux Falls
	Finalization	November 1-2, 2018	Sioux Falls

COMMISSION PROPOSAL

Spring Light Goose Conservation Order.

Duration of Proposal: 2020 hunting season

Season Dates: February 17 – May 15, 2020

Open Area: Statewide

Daily Limit: None

Possession Limit: None

Requirements and Restrictions:

1. With the exception of items 2-5, requirements and restrictions for the Conservation Order are the same as fall waterfowl hunting seasons.
2. The Federal Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation stamp is not required.
3. The use of electronic calls is allowed.
4. Shotguns may be capable of holding more than three shells.
5. Shooting hours are ½ hour before sunrise to ½ hour after sunset.

Proposed changes from last year:

1. Change the season dates of the Spring Light Goose Conservation Order from "79 days beginning the day after the Unit 2 dark goose season" to "the day after the Unit 2 dark goose season to May 15".

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION

Recommended changes from proposal: None.

SUPPORTIVE INFORMATION

SDGFP staff have received requests to allow additional hunting opportunities for light geese after the current season end date. The Conservation Order is a Congressional Order which amends the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) regulations based on a 1999 Congressional action effectively reinstating regulations intended to reduce the population of mid-continent light geese (MCLG). The law also authorizes the use of additional hunting methods (electronic calls and unplugged guns) to increase the take of MCLG. As a result, a Conservation Order for the reduction of the MCLG population was authorized. Since MCLG population estimates continue to exceed population objective and USFWS regulations do not indicate a season end date, allowing additional days to this season is recommended

Year	Licenses			Geese Harvested	Geese per Hunter
	Resident	Nonresident	Total		
2013	3,166	4,142	7,308	168,496	23.1
2014	2,159	4,514	6,673	149,116	22.3
2015	2,147	4,277	6,424	165,331	25.7
2016	1,866	3,843	5,709	126,199	22.1
2017	2,672	4,448	7,120	181,460	25.5

APPROVE _____ **MODIFY** _____ **REJECT** _____ **NO ACTION** _____

GAME, FISH AND PARKS COMMISSION ACTION FINALIZATION

Black Hills Elk Hunting Season

Chapter 41:06:26

Commission Meeting Dates:	Proposal	September 6-7, 2018	Yankton
	Public Hearing	October 4, 2018	Deadwood
	Public Hearing	November 1, 2018	Sioux Falls
	Finalization	November 1-2, 2018	Sioux Falls

COMMISSION PROPOSAL

Proposed additional rules:

1. Establish an Elk Raffle License in the Black Hills Elk Hunting Season to be valid in any unit where an Any Elk license is allocated.
2. Elk Raffle License would not be valid in Custer State Park.
3. Raffle license only available to qualifying residents.
4. Raffle license would be available to any 501(c)3 non-profit conservation organization dedicated to wildlife management.
5. Make it clear the raffle license would only be valid in hunting units within the Black Hills elk hunting season where "any" elk licenses are allocated.
6. Funds raised are to be held within an account that can specifically identify and track the revenues and expenditures of the raffle to assure funds generated are spent on wildlife management activities enhancing SD natural resources.

** Important to note the specific rules developed for this raffle license follow the same format as the rules currently in place for the Custer State Park elk raffle license found in 41:06:27.

SUPPORTIVE INFORMATION

A petition was submitted to the GFP Commission requesting another elk license be made available for a raffle for one wildlife conservation organization per year to be used to generate funds for wildlife management. The petition requested the license be made available in any unit where an "any" elk license is allocated within the Black Hills elk hunting season, but not to include Custer State Park.

APPROVE _____	MODIFY _____	REJECT _____	NO ACTION _____
---------------	--------------	--------------	-----------------

GAME, FISH AND PARKS COMMISSION ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION**Monarch Management Plan – Action of Adoption**

Commission Meeting Dates:	Presented	October 4-5, 2018	Deadwood
	Public Hearing	November 1, 2018	Sioux Falls
	Finalization	November 1-2, 2018	Sioux Falls

APPROVE ____	MODIFY ____	REJECT ____	NO ACTION ____
---------------------	--------------------	--------------------	-----------------------

South Dakota Monarch Conservation and Management Strategic Plan



Monarch adult on swamp milkweed

**South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks
Pierre, South Dakota
November 2018**

Executive Summary

In response to concerns about threats to native pollinators and specifically the potential need to protect the monarch butterfly under the authority of the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (MAFWA) committed to coordinating with MAFWA-member states and other partners to address this situation. In addition to a 20-year MAFWA Conservation Strategy, individual states have gathered existing and potential partners to plan for the needs of the monarch butterfly and other native pollinators at state levels.

South Dakota began its monarch planning effort with a South Dakota Monarch Summit in October 2017, which helped South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks (SDGFP) structure a Plan Steering Committee to develop a state monarch strategic plan. The Planning Committee met 5 times to discuss national and state-level issues and ways for South Dakota to realistically contribute to monarch conservation and management needs. This document reflects input gathered at the South Dakota Monarch Summit and additional discussions with Planning Committee members who represented wildlife, public and private land stewardship, extension, research, agriculture, education, and certain road rights-of-ways.

This document presents background information on the monarch's status and conservation challenges, including this plan's context within MAFWA's Conservation Strategy. As with other multi-state efforts, all states must participate at appropriate levels to improve the species' status such that listing under the ESA is unnecessary. As part of that shared commitment, South Dakota's habitat goal is to provide an additional 68 million milkweed stems within a landscape with suitable nectar sources. The origin and information limitations of this goal are described in the plan.

Planning categories for this strategic plan are: general public and private habitat conservation and management; public and private rights-of-way habitat enhancement; urban and municipal lands habitat enhancement; education and outreach; research, monitoring, and data management; and plan assessment. As additional resources are available, this plan will transition to include specific implementation activities with associated deadlines and responsible parties. SDGFP will continue its coordination role in this effort and hopes to benefit from the knowledge of partners with expertise in rural and urban land management, education and outreach, and land management practices compatible with sustainable land use.

Acknowledgements

Cover image ©Doug Backlund

South Dakota Monarch Summit participants provided valuable input on existing efforts and future direction to benefit monarchs and other native pollinators. The South Dakota Monarch Plan Steering Committee assisted SDGFP in drafting this strategic plan to meet the needs of the MAFWA regional plan while accommodating state-specific considerations. We thank members of the public and representatives of organizations for reviewing and commenting on the plan. We also thank educators, gardeners and land managers whose commitments to native pollinators can serve as models for implementing the strategic directions described in this plan.

Acronyms and Abbreviations:

ACEP – Agricultural Conservation Easement Program
BMP – best management practice
CEC – Commission for Environmental Cooperation
CRP – Conservation Reserve Program
CSP – Conservation Stewardship Program
EQIP – Environmental Quality Incentives Program
ESA – Endangered Species Act
GIS – geographic information system
JV – Joint Venture
MAFWA – Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies
MCSP – Monarch Conservation Science Partnership
NRCS – Natural Resources Conservation Service
PECE – Policy for Evaluation of Conservation Efforts
PFW –Partners for Wildlife (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)
SDGFP – South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks
SDSU – South Dakota State University
Service – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
spp. – >1 species; typically refers to all species in a given genus

List of Figures:

Figure 1. MAFWA Monarch Planning Geographies	6
Figure 2. Monarch development cycle	9
Figure 3. Area occupied by monarch colonies at overwintering sites in Mexico	10

List of Appendices:

Appendix A. South Dakota Monarch Summit Materials, including agenda, participant list, highlights, and notes from brainstorming sessions	25
Appendix B. South Dakota Monarch Plan Steering Committee	49
Appendix C. South Dakota-relevant Information Sources	50
Appendix D. Draft Plan Public Comments Received	51

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Acknowledgements	2
Acronyms and Abbreviations	3
List of Figures	3
List of Appendices	3
Table of Contents	4
Plan Background	5
Plan Purpose and Scope	7
Relevance of Plan to Potential Listing of Monarch	7
Biological Background	8
Public Involvement	12
Strategic Plan Outline	12
A. General Public and Private Habitat Conservation and Management	13
B. Public and Private Rights-of-way Habitat Enhancement	15
C. Urban and Municipal Lands Habitat Enhancement	17
D. Education and Outreach	19
E. Research, Monitoring and Data Management	21
F. Plan Assessment	23
Literature Cited	24
Appendix A. South Dakota Monarch Summit Materials, including agenda, participant list, highlights, and notes from brainstorming sessions	25
Appendix B. South Dakota Monarch Plan Steering Committee	49
Appendix C. South Dakota-relevant Information Sources	50
Appendix D. Draft Plan Public Comments Received	51

Plan Background

Although the plight of pollinators in North America has caused widespread concern and reiterated the economic and ecological importance of pollinators, two trends have caused recent specific and urgent planning and action. Losses of honeybee hives due to a still uncertain combination of factors have generated grave concern among those who benefit directly and indirectly from this introduced pollinator. Sharp declines in honeybees following introduction of a parasitic mite in 1987 and first reports of a phenomenon called Colony Collapse Disorder in 2006 helped prioritize this issue for a national strategy under President Obama (Pollinator Health Task Force 2015). South Dakota beekeepers produced more than 12% of the U.S. honey crop in 2016 alone, with an economic contribution of more than \$34 million in the same year (SD Dept. of Agriculture 2017).

Declines in pollinators native to North America have caused equal alarm (National Research Council 2007). The identity and variety of pollinating bees, wasps, ants, butterflies, and moths is a mystery to many, but not so with the monarch butterfly. Most people have long known this familiar butterfly, whether we experienced an urban or rural upbringing. Huge migrating concentrations were a familiar sight in South Dakota in recent memory, including the fall of 2018 in portions of the state. Contrast that experience with the review being conducted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) to potentially add the monarch to the list of species that need protection under the federal ESA.

In 2014, the Service received a petition to list the eastern subspecies of the monarch (*Danaus plexippus plexippus*) as a threatened species under the ESA. This subspecies lives east of the Rocky Mountains, with the western subspecies ranging from west of the Rockies to the Pacific Coast. The Service concluded the petition presented ample justification for a status review prior to the Service issuing its listing determination by June of 2019. Although many dedicated conservationists and scientists have monitored and studied the monarch for decades, the potential federal listing galvanized state agriculture and wildlife agencies, in particular, to prioritize this species for increased attention.

The importance of Midwestern states to monarch reproduction and migration caused MAFWA to assume a key coordination role in voluntary monarch planning activities by the 13 MAFWA states, in cooperation with several states in the Southern Great Plains and northeastern U.S. In addition to facilitating coordination of state wildlife agency efforts, MAFWA is working with other national leaders in pollinator conservation, including the Monarch Joint Venture (JV), National Wildlife Federation, Pheasants Forever/Quail Forever, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, Monarch Watch and the U.S. Geological Survey. MAFWA recently released the "Mid-America Monarch Conservation Strategy," a 20-year blueprint to improve the status of the eastern monarch population in its midcontinental range (MAFWA 2018; Figure 1): (http://www.mafwa.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/MAMCS_June2018_Final.pdf).

Monarch Conservation Geographic Priorities and Mid-American Monarch Conservation Strategy Geography




Figure 1. MAFWA Monarch Planning Geographies. Source: http://www.mafwa.org/?page_id=2347

Although MAFWA has provided important oversight and coordination, monarch planning and program delivery will happen primarily at the local and state levels. Most MAFWA states have hosted Monarch Summits and produced or are developing state monarch (or native pollinator) plans. SDGFP organized a Monarch Summit, held in Mitchell, South Dakota, in October 2017. A variety of groups representing critical partners and industries were invited to a facilitated meeting that included presentations by experts on monarch life history and conservation challenges and offered participants the opportunity to brainstorm strategies to jumpstart the more formal state monarch planning effort (Appendix A). The South Dakota Monarch Conservation and Management Plan provides a strategic framework that will transition to an implementation plan where partners can contribute to completing specific tasks and fulfilling commitments. Input gathered during the South Dakota Monarch Summit will continue to provide valuable information for planning and implementation.

Based on participant willingness to assist with monarch plan development, SDGFP formed a South Dakota Monarch Plan Steering Committee (Appendix B). SDGFP is committed to helping MAFWA meet regional monarch goals, but effective voluntary delivery within the state will depend on involvement of partner agencies, organizations, and individuals, such as educators, gardeners, private organizations, and local communities as well as government entities.

Many potential listing stories have a familiar theme – a species needs a particular habitat that is now rare because of conversion for other uses and/or remaining habitat is degraded because of invasive species or lack of historical disturbance regimes, such as grazing or periodic fires. Female monarchs lay their eggs on various species of milkweed plants (mainly *Asclepias* spp.), and the larvae feed exclusively

on these species. The prevailing hypothesis among scientists that is most relevant to South Dakota is that milkweed abundance declines have contributed to monarch population declines since the 1990s. The good news for enhancing monarchs on the breeding ground is that milkweeds often thrive on disturbance and are not typically found in pristine habitats that must be set aside or undergo sophisticated management. When coupled with appropriate nectar sources, this scenario presents many opportunities for enhancement in a variety of ways and places.

Plan Purpose and Scope

South Dakota's monarch plan is designed to work toward long-term sustainability of the monarch butterfly and other native pollinator species by providing a strategic framework for existing and planned conservation activities; by raising awareness of pollinator values to agriculture, ecological processes and quality of life; by providing a platform for information on plant diversity, plant selection and appropriate management tools to meet the needs of all pollinators; and by participating in the MAFWA regional strategy to help restore the eastern monarch population and avoid listing of the monarch butterfly under the federal ESA.

Although efforts to enhance native pollinators are encouraged throughout South Dakota, the emphasis of this plan is on eastern South Dakota or the area east of the Missouri River (eastriver). We consider this area more likely to contribute to conservation goals being established for the North Core Monarch Butterfly Conservation Unit (MAFWA 2018, page 25). Rather than adopting the specific counties outlined in the conservation unit map for emphasis, we have chosen eastern South Dakota as a management emphasis boundary because it is more relevant to the state's geography and related land uses.

This plan is not a standalone source of information on the monarch's life history and conservation challenges. Where appropriate, the reader will be directed to more comprehensive information sources to keep this document concise and state focused. In many cases, these references are websites that are more dynamic than a static plan in the flexibility to incorporate new information. Unless we have state-specific data to offer, we have chosen not to rehash general topics that are explained in detail in numerous regional, national, and international sources.

Relevance of Plan to Potential Listing of Monarch

As mentioned earlier, MAFWA has led state wildlife agencies and other partners in raising awareness of the plight of the monarch to facilitate monarch population recovery and in the process potentially help avoid the regulatory burden of listing under the ESA. The Service will apply its Policy for the Evaluation of Conservation Efforts (PECE) (U.S. Dept. of Interior 2003) to evaluate conservation actions and commitments, such as plans or agreements, for their certainty of implementation and potential effectiveness in removing threats to the monarch. During the listing evaluation process as guided by PECE, the Service will consider regional coordination efforts, individual state plan commitments, and related actions to monitor the species and improve habitat availability. A specific tool for documenting new habitat is a Monarch Conservation Database, developed by the Service, to allow partners to enter habitat practices completed since 2014 and relationship of practices to applicable conservation plans.

Just as state planning is tiered from MAFWA coordination, MAFWA efforts support an international commitment to increase the eastern monarch population such that the average occupied area on the Mexican wintering grounds covers 6 hectares (Pollinator Health Task Force 2015). Several authors have attempted to translate this wintering goal to what is needed on Midwestern breeding grounds

(Pleasants 2017, Thogmartin et al. 2017). While these discussions continue, MAFWA has encouraged its member states to provide specific and realistic 20-year monarch habitat acreage goals to demonstrate commitments that can be evaluated under PECE.

As part of its engagement with MAFWA, SDGFP provided a placeholder goal to add 68 million milkweed stems within a landscape with appropriate nectar sources during the next 20 years. Two numbers helped determine this goal. South Dakota's proportion of acreage within the North Core milkweed emphasis area (Figure 1) is 5.2%, and MAFWA's milkweed stem goal is 1.3 billion additional stems (MAFWA 2018). South Dakota goal's was determined by multiplying 1.3 billion by 5.2%, resulting in 68 million additional stems by 2038. At this time, we lack South Dakota-specific information on the extent of milkweed abundance, distribution across the state, and concentration by land-use types. Given these data limitations, South Dakota will revisit the milkweed stem goal commitment of 68 million additional milkweed stems in 5 years or when additional data allow a more informed estimate that continues to help fulfill South Dakota's responsibility within the broader MAFWA effort. If revised, the new milkweed stem goal will serve as the state's contribution to the overall MAFWA goal for the period ending in 2038.

Biological Background

Life History:

The female monarch lays eggs, one at a time, only on milkweed species (*Asclepias* spp.) (Figure 2). Eggs hatch in 3-5 days. The larva (caterpillar) eats milkweed leaves during a 9-13 day development. A caterpillar then forms a chrysalis or cocoon that is attached to various surfaces and not necessarily milkweeds. Following another 8-12 days, the pupa transforms into an adult monarch, completing one generation. Development time from egg to adult can vary with temperature. The adult seeks nectar prior to starting the life cycle again. Typically the fourth generation of the summer suspends development (diapause) before beginning a southward migration to a small, specific area of the Sierra Madre Mountains in Mexico.




Figure 2. Monarch development cycle. Illustration courtesy of Wendy Caldwell, Monarch Joint Venture. Photo credits Michelle Solensky, Denny Brooks, Mary Holland, Dave Astin, and Wendy Caldwell.

Monarchs need suitable shelter and energy-rich nectar for refueling along the way. By February, overwintering monarchs in Mexico begin mating and journeying north. The northward migrants must find milkweeds for egg laying and nectar for energy. Monarchs arriving in South Dakota in the summer are several generations removed from the overwintering generation.

Monarchs rely on milkweeds because they contain toxic chemicals called cardenolides, which protect the plant against foraging by many herbivores. But monarchs can safely ingest milkweeds and in turn take on the toxic properties of the cardenolides, making them unpalatable to many predators.

The overwintering site for the vast majority of eastern monarchs was discovered more than 40 years ago in Mexico's Transvolcanic Belt in the state of Michoacan, approximately 100 miles west of Mexico City. Monarchs congregate in extremely dense concentrations in oyamel fir (*Abies religiosa*) forests found at 10,000 foot elevation. Here they find the suitable microclimate to allow them to avoid getting too cold or too warm. Many of the most critical wintering sites are contained in the Monarch Butterfly Biosphere Reserve (<https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1290>).

This overwintering concentration phenomenon has allowed estimates of the eastern subspecies of the monarch, a process that is challenging because the concentration density may vary across sites. Wintering population estimates are a critical argument for the need to list this subspecies, as demonstrated by Figure 3.




Figure 3. Area occupied by monarch colonies at overwintering sites in Mexico. Figure courtesy of MonarchWatch.org.

For a more detailed description of the monarch's life cycle and habitat needs, visit the Monarch JV's website: <https://monarchjointventure.org/monarch-biology/>

Conservation Challenges:

The monarch's life cycle and migratory habits help explain some of its conservation challenges. The female must find milkweed plants on which to lay her eggs, and the host plants must remain long enough for the eggs to hatch and larvae to pupate to the chrysalis stage. Migrating monarchs need nectar sources during their journeys north and south. The fact that wintering monarchs are concentrated in a small area with a specific microclimate makes this period a particularly vulnerable time for the monarch's eastern population.

The Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC; 2008) listed 5 primary categories of factors causing monarch decline:

- Breeding habitat loss and degradation;
- Wintering habitat loss and degradation;
- Disease and parasites;
- Climate change; and
- Pesticide use.

More detail on CEC's discussion can be found here:

https://monarchjointventure.org/images/uploads/documents/5431_Monarch_en.pdf

The Monarch JV uses a similar categorization of conservation challenges for this species, with an added category of “other anthropogenic concerns.” Additional details on the Monarch JV’s review of this topic can be viewed here: <https://monarchjointventure.org/threats>

MAFWA’s discussion of threats to the monarch centered on the five listing factors used by the Service:

- Modification or curtailment of habitat or range;
- Overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or education purposes;
- Disease or predation;
- Inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms; and
- Other factors affecting the monarch’s continued existence (MAFWA 2018).

Following an analysis of threats, MAFWA’s conclusion was that an emphasis on increasing and improving monarch breeding habitat is the most effective role for MAFWA states.

The importance of the Corn Belt to monarch recovery is supported by recent research findings. Pleasants and Oberhauser (2013) found a strong correlation between monarch production in the Midwest and the overwintering population in Mexico. They estimated a 58% decline in milkweeds in the Midwest and an 81% decline in monarch production between 1999 and 2010, a time of increased use of glyphosate herbicides and increased planting of genetically-modified glyphosate-tolerant corn and soybeans. During 4 years of surveys, the authors found monarch egg densities on milkweeds in agricultural fields were higher than those on milkweeds in non-agricultural fields by an average factor of 3.89. The authors also found higher egg densities in smaller milkweed patches, with patch size typically smaller in agricultural fields. Following loss of milkweed habitat in agricultural fields, Pleasants and Oberhauser (2013) considered Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) habitat next most important for providing milkweed habitat.

As is true for most wildlife species, lack of information is a significant conservation challenge for managing the monarch and its habitats. Understanding and evaluating threats to wildlife species that have generally discrete breeding, migratory, and wintering habitats is challenging, particularly without specific data. In the case of the monarch’s breeding habitat, few entities have monitored milkweed abundance and distribution through time, made more difficult by the opportunistic nature of milkweed species. Similarly, monitoring monarch populations during breeding and migration is challenging, despite efforts of such citizen scientist programs as Monarch Watch (<https://www.monarchwatch.org/>), the Monarch Larva Monitoring Project (www.mlmp.org), and Journey North (<https://journeynorth.org/monarchs>). A recent effort called the Integrated Monarch Monitoring Program is designed to monitor monarch populations and habitats in the breeding range by targeting priority monarch blocks (<https://monarchjointventure.org/get-involved/mcsp-monitoring>). Components include milkweed and blooming plant surveys, monarch eggs and larvae surveys, adult monarch surveys, and tracking parasitism and monarch survival. The success of this monitoring effort will depend on availability of agency personnel, funds to contract the work, and willingness of qualified citizen scientists to contribute time and expertise.

Public Involvement

Opportunities to raise public awareness about this effort and solicit public input on this plan included the following:

- Input collected at the South Dakota Monarch Summit;
- Assistance from the South Dakota Monarch Plan Steering Committee;
- Targeted request for plan review to Monarch Summit participants;
- South Dakota Public Radio interview in mid-October 2018 regarding the plan background and comment opportunity;
- Plan background and review opportunity shared at South Dakota Master Gardeners Update held in Sioux Falls on September 29, 2018; and
- SDGFP request for public review and comment through its Commission process and agency website. The draft plan's availability was shared at the October 2018 Commission meeting, with input solicited through the SDGFP website.

A Plan Steering Committee member shared one correction, which was made to the plan. A separate letter from the South Dakota Association of Conservation Districts (Appendix D) included three suggested additions, which were made to the plan. Additional public feedback included support for the plan, examples of individual efforts to benefit monarchs or pollinators in general, and requests to be involved in future efforts to implement the plan. None of the additional public feedback resulted in specific changes or additions to the plan, but these comments should be revisited to assure that requests for future involvement have been met. All public comments are included in Appendix D.

Strategic Plan Outline

- A. General Public and Private Habitat Conservation and Management
- B. Public and Private Rights-of-way Habitat Enhancement
- C. Urban and Municipal Lands Habitat Enhancement
- D. Education and Outreach
- E. Research, Monitoring and Data Management
- F. Plan Assessment

A. General Public and Private Habitat Conservation and Management

Providing adequate feeding and breeding habitat for monarchs and other pollinators while in South Dakota is the primary concern and overarching desired result of this plan. Monarch butterflies and other pollinators need sufficient habitat available throughout the growing season and throughout their range to complete their life cycles and increase populations. This plan establishes objectives for restoring, enhancing, creating, and managing habitat to achieve this goal. Milkweed and other nectar plants must be added to South Dakota's landscape to meet the special needs of the monarch butterfly and other pollinators.

Excluding open water, eastern South Dakota has approximately 460,000 acres of public lands (SDGFP, unpublished data). This includes the following land ownerships:

- SDGFP game production areas and state park lands
- SD School and Public Trust Lands
- Bureau of Land Management
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- National Park Service
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service refuges and waterfowl production areas

Public lands were purchased or designated with various associated purposes and mandates. Just as a private landowner will determine which practices and plantings are compatible with their goals and property uses, public land managers will evaluate pollinator habitat enhancement in the context of other obligations and user expectations.

GOAL 1: Conserve, enhance and restore habitat on public and private lands to increase populations of monarch butterflies and other pollinator species.

Objective 1: Conserve and manage existing monarch and pollinator habitat and restore, create, or enhance acreage needed to fulfill state milkweed stem goal, containing milkweed and other nectar sources, which support monarchs and other pollinators by 2038.

Strategy 1: Use gross determinations of existing milkweed habitat from existing information for initial, short-term work but refine information and scale over time to improve the impact of habitat conservation efforts.

Strategy 2: Assess the accuracy of existing milkweed density estimates and develop new estimates tailored to South Dakota to make the South Dakota monarch conservation strategy more efficient and improve the reliability of its outcomes.

Strategy 3: Provide and promote best management practices (BMPs) for management of pastures, farmland, lands primarily managed as wildlife habitat, rights-of-way, parks, yards, and gardens. Several practices that manage ground cover could be altered to improve milkweed and nectar plant production and better meet the special needs of pollinators.

Strategy 4: Engage communities and their residents in discussions about the role they can play in monarch and pollinator conservation. Help identify opportunities for voluntary habitat conservation and enhancement.

Strategy 5: Use Federal and state habitat programs to the maximum extent possible to increase milkweed and nectar plants on private lands. These include, but are not limited to:

- South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks Private Lands Habitat Program
- Farm Bill Conservation Programs
 - Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)
 - Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP)
 - Agricultural Conservation Easement Program (ACEP)
 - Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP)
- USFWS - Partners for Fish and Wildlife (PFW)
- South Dakota Conservation Districts
- Other conservation organizations

Strategy 6: Encourage landowners to diversify grassland communities and use cover crops on farmlands to enhance ecology and economics of their operations and benefit pollinators.

Strategy 7: Maximize use of public lands in habitat enhancement to benefit monarchs and other pollinators. These include, but are not limited to lands owned or managed by:

- South Dakota Dept. of Game, Fish and Parks
- South Dakota Office of School and Public Lands
- SD Department of Transportation
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- U.S. Forest Service
- National Park Service
- U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
- U.S. Bureau of Land Management
- South Dakota public universities
- additional local parks, rest areas, and visitors centers

Strategy 8: Identify nurseries and other plant material providers for partnerships to provide appropriate pollinator planting materials.

Objective 2: Ensure that agronomists, biologists, and other land management professionals working with landowners are providing information about opportunities to enhance monarch and pollinator habitat. Provide educational materials that cover the benefits of healthy pollinator populations.

Strategy 1: Encourage use of local seed sources.

Strategy 2: Identify and fulfill specific information needs. Examples include suggested pollinator planting mixes tailored to plot sizes, budgets, locations within landscapes, and geographical areas within the state; seed or plug sources appropriate to the state; and suggested management regimes to establish and maintain pollinator plantings.

B. Public and Private Rights-of-way Habitat Enhancement

A right-of-way is a legal right to allow passage or access through an area for various purposes. This land category includes roads, utility transmission lines, and railroad lines. This category may include lands owned or leased by public agencies, private businesses, or various levels of government. A road right-of-way is only one example of this land category.

A recent research evaluation of the potential importance of roadside habitat to monarchs included transects in east-central South Dakota (Kasten et al. 2016). The authors found milkweed, primarily common milkweed, on about 60% of roadside transects. Although roadside sites had lower mean egg and larvae per plant than relevant data from the Monarch Larva Monitoring Project, a citizen science project, these habitats can contribute to monarch recovery if managed appropriately. Consideration should be given to potential for pesticide drift from nearby agricultural fields, mortality from traffic, and vegetation management practices. The authors found adult monarchs associated with milkweed in roadsides during the breeding season, but not during migration.

Traditional grass monocultures along rights-of-way can be transitioned to pollinator habitat while accommodating human factors and traditional uses, such as diversified recreational uses, grazing and mowing practices, and public safety. Based on the National Land Cover Database of 2011 (<https://www.mrlc.gov/nlcd2011.php>), eastern South Dakota has nearly 800,000 acres in the land cover class of roads, rails, and transmission lines (SDGFP, unpublished data). This acreage is not an exact representation of roads plus associated maintained areas or specific buffer zones around railroads or utility lines.

GOAL 2: Use public and private rights-of-way to contribute to pollinator habitat in South Dakota.

Objective 1: Determine and summarize extent of current use of pollinator plantings on public and private rights-of-way in South Dakota.

Strategy 1: Review past and present pollinator planting plans used in this land category to identify what was effective and lessons learned from ineffective methods.

For example, Monarch JV's website includes various efforts by state departments of transportation to benefit monarchs and other pollinators: <https://monarchjointventure.org/i-am-a/departments-of-transportation>

Strategy 2: Identify methods of communication to reach land owners or managers of this land category at the county, township, and other local levels. Use these mailing lists, meeting opportunities, or association contacts to determine the current extent of pollinator plantings and willingness to incorporate such plantings in the future.

Strategy 3: Survey land owners, managers, and administrators responsible for habitat maintenance on railroads and utility line corridors to determine their experience with pollinator plantings and willingness to transition to such plantings.

Objective 2: Provide recommendations and related best management practices for habitat development and maintenance for this land category.

Strategy 1: Identify the most appropriate mowing practices and pollinator planting seed mixes suitable for the various rights-of-way and utility corridor habitats in South Dakota. Determine additional information needs for this land category, such as practices to address weed competition during planting establishment and invasive species issues.

For example, the Monarch JV developed the following guidance: "Mowing: Best Practices for Monarchs"

(<https://monarchjointventure.org/images/uploads/documents/MowingForMonarchs.pdf>)

Strategy 2: Identify the most appropriate communication method for this user group to help link them with sources of information and to seek their feedback on methods that have or have not worked for their lands.

Objective 3: Identify focal areas for pollinator planting enhancement in this land category, including both high-use areas and other sites spread across the state.

Strategy 1: Determine funding needs for new establishment of focal areas and identify potential partners or funding opportunities to address these needs.

Strategy 2: Determine suitability of pollinator planting focal areas to serve as seed sources for additional sites.

C. Urban and municipal lands habitat enhancement

Monarch enhancement presents an opportunity for nearly every land use class to contribute, including urban lands, both large and small. Based on the National Land Cover Database of 2011 (<https://www.mrlc.gov/nlcd2011.php>), eastern South Dakota has 486,000 acres in the “developed” land cover class (SDGFP, unpublished data). Areas in this land cover class range from open space within cities or towns, such as parks and golf courses, to areas with varying combinations of developed area and vegetation.

GOAL 3: Use urban and municipal areas to contribute to pollinator habitat in South Dakota.

Objective 1: Identify the most effective means of communicating with homeowners to most efficiently target backyard habitats for pollinator plantings.

Strategy 1: Identify where and how urban and suburban homeowners are most likely to obtain information for gardening design, plant material sources, and pesticide practices.

Strategy 2: Publicize availability of regional gardening guidelines for pollinators until state-specific species lists and guidelines are available.

Example: Xerces Society Monarch Nectar Plants – Northern Great Plains:

http://www.xerces.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/NPlains_Monarch_Plant_List_PRINT.pdf

Strategy 3: Avoid information overload on the topic of plant selection by developing suggested planting mixtures based on readily available plant material sources, likelihood of success, and in combinations that will accommodate pollinator needs through multiple seasons.

Strategy 4: Determine the best use of local Master Gardeners and garden clubs, entities that receive many requests each year for a variety of gardening and extension needs.

Strategy 5: Work with local gardening centers and arboretums to facilitate sharing of credible information on pollinators and their habitat needs. Assist with plant selection or guidance, if requested.

Strategy 6: Share relevant information regarding impacts of excessive annual mowing to monarchs.

Objective 2: Identify the most effective means of communicating with owners and managers of city and municipal park lands, bike trails, zoos, school grounds, and other open spaces to encourage pollinator plantings.

Strategy 1: Obtain funding for competitive grants to establish demonstration sites on these lands, including follow up maintenance by successful applicants and appropriate interpretive signage and recognition. Encourage use of successful plantings for seed collection for additional sites.

Strategy 2: Use free seed pack distribution sparingly to avoid unrealistic expectations.

Strategy 3: Establish communication with local leaders, recreation departments, school boards, and community associations to spread the word about pollinator needs and the importance of partnerships.

Strategy 4: Publicize the National Wildlife Federation's Mayors' Monarch Pledge:
<https://www.nwf.org/Garden-For-Wildlife/About/National-Initiatives/Mayors-Monarch-Pledge.aspx>

Objective 3: Maximize higher populations in urban areas to recruit citizen scientists to contribute data to projects that monitor pollinators and pollinator plants.

Strategy 1: Link teachers with relevant lesson plans on monarchs and pollinators in general. Refine existing curricula that are not relevant to South Dakota.

Strategy 2: In addition to established monitoring programs, encourage data collection and reporting on local topics, such as pollinator phenology, pollinator planting successes or failures, and other lessons learned.

Strategy 3: Identify and facilitate training and information needs.

D. Education and Outreach

GOAL 4: Use enhanced awareness to increase conservation actions and support for monarchs and other pollinators

Objective 1: Identify specific methods matched with user groups to raise awareness about monarchs and other pollinators and their habitats

Strategy 1 – Use social media, including partner’s web pages, printed materials, television and radio broadcasts to inform the public about monarch population and habitat declines and related topics.

Strategy 2 – Increase public awareness about the following topics through a variety of media, such as radio, mailers/brochures, social media, newspaper and more through existing partnerships (SD GFP, SDSU Extension 4-H, Pheasants Forever, conservation districts, etc.) to be distributed in late winter early spring each year for 5 years:

- a. Insecticide use around the home - unintended consequences
- b. Establishing waystations and species mixes and considerations
- c. Techniques for the novice gardener (written with master gardeners)

Strategy 3 – Develop a landing page on the GF&P web site with “near real-time” information (from Monarch JV web site, etc.) with breaking information on population status estimates, etc., and that partners can link their web sites to.

Objective 2 – Provide farmers and ranchers with accurate technical information on the potential consequences of pollinator species being listed under the ESA, and on conserving and enhancing pollinator habitat.

Strategy 1 – Develop or distribute existing suitable fact sheets and other printed reference materials and conduct workshops for producers on:

- a. Habitat needs of monarchs and other pollinators
- b. Means of minimizing impacts of pest control on monarchs and other pollinators
- c. Government programs that support pollinator habitat restoration and enhancement
- d. Holistic management techniques for farm and ranch lands that increase plant diversity and pollinator habitat health
- e. Mentors/resources for interested producers

Strategy 2 – Host public meetings and help sponsor partner education events on means of enhancing and creating pollinator habitat quarterly or bi-annually for two years and upon request after two years.

Strategy 3 – Work with NRCS, SDSU Extension, conservation districts, and the agribusiness community to develop and promote pollinator friendly cover crop mixes, and economic information on how to use these mixes in crop rotations to meet the annual needs of pollinators and improve soil health.

Strategy 4 – Develop website content tailored to producers with information on at risk pollinators to be particularly concerned about in their area, means of enhancing pollinator

habitat including holistic ranch and farm management, modified pest management strategies (chemicals to use, application rates, application methods, to minimize adverse impacts, and other items listed above, including available information on economic impacts of alternative management practices). Link website content to appropriate existing websites.

Objective 3 – Ensure that agronomists, biologists, and other land management professionals working with landowners are providing information about opportunities to enhance monarch and pollinator habitat. Provide educational materials that cover the benefits of healthy pollinator populations.

Strategy 1 – Host workshops for conservation and agribusiness professionals

Objective 4 – Work with appropriate partners to produce, disseminate and implement the above information.

Strategy 1 – Reach out to the agribusiness industry for financial support on education and communication and to encourage the development of pollinator-friendly products.

Strategy 2 – Reach out to local conservation entities (conservation districts, Pheasants Forever, Ducks Unlimited, etc.) to encourage discussion of pollinator-friendly practices in their interactions with producers.

Objective 5: Identify and use networks of state agencies, federal agencies and other stakeholders (public, private, academic, etc.) more effectively to further monarch/pollinator conservation.

Strategy 1: Encourage use of Monarch Conservation Database to share habitat project information and outlets such as iNaturalist and other citizen science data bases by including the information on the education brochures, social media, and other venues listed in Objective 1.

Strategy 2: Promote and acknowledge the efforts of all participating agencies/groups by using their logos on materials produced.

Strategy 3: Improve and expand citizen science efforts (monarch tagging, milkweed tracking, butterfly and milkweed surveys) by including the information in all new monarch materials produced.

Strategy 4: Involve educational entities, such as the SD Dept. of Education and the South Dakota Science Teachers Association to encourage relevancy and compliance with state education standards.

Objective 6: Use interpretive displays to promote pollinator conservation at sites with extensive public visitation, such as university campuses, SDGFP Outdoor Campus East and Outdoor Campus West, public rest areas, and other high public-use areas.

Strategy 1: Use pollinator plantings at areas with extensive public visitation as focal points for sharing educational messages about pollinator habitat needs.

Strategy 2: Incorporate materials that are easy to download or link to, including appropriate social media methods.

E. Research, Monitoring and Data Management

Despite the monarch's widespread distribution and familiarity to many people, wildlife agencies lack important information needed to better understand and enhance the species and its habitats. Research and evaluation prescribed under Goal 5 should be conducted in coordination with other MAFWA states that have habitats similar to South Dakota to increase the reliability and utility of outcomes. See Objective 5 for potential South Dakota-specific tasks that could contribute to a broader, regional evaluation of research needs.

GOAL 5: Use the best biological information to enhance monarchs and associated habitats in South Dakota.

Objective 1: Estimate current milkweed acreage in South Dakota (see Goal 1, Objective 1, Strategy 2)

Strategy 1: Form a subgroup of botanists, land managers, and GIS specialists to evaluate potential milkweed acreage estimation methods.

Strategy 2: Test potential acreage estimation methods, including components that relate milkweed stems to land types, such as rangeland, cropland, rights-of-way, etc. and known disturbance patterns.

Strategy 3: Implement chosen acreage estimation method to determine baseline acreage in eastern South Dakota.

Objective 2: Determine the most appropriate monitoring protocols for breeding monarchs and associated habitats in South Dakota based on cost and likelihood of implementation

Strategy 1: Consult with species and habitat experts, statisticians, and personnel in other states to determine potential monitoring protocols based on information needs

Strategy 2: Consult with GIS specialists to determine potential remote sensing options for habitat monitoring

Strategy 3: Test and evaluate potential monitoring protocols, including the Integrated Monarch Monitoring Program

Objective 3: Implement the selected monitoring protocols for breeding monarchs and associated habitats

Strategy 1: Identify funding sources to implement monitoring

Strategy 2: Solicit assistance of citizen scientists and/or suitable consultants

Strategy 3: Prepare data collection protocols and conduct necessary in-person training or a suitable remote alternative

Strategy 4: Establish data management systems for data entry or customize an existing citizen science program such as iNaturalist

Strategy 5: Evaluate whether the US Fish and Wildlife Service's Monarch Conservation Database is a suitable tool for keeping track of new monarch/pollinator habitat; if not, create an alternative for South Dakota

Strategy 5: Conduct monitoring protocols for monarchs and habitats for a 5-year cycle, evaluate, reassess feasibility and make needed adjustments

Objective 4: Monitor monarch migration in South Dakota

Strategy 1: Encourage participation in Journey North/Monarch Watch reporting and increased number of Monarch Waystations

Strategy 2: Identify and address shortcomings in existing citizen science opportunities, such as gaps in coverage within the state

Strategy 3: Develop convenient reporting method for monarch concentrations for people who choose not to participate in an established citizen science program

Strategy 4: Evaluate whether to promote increased emphasis on tagging and tracking monarchs in the state

Objective 5: Identify and prioritize a list of research priorities for the monarch and its habitats in South Dakota to meet short-term and long-term information needs

Strategy 1: Compile pertinent scientific literature related to monarchs and milkweed in the Northern Great Plains

Strategy 2: Convene a subgroup of researchers and naturalists to brainstorm South Dakota-specific research needs for the monarch

Strategy 3: Consult with botanists; private, public and tribal land management specialists; and master gardeners to determine South Dakota-specific research needs for milkweed species and pollinator habitat enhancement

Strategy 4: Determine system for prioritizing research needs for monarch and milkweed; match highest priorities with potential funding sources and partners

Strategy 5: Regularly revisit list of research priorities as research is conducted in South Dakota or in other applicable geographical areas

Strategy 6: Ensure that pertinent research findings are publicized and shared appropriately

Strategy 7: Evaluate through use of expert opinion or field research whether existing best management practices for land management are applicable to South Dakota

F. Plan Assessment

GOAL 6: Allocate necessary resources for plan coordination to allow meaningful assessment and appropriate course corrections

Objective 1: Identify a monarch plan coordinator for the first 5 years of plan implementation

Strategy 1: Identify potential funding sources and partners to fund plan coordinator. Example: State Wildlife Grant funds available to SDGFP with nonfederal partners assisting with the required match to fund a native pollinator planning coordinator for a five-year term

Strategy 2: Refine partner and public engagement through this consistent individual/presence

Strategy 3: Provide annual updates on monarch/pollinator activities through the established website, including a running list of accomplishments sorted by plan objectives and strategies

Strategy 4: Conduct a five-year evaluation of plan progress resulting in a cumulative accomplishments report and revised plan reflecting accomplishments and new or revised priorities

Literature Cited:

- Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC). 2008. North American Monarch Conservation Plan. Communications Department of the CEC Secretariat, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. Accessed at this site: https://monarchjointventure.org/images/uploads/documents/5431_Monarch_en.pdf on 13 August 2018.
- Kasten, K., C. Stenoien, W. Caldwell, and K. S. Oberhauser. Can roadside habitat lead monarchs on a route to recovery? *J. Insect Conserv.* 20(6):1047-1057.
- Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (MAFWA). 2018. Mid-America monarch conservation strategy, 2018-2018, Version 1.0.
- National Research Council. 2007. Status of pollinators in North America. National Academies Press.
- Pleasants, J. 2017. Milkweed restoration in the Midwest for monarch butterfly recovery: estimates of milkweeds lost, milkweeds remaining and milkweeds that must be added to increase the monarch population. *Insect Conservation and Diversity* 10:42-53.
- Pleasants, J. M. and K. S. Oberhauser. 2013. Milkweed loss in agricultural fields because of herbicide use: effect on the monarch butterfly population. *Insect Conservation and Diversity* 6:135-144.
- Pollinator Health Task Force. 2015. National strategy to promote the health of honey bees and other pollinators. <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/Pollinator%20Health%20Strategy%202015.pdf>; accessed 16 Aug 2018.
- SD Dept. of Agriculture. 2017. South Dakota Managed Pollinator Plan. SD Dept. of Agriculture, Pierre.
- Thogmartin, W. E., L. Lopez-Hoffman, J. Rohweder, J. Diffendorfer, R. Drum, D. Semmens, S. Black, I. Caldwell, D. Cotter, P. Drobney, L. Jackson, M. Gale, D. Helmers, S. Hilburger, E. Howard, K. Oberhauser, J. Pleasants, B. Semmens, O. Taylor, P. Ward, J. Weltzin, and R. Wiederholt. 2017. Restoring monarch butterfly habitat in the Midwestern US: 'all hands on deck.' *Environmental Research Letters*. 12:074005.
- U.S. Dept. of Interior. 2003. Policy for evaluation of conservation efforts when making listing decisions. *Federal Register*, Vol. 68, No. 60, pp. 15100-15115. <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2003-03-28/pdf/03-7364.pdf>; accessed 16 Aug 2018.

License Sales Totals

(as of Oct 28)

date updated: 29 Oct 2018

Resident	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	+/- Licenses	+/- Revenue
Combination	44,589	46,510	47,372	46,377	44,709	-1,668	\$ (91,740)
Junior Combination	7,938	7,919	7,900	7,551	6,832	-719	\$ (19,413)
Senior Combination	6,746	7,682	8,388	8,914	9,349	435	\$ 17,400
Small Game	19,768	19,011	17,495	13,066	13,698	632	\$ 20,856
Youth Small Game	4,717	4,669	4,393	3,935	3,744	-191	\$ (955)
1-Day Small Game	578	764	751	608	605	-3	\$ (36)
Migratory Bird Certificate	30,469	27,694	26,190	25,248	24,717	-531	\$ (2,655)
Predator/Varmint	1,367	1,435	1,655	1,354	1,421	67	\$ 335
Furbearer	3,101	2,915	2,711	2,647	2,957	310	\$ 9,300
Annual Fishing	64,986	63,208	62,302	61,140	56,710	-4,430	\$ (124,040)
Senior Fishing	12,866	12,691	12,802	13,167	12,891	-276	\$ (3,312)
1-Day Fishing	4,717	6,166	6,241	6,110	5,483	-627	\$ (5,016)
Gamefish Spearing/Archery	2,758	2,702	2,727	2,904	2,972	68	\$ 340
Nonresident							
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018		
Small Game	45,656	49,935	50,583	36,931	38,177	1,246	\$ 150,766
Youth Small Game	1,395	1,521	1,567	1,144	1,106	-38	\$ (380)
Annual Shooting Preserve	249	321	332	316	251	-65	\$ (7,865)
5-day Shooting Preserve	6,567	6,750	7,150	7,572	7,832	260	\$ 19,760
1-day Shooting Preserve	655	725	801	707	774	67	\$ 3,082
Spring Light Goose	4,572	4,249	3,965	4,494	4,711	217	\$ 10,850
Youth Spring Light Goose	165	161	141	159	179	20	\$ 520
Migratory Bird Certificate	1,181	908	959	928	1,273	345	\$ 1,725
Predator/Varmint	3,842	4,448	4,639	4,688	4,831	143	\$ 5,720
Furbearer	6	8	5	10	8	-2	\$ (550)
Annual Fishing	24,913	26,522	27,826	26,057	25,842	-215	\$ (14,405)
Family Fishing	8,996	9,340	9,671	9,323	8,721	-602	\$ (40,334)
Youth Annual Fishing	1,485	1,475	1,609	1,332	1,234	-98	\$ (2,450)
3-Day Fishing	23,261	24,284	25,123	23,931	23,908	-23	\$ (851)
1-Day Fishing	21,894	21,231	23,075	21,785	19,599	-2,186	\$ (34,976)
Gamefish Spearing/Archery	672	650	701	674	728	54	\$ 270
TOTALS =	350,109	355,894	359,074	333,072	325,262	-7,810	\$ (108,054)

Division of Parks and Recreation
October YTD 2018 Revenue by Item

27

	2017		2018		%
	Number	Dollar	Number	Dollar	
Annual	55,484	\$ 1,664,528	55,151	\$ 1,654,545	-1%
2nd Annual	14,611	\$ 219,172	14,441	\$ 216,621	-1%
Combo	26,966	\$ 1,213,489	28,443	\$ 1,279,956	5%
Transferable	1,772	\$ 115,178	1,933	\$ 125,642	9%
Daily License	122,634	\$ 669,107	111,076	\$ 666,457	0%
Unattended Vehicle Daily	2,186	\$ 21,858	2,024	\$ 20,244	-7%
GSM Annual Trail Pass	4,425	\$ 66,375	4,514	\$ 67,710	2%
GSM Daily Trail Pass	15,438	\$ 61,750	14,829	\$ 59,316	-4%
Motorcoach Permit	29,021	\$ 87,062	26,892	\$ 80,677	-7%
CSP 7 Day Pass	169,947	\$ 3,398,937	166,893	\$ 3,337,852	-2%
CSP 7 Day Bike Band	21,630	\$ 216,304	21,624	\$ 216,237	0%
Rally Bike Band	28,369	\$ 283,690	31,224	\$ 312,240	10%
One-Day Special Event		\$ 8,000		\$ 10,828	35%
PERMITS	492,483	\$ 8,025,449	479,046	\$ 8,048,325	0%
Camping Services		\$ 8,707,797		\$ 8,946,945	3%
Picnic Reservations		\$ 16,975		\$ 14,422	-15%
Firewood	33,384	\$ 166,919	43,655	\$ 218,275	31%
Gift Card		\$ 6,145		\$ 11,537	88%
LODGING	33,384	\$ 8,897,837	43,655	\$ 9,191,179	3%
TOTAL	525,867	\$ 16,923,286	522,701	\$ 17,239,504	2%

Division of Parks and Recreation
October 2018 YTD Revenue by District

27A

LOCATION	2017	2018	%
Pickrel Lake			
Fort Sisseton			
Roy Lake			
Sica Hollow			
DISTRICT 1	\$ 471,855	\$ 477,834	1%
Richmond Lake			
Mina Lake			
Fisher Grove			
Amsden			
Lake Louise			
DISTRICT 2	\$ 298,161	\$ 291,484	-2%
Pelican Lake			
Sandy Shore			
Lake Cochrane			
Hartford Beach			
DISTRICT 3	\$ 432,631	\$ 485,368	12%
Oakwood Lakes			
Lake Poinsett			
Lake Thompson			
DISTRICT 4	\$ 817,747	\$ 913,238	12%
Lake Herman			
Walker's Point			
DISTRICT 5	\$ 303,650	\$ 323,899	7%
Snake Creek			
Platte Creek			
Buryanek			
Burke Lake			
DISTRICT 6	\$ 440,105	\$ 459,064	4%
Palisades			
Big Sioux			
Lake Vermillion			
DISTRICT 7	\$ 904,811	\$ 895,657	-1%
Newton Hills			
Good Earth			
Union Grove			
Lake Alvin			
Adams			
DISTRICT 8	\$ 593,648	\$ 610,688	3%

LOCATION	2017	2018	%
Lewis & Clarks			
Chief White Cran			
Pierson Ranch			
Springfield			
Sand Creek			
Tabor			
DISTRICT 9	\$ 1,998,056	\$ 2,075,130	4%
North Point			
North Wheeler			
Pease Creek			
Randall Creek			
South Shore			
South Scalp			
Whetstone			
White Swan			
DISTRICT 10	\$ 660,073	\$ 678,034	3%
Farm Island			
West Bend			
DISTRICT 11	\$ 535,341	\$ 530,976	-1%
Oahe Downstream			
Cow Creek			
Okobojo			
Spring Creek			
DISTRICT 12	\$ 375,831	\$ 538,114	-7%
West Whitlock			
East Whitlock			
Swan Creek			
Indian Creek			
Lake Hiddenwood			
Revheim Bay			
Walth Bay			
West Pollock			
DISTRICT 13	\$ 395,787	\$ 399,142	1%
Mickelson Trail			
Bear Butte			
DISTRICT 14	\$ 173,851	\$ 153,256	-12%
Shadehill			
Llewellyn Johns			
Rocky Point			
DISTRICT 15	\$ 457,088	\$ 483,552	6%
Custer			
DISTRICT 16	\$ 6,927,651	\$ 6,830,267	-1%
Angostura			
Sheps Canyon			
DISTRICT 17	\$ 720,852	\$ 780,507	8%
PIERRE OFFICE	\$ 216,148	\$ 313,295	45%
TOTAL	\$ 16,923,286	\$ 17,239,504	2%

Division of Parks and Recreation
October YTD 2018 Camping by District

27B

LOCATION	2017	2018	%
Pickere Lake	6,562	5,986	-9%
Fort Sisseton	1,531	1,304	-15%
Roy Lake	6,640	6,755	2%
Sica Hollow	197	208	6%
DISTRICT 1	14,930	14,253	-5%
Richmond Lake	1,649	1,548	-6%
Mina Lake	3,063	2,755	-10%
Fisher Grove	1,162	1,092	-6%
Amsden	270	139	-49%
Lake Louise	2,170	2,231	3%
DISTRICT 2	8,314	7,765	-7%
Pelican Lake	5,421	5,293	-2%
Sandy Shore	1,281	1,444	13%
Lake Cochrane	1,982	1,949	-2%
Hartford Beach	5,855	5,770	-1%
DISTRICT 3	14,539	14,456	-1%
Oakwood Lakes	9,596	9,203	-4%
Lake Poinsett	8,581	9,164	7%
Lake Thompson	7,147	7,156	0%
DISTRICT 4	25,324	25,523	1%
Lake Herman	5,917	5,796	-2%
Walker's Point	3,094	3,067	-1%
Lake Carthage	718	849	18%
DISTRICT 5	9,729	9,712	0%
Snake Creek	9,204	9,121	-1%
Platte Creek	1,677	1,451	-13%
Buryanek	2,742	2,548	-7%
Burke Lake	49	44	-10%
DISTRICT 6	13,672	13,164	-4%
Palisades	4,967	4,616	-7%
Big Sioux	6,265	6,253	0%
Lake Vermillion	9,624	9,097	-5%
DISTRICT 7	20,856	19,966	-4%
Newton Hills	11,696	11,010	-6%
Good Earth	13	73	
Union Grove	1,781	1,646	-8%
DISTRICT 8	13,490	12,729	-6%

LOCATION	2017	2018	%
Lewis & Clark	41,211	40,745	-1%
Chief White Crane	12,241	11,864	-3%
Pierson Ranch	4,767	4,840	2%
Springfield	1,314	1,245	-5%
Sand Creek	140	106	-24%
Tabor	91	41	-55%
DISTRICT 9	59,764	58,841	-2%
North Point	9,900	9,745	-2%
North Wheeler	815	683	-16%
Pease Creek	1,554	1,355	-13%
Randall Creek	7,517	7,258	-3%
South Shore	489	360	-26%
South Scalp	103	69	-33%
Whetstone	424	305	-28%
White Swan	228	223	-2%
DISTRICT 10	21,030	19,998	-5%
Farm Island	7,759	7,539	-3%
West Bend	9,818	9,114	-7%
DISTRICT 11	17,577	16,653	-5%
Oahe Downstream	14,398	13,508	-6%
Cow Creek	2,517	2,666	6%
Okobojo	1,509	1,398	-7%
DISTRICT 12	18,424	17,572	-5%
West Whitlock	4,269	4,079	-4%
East Whitlock	99	96	-3%
Swan Creek	703	642	-9%
Indian Creek	6,470	7,513	16%
Lake Hiddenwood	426	10	-98%
Walth Bay	33	35	6%
West Pollock	1,098	1,309	19%
DISTRICT 13	13,098	13,684	4%
Bear Butte	1,201	1,090	-9%
DISTRICT 14	1,201	1,090	-9%
Shadehill	5,906	5,823	-1%
Llewellyn Johns	524	559	7%
Rocky Point	5,816	5,865	1%
DISTRICT 15	12,246	12,247	0%
Custer	52,805	52,748	0%
DISTRICT 16	52,805	52,748	0%
Angostura	18,683	18,337	-2%
Sheps Canyon	1,807	1,813	0%
DISTRICT 17	20,490	20,150	-2%
TOTAL	337,489	330,551	-2%