

An Independent Review of South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks' Division of Wildlife's Wildlife Damage Management Program



In Response to SD RFP 1640

Wildlife Management Institute, Inc.

November 22, 2019

Contents

Executive Summary.....	4
Introduction	16
Methods.....	18
Findings and Recommendations.....	22
Q1. Does the current organizational, administrative and program management structure of the WDM program in South Dakota lend itself to the delivery of effective WDM program services that meet the needs of agricultural producers, other state citizens, and sportsmen/women?	22
Findings	22
Recommendations	26
Q2: Do field supervisors have sufficient experience, education, training and knowledge to effectively supervise all field operations and associated staff? If not, please identify several recommendations that would enhance field supervisors' ability to be more effective.	27
Findings	27
Recommendations:	28
Q3: Are current budget revenue sources used to deliver WDM program services sufficient and are the sources of these revenues appropriate given the diversity of program management needs across GFP?	29
Findings:	29
Recommendations:	31
Q4: Do current staffing levels and budget allocations within the WDM program provide effective use of budget resources and man-power and efficient and effective delivery of WDM program services, considering the needs for the entire spectrum of WDM program services across the State?	31
Findings:	31
Recommendations	32
Q5: Is GFP the appropriate agency to deliver WDM program services or are there other more effective and capable alternatives for delivering these services, given the constraints of current and projected future budget revenues.....	33
Findings	33
Recommendations:	35
Q6: Does GFP appropriately consider the potential for wildlife damage to private property in establishing wildlife harvest objectives, employing wildlife harvest strategies and employing other management regulations, tools and techniques to ensure various wildlife populations are	

effectively managed for all SD citizens? If not, what additional mechanisms, techniques or strategies could be employed to ensure wildlife populations are more effectively managed within landowner tolerance while at the same time meeting sportsmen’s expectations for the availability of these resources for hunting or the public’s expectations for wildlife viewing opportunities? 35

Findings: 35

Recommendations: 36

Q7: Is there sufficient opportunity for appropriate staff input at all levels of GFP to help ensure effective delivery of WDM program services? Do WDM program supervisors and administrators provide an appropriate level of supervision, oversight and review in making decisions regarding the allocation of staff and budget resources and the establishment of guidelines for the delivery of WDM program services? 37

Findings: 37

Recommendations: 37

Q8: Does GFP conduct effective communication, outreach and engagement with regard to the various constituents or recipients of WDM program services and other important stakeholders? If not, what changes could GFP make to more effectively engage stakeholders and improve the delivery of WDM program services. 38

Findings: 38

Recommendations: 39

Q9: Does GFP provide a sufficient level of transparency and accountability regarding WDM programs and services to constituents and stakeholders? 39

Findings: 39

Recommendations: 40

Additional Findings and Recommendations 40

Recruitment, Orientation, and Training 40

Findings 40

Recommendations: 41

Public and Staff Expectations 42

Findings 42

Recommendations: 42

Policy Direction and Program Priorities 42

Finding 43

Recommendation 43

WDMS Equipment Needs 43

Findings	43
Recommendations	43
Literature Cited	44
Appendix A: Agricultural Producer Survey Responses.....	45
Appendix B: Landowner Survey Responses	67
Appendix C: General Public Survey Responses	80
Appendix D: 2017 & 2018 WDM Service Recipient Responses	111
Appendix E: South Dakota RFP 1640	136
Appendix F: Contract	158

Executive Summary

In May 2019, the South Dakota Governor's Office selected the Wildlife Management Institute (WMI) to conduct an independent, 10-year historical review of South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks' (GFP) comprehensive Wildlife Damage Management (WDM) program. The review was intended to examine program components related to Animal Damage Control (ADC) (i.e. coyote, fox, prairie dog and nuisance beaver control) and Game Damage Management (GDM) (i.e. damage to property caused by game animals, primarily deer, elk, geese and turkeys). The review was to examine the history and evolution of the WDM program; current organizational structure; budgets and revenue sources; public opinion surveys; statutes, regulations, policies, and procedures; communication efforts; and overall effectiveness. Over the past century, WMI has conducted more than 80 such reviews of state, federal and provincial fish and wildlife programs.

WMI employed a four-member team with a cumulative total of over 100 years of professional wildlife management experience in eight states to conduct the review. WMI examined background documents provided by GFP and conducted interviews with three GFP Commissioners, 16 interested individuals and stakeholder representatives, and 23 GFP staff across all levels of the WDM program administrative structure. WMI administered online surveys to WDM program service recipients (responses received =226), South Dakota Landowners (responses received=229), South Dakota Agricultural Producers (responses received =320), and the general public (responses received= 454) to gain additional insights into the WDM program.

Overarching Issues

Much of the current controversy related to the WDM program stems from the reorganization of the ADC and GDM components in 2009. Prior to 2009, there were 21 ADC staff called "Extension Trappers" or "State Trappers" who focused full-time on coyote, fox, and to a lesser degree prairie dog control and removal of problem beavers.¹ At that time, GFP employed only four staff assigned full-time to game damage management.

In 2009, in response to elimination of federal funding support to the ADC program, increasing demand for game damage services, and the desire to better integrate the ADC program with regional wildlife management, GFP combined ADC and GDM into a consolidated WMD program. Under the revised program structure field-level positions were reclassified as Wildlife Damage Management Specialists (WDMS) responsible for addressing both ADC and GDM complaints within an assigned district. In view of the broader scope of duties, these positions were elevated one pay grade from the former ADC and GDM positions. A few ADC staff disagreed with the reassignment and left GFP at that time or shortly thereafter. Over the past decade, the number of WDMS has increased from 24 to 28.

¹ GFP is the only state in the region that employs individuals to conduct coyote control. In MT, ND, and WY coyote control is conducted by USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service – Wildlife Services.

Some people believe that the former structure with ADC as a stand-alone program was more efficient and effective, particularly with respect to reducing coyote numbers and/or depredation. These individuals lack confidence in the current administration of the WDM program and argue for a return to the former structure, based in part on their perception that the goal of the ADC program should be general suppression of coyote numbers.

In contrast, GFP's ADC program is focused on localized removal of coyotes that are actively involved in livestock depredation or specific areas where depredation is chronic. This approach is supported by research that demonstrates that broad-scale efforts to control coyote numbers are largely ineffective.

Most members of the public and GFP staff expressed the view that the goal of the WDM program is to resolve damage complaints, maintain positive relationships with landowners, and achieve high levels of customer satisfaction. However, GFP has not developed measurable, outcome-based objectives related to "customer satisfaction" or "positive landowner relationships" or "resolving damage complaints." Without such objectives, it is difficult – if not impossible – to effectively gauge program performance or resolve disagreements about effectiveness. The lack of clear objectives also contributes to development of unrealistic expectations for the program that cannot be met with available resources.

WMI recommends GFP:

- 1. Engage stakeholders and staff in a planning process to resolve disagreement regarding WDM program goals and to define meaningful, measurable, outcome-based objectives to provide greater transparency and accountability for the program.**
- 2. Develop and implement cost-effective means of evaluating outcome-based objectives on a regular basis.**

Responses To Governor's Office Questions

Q1. Does the current organizational, administrative and program management structure of the WDM program in South Dakota lend itself to the delivery of effective WDM program services that meet the needs of agricultural producers, other state citizens, and sportsmen/women?

Findings:

- The current organizational, administrative, and management structure of the WDM program generally provides an effective and efficient response to wildlife damage complaints across South Dakota. WDMS routinely respond to calls regarding complaints within 24 hours and most service recipients are satisfied with the actions taken.
- The merging of ADC and GDM programs implemented in 2009 makes efficient use of WDMS' time, but the broader range of duties now assigned to WDMS has impacts on workload, necessary skill sets, and training needs that must be considered.

- The size and distribution of WDMS districts is generally appropriate, but the nature of game damage issues in some districts creates a workload that is larger than can be effectively managed by current staff. Demands for predator control in late winter and early spring, concurrent with calving and lambing, can compete with demands for response to deer and elk depredation on stored crops to an extent that exceeds the capacity of the WDMS. This is a chronic issue in Region 3 and occurs in other regions during severe winters like the winter of 2018-19.
- GFP uses an “all hands on deck” approach to address game damage complaints during severe winters, but lack of familiarity with equipment or procedures by staff assigned to help out during “crunch” times limits the effectiveness of this approach and redirecting other program staff can have adverse impacts on those other programs.
- Changes in the WDM program structure have contributed to the perception that WDMS have too many supervisors and that their supervisors lack knowledge of ADC practices. In practice, the WDMS complete their work relatively independently with limited supervision from the Regional Program Managers (RPM). Regional Terrestrial Resource Supervisors (RTRS) and Regional Supervisors have limited direct influence on WDMS. Although there are some issues related to supervision that need to be addressed (see Question 2), the number of supervisory levels above the WDMS is not a barrier to effective program management.
- The WDM program has effective procedures in place for reporting time, activities and program outputs, but lacks regular measurement of program outcomes in relation to the implied program goal of resolving complaints and maintaining positive relationships between GFP and landowners and agricultural producers.

Recommendations:

1. Resolve confusion and/or debate regarding the goal of the ADC components of the WDM program. GFP should clearly communicate that the goal of the ADC program is to respond to and resolve individual producer’s depredation complaints and not to reduce coyote numbers in general. GFP should work with producers, policymakers, and other constituents to establish quantifiable objectives related to desired outcomes (e.g., “customer satisfaction/tolerance”) to document and monitor the effectiveness of the program.
2. Review and adjust sizes and/or staffing of districts; consider additional FTE for WDMS as necessary.
3. Provide appropriate training for non-WDM staff that can reasonably be expected to be called upon to assist with GDM efforts when winter severity creates high demand for services.
4. Take steps to ensure RPMs complete annual performance reviews with all WDMS.
5. Take steps to ensure RTRS complete annual performance reviews with all RPMs
6. Clarify respective roles of RPM and RTRS within the field organization.
7. Clearly communicating the prioritization of resolving ongoing coyote depredation in relation to GDM duties (e.g. stored feed protection), and maintenance/preventative coyote control.

Question 2: Do field supervisors have sufficient experience, education, training and knowledge to effectively supervise all field operations and associated staff? If not, please identify several recommendations that would enhance field supervisors' ability to be more effective.

Findings:

- Field supervisors for the WDM Program include the RPM, RTRS, and Regional Supervisor. RPMs have the most important supervisory relationship to WDMS.
- WMI found that field supervisors at all levels recognize and respect the highly technical skills of WDMS and have confidence in the WDMS' ability to resolve complaints. This degree of confidence combined with other supervisory demands of the RPMs has resulted in the RPMs spending relatively little time in the field with the WDMS.
- Concerns related to field supervision of the WDM Program centered on whether RPMs who lacked field experience with predator control could effectively supervise WDMS. At present, two of the four RPMs have experience with predator control.
- Prior experience as a WDMS would be beneficial but is not the only way RPMs can gain the knowledge and skills needed to supervise WDMS.
- Turnover among supervisory staff is a more significant factor than the lack of prior experience with predator control with respect to effective supervision of WDMS.

Recommendations:

1. Take steps to ensure RPMs spend additional time in the field with WDMS to gain first-hand knowledge of the working conditions and needs of the WDMS. This may require review of RPM's workload and/or embedding this requirement in job descriptions and annual performance plans/reviews.
2. For RPMs that have little or no personal experience with trapping, consider having them attend the same "trapping college" that newly hired WDMS with limited trapping experience attend or other training to familiarize them with trapping.
3. Provide RPMs and RTRSs additional supervisory training.
4. Provide potential future supervisors with training prior to assignment.
5. Keep Accountability & Competency Evaluations (ACEs) evaluations current.
6. Good practice in employment would indicate the routine use of annual appraisal which could include a review of how the supervision process has worked both structurally and functionally over the period. This might involve comments from both the supervisor and the subordinate, with suggestions about how things could be improved. The purpose of this is not mutual criticism but mutual improvement for the benefit of people who use WDM services. The addition of the RTRS level to field supervision was a logical step to provide Program Managers additional time to focus on supervision and support of WDMS.

Question 3: Are current budget revenue sources used to deliver WDM program services sufficient and are the sources of these revenues appropriate given the diversity of program management needs across GFP?

Findings:

- Major funding for the ADC program comes from a county-level per-capita tax on livestock, a matching source of general hunting license fees, a \$1.00 surcharge on most hunting licenses, and a portion of the transaction fee on license sales. These sources provide about \$1.6 million per year.
- The USDA Animal and Plant Inspection Service – Wildlife Services program provided \$300,000 to \$700,000 per year for the ADC program until 2008. When Congress eliminated “ear marks,” this funding ceased.
- GFP has taken steps to maximize use of ADC funds for coyote control efforts.
- The South Dakota Department of Agriculture has provided from \$0 to \$225,000 for prairie dog control in some years.
- Major funding for GDM activities comes from a portion of a \$5.00 surcharge on most hunting licenses, general license fees, a portion of the transaction fee on license sales and a portion of the revenue from Special Buck licenses.
- The funding sources distribute the cost of the WDM program across agricultural producers and license buyers, which is appropriate given the benefits of the program to both parties.
- GFP partners with county-based Predator Control Districts (PCD) in some parts of the state to increase effectiveness. The role of PCDs could be expanded and improved.
- Based on high levels of agricultural producers’ and service-recipients’ satisfaction, current budgets and revenues appear adequate to provide a reasonable level of service.
- Criticism of the WDM stems, in part, from unrealistic and/or unlimited expectations regarding the level of service GFP should provide. Without established objectives and routine monitoring of desired WDM program outcomes, arguments about whether current budgets are “sufficient” cannot be resolved.

Recommendations:

1. Develop objectives and associated metrics for ADC and GDM programs.
2. Develop a cost-effective means of evaluating customer satisfaction.
3. Support growth and development of predator control districts which benefit from producers influencing direction of predator control programs
4. Review and adjust sizes and/or staffing of districts; consider additional FTE for WDMS as necessary.

Q4: Do current staffing levels and budget allocations within the WDM program provide effective use of budget resources and man-power and efficient and effective delivery of WDM program services, considering the needs for the entire spectrum of WDM program services across the State?

Findings:

- Current staffing levels are generally adequate, but in some areas – particularly in Region 1 – the size of some WDMS' districts, combined with unrealistic expectations about the required level of service, contribute to excessive workloads for some WDMS.
- In Region 3 during most years and across the state in severe winters (e.g. 2019), demand for game damage services (e.g. fencing stack yards), exceeds the capacity of WDM Program staff. Regions find it difficult to secure short-term workers to fill this need, resulting in re-assignment of other programs' staff to WDM duties. This approach, while necessary to meet agency and public expectations related to game damage management, has an adverse impact on other agency programs when staff is re-directed.
- Restrictions on use of overtime and the process for overtime approval continue to constrain WDMS' ability to meet public expectations in some districts.
- Demand for aerial predator control from mid-January through April can exceed the capacity of the two pilot-gunner teams employed by GFP. Use of contracted pilot-gunner teams during these months could increase effectiveness.
- GFP employs only one WDMS with the necessary experience and dogs trained to conduct lion control work statewide. This impacts this WDMS' ability to fulfill duties within his district and will leave GFP unprepared to deal with lion complaints when this employee retires.

Recommendations:

1. Review and adjust sizes and/or staffing of districts; consider additional FTE for WDMS as necessary.
2. Secure the services of 1 or 2 private contract pilot/gunner teams to provide additional capacity during the period from mid-January through April. Contracting private pilot/gunner teams that do not have to comply with state and federal training requirements offers greater flexibility for meeting this seasonal demand. To the extent practical, delegate coordination of contract pilot/gunner teams to RPMs for most efficient use of this resource.
3. State employees should not gun for private contract pilots to limit liability in case of an accident.
4. GFP should develop additional capacity to address mountain lion complaints as a way to reduce the demands on the current WDMS and prepare for his eventual retirement.
5. GFP should review its policies and standards for offsetting the costs associated with maintaining dogs for use in coyote control to ensure more equitable compensation and increase the number of WDMS who have this capacity.

Question 5: Is GFP the appropriate agency to deliver WDM program services or are there other more effective and capable alternatives for delivering these services, given the constraints of current and projected future budget revenues.

Findings:

- Wildlife, including predatory species, is a public trust resource and state fish and wildlife agencies, like GFP, have the best understanding of the science of wildlife management and the tools for managing the wide diversity of wildlife damage issues.
- Wildlife damage management is best undertaken as a partnership between GFP and other state and federal agencies, landowners, agricultural producers and the public.
- GFP has designed the current WDM program to provide specialized response to a broad range of wildlife damage issues including both predator control to reduce livestock depredation and game damage to agriculture and property.
- South Dakota is the only state in the region that has agency staff engaged in predator control. In MT, ND, and WY, USDA-APHIS-Wildlife Services conducts predator control in response to livestock depredation.
- Transferring all responsibility for predator control to APHIS-WS would be consistent with the role USDA-APHIS-WS has in surrounding states and would re-establish predator control as a “stand-alone” program with a narrow focus, as recommended by some stakeholders, but would raise numerous problematic issues.
- Predator Control Districts (PCDs) are a valuable adjunct to GFP’s WDM program but are not capable of administering or delivering the full array of WDM program services locally or statewide.
- Transferring some or all the WDM program to the SD Dept. of Agriculture would be logical but raises many of the same issues as a transfer to USDA-APHIS-WS along with several others.

Recommendations:

1. GFP should evaluate the status and effectiveness of PCDs. In counties where no PCD currently exists, or the existing PCD is not providing meaningful services, GFP should work with producers to establish or re-vitalize a PCD to increase the degree to which producers have a financial stake in coyote control efforts
2. GFP should maintain, and if necessary, memorialize, working relationships with existing agency partners. Publicly available memorandums add transparency to the public and employees.
3. Based on current revenue streams, which include fees related to hunting licenses, the WDM program should remain in GFP.

Question 6: Does GFP appropriately consider the potential for wildlife damage to private property in establishing wildlife harvest objectives, employing wildlife harvest strategies and employing other management regulations, tools and techniques to ensure various wildlife populations are effectively managed for all SD citizens? If not, what additional mechanisms, techniques or strategies could be employed to ensure wildlife populations are more effectively managed within landowner tolerance while at the same time meeting sportsmen’s expectations for the availability of these resources for hunting or the public’s expectations for wildlife viewing opportunities?

Findings:

- Policy direction from the Secretary's Office is clear that "landowner tolerance" is a significant factor in the establishment of GFP's wildlife population objectives, harvest strategies and use of GDM tools and techniques. GFP's season- and quota-setting processes incorporate consideration of the impacts of game populations on agricultural producers.
- GFP personnel at all levels recognize the importance of managing wildlife populations within the limits of landowner tolerance to maintain hunting access and opportunity.
- GFP's initial use of kill permits to reduce goose depredation was perceived by some producers as overly conservative. Following reduction of the resident goose population, use of goose kill permits appears to be in line with needs and expectations.
- The variability of winter weather makes it impossible to avoid having populations that producers think are "too high" when winters are severe or that are "too low" to satisfy hunters during periods of mild winters.
- GFP uses a broad range of tools to address wildlife damage complaints and routinely seeks ways to improve effectiveness.
- Human-bear conflicts in Region 1 are expanding and need to be addressed with increased efforts related to securing attractants.

Recommendations:

1. GFP should continue to use Human Dimensions research and effective tools for public engagement to develop, monitor implementation of, and adjust management plans for deer, elk, and pronghorn. Regular measurement of landowner and hunter/public satisfaction should be integral to this process.
2. GFP should communicate the impacts of variable winter severity to establish realistic public expectations regarding their ability to optimize ungulate populations.
3. GFP should initiate an outreach effort to reduce human-bear conflicts in and around the Black Hills. The Southeast Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies' "Bearwise" program, the Montana Bear Education Working Group, and the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee can serve as models and information sources for such a program. Such efforts would logically be included in a black bear management plan.

Question 7: Is there sufficient opportunity for appropriate staff input at all levels of GFP to help ensure effective delivery of WDM program services? Do WDM program supervisors and administrators provide an appropriate level of supervision, oversight and review in making decisions regarding the allocation of staff and budget resources and the establishment of guidelines for the delivery of WDM program services?

Findings:

- GFP provides regular opportunities for WDM staff to provide input on current issues, policy, and training needs. Recently, Secretary Hepler spent over 4 hours meeting with WDM staff from all levels.

- Program supervisors and administrators provide appropriate guidance and oversight of allocation of staff and budget.
- Performance evaluations using the ACE system are not consistently completed in a timely manner.

Recommendations:

1. Efforts to have greater inclusion of staff to ensure an opportunity to contribute to improving delivery of WDM services should continue.
2. The WDM program should be represented in development of species plans.
3. Pierre administrators should notify chain of command when significant concerns from a producer come in and allow the field structure to resolve the concerns.

Question 8: Does GFP conduct effective communication, outreach and engagement with regard to the various constituents or recipients of WDM program services and other important stakeholders? If not, what changes could GFP make to more effectively engage stakeholders and improve the delivery of WDM program services.

Findings:

- GFP conducts regular outreach to the public in general and to agricultural producers in particular. Nevertheless, significant numbers of South Dakota residents have limited knowledge of the WDM program.
- WDMS communicate quickly and effectively with individuals that have damage complaints and the majority of service recipients reported the WDMS were fair, professional, responsive, courteous and had a positive attitude.

Recommendations:

1. Leadership should recognize that WDMS are the face of the WDM program. Managers should ensure that WDMS staff have current information and are aware of the “why” of policy decisions in addition to knowledge of technical solution.
2. WDMS should continue engagement with agricultural producers, landowners and the communities in their area. These efforts help make the public aware of GFP efforts to manage wildlife resources and address wildlife issues in the state.
3. Develop a cost-effective means of evaluating customer satisfaction (also in Q2 recommendations.)
4. The WDM program should continue to use a centralized database for tracking program outputs as supplementary information to inform variations in customer satisfaction metrics (recommended to be developed). Consistency in reporting results and use of documented methods and metrics will address data concerns.
5. Where possible, and if resources are available, incorporate automated query routines to address recurring questions. Frequently asked questions or follow-up questions about existing information often help identify issues that the WDM annual report can address proactively and responsively.

Question 9: Does GFP provide a sufficient level of transparency and accountability regarding WDM programs and services to constituents and stakeholders?

Findings:

- The WDM program is highly transparent and accountable to the producers experiencing wildlife-related damage. The program is less visible or transparent to other South Dakotans.
- GFP regularly provides information about the WDM program to the general public in the form of press releases, newsletters, etc.
- GFP produces a WDM annual report that includes a great deal of information about program outputs and operations. Constituents and stakeholders can analyze the report.
- WDMS feel personally responsible and accountable to the producers they serve.
- In one case, GFP took a long time to respond to a complex information request from a stakeholder. The manner in which this request was handled compromised staff credibility.

Recommendations:

1. Develop goals and associated metrics for ADC and GDM programs.
2. Develop a cost-effective means of evaluating customer satisfaction (also in Q2 recommendations.)
3. Incorporate goals and associated metrics into communication and outreach materials.

Additional Findings and Recommendations

In addition to addressing the nine questions posed by the Governor's Office, WMI made several other findings that are relevant to an overall review of the WDM program. These findings and associated recommendations are as follows.

Recruitment, Orientation, and Training

Findings

- The WDMS job requires a unique set of skills ranging from the ability to trap, snare, and shoot coyotes, to coordinating aerial shooting, to trapping beavers and other nuisance animals, to securing both standing and stored crops from game animals such as geese and elk.
- GFP recognizes the importance of communication and inter-personal skills for WDMS and seeks applicants with these skills.
- Some WDMS have a family or personal history of trapping or aerial shooting coyotes, which is one of the most challenging aspects of the job. This sort of background is increasingly hard to find.
- GFP does not have a well-defined or consistently implemented process for "onboarding" new WDMS to ensure they receive the orientation and training they need to be successful.

Recommendations:

1. GFP should continue to encourage young people to participate in recreational trapping to sustain interest and skills for future applicant pools.
2. Develop and implement a process for “onboarding” and mentoring of newly hired WDMS that takes advantage of the knowledge, skills, and abilities of experienced WDMS. This will require active involvement of the RPM to ensure experienced WDMS’ workloads are adjusted to provide time for mentoring new hires. This process could mirror the way law enforcement uses “field training officers” to develop real-world skills and to mentor junior officers.
3. GFP should continue to provide new WDMS with limited experience in predator control opportunities to learn from experienced trappers within and outside the ranks of GFP.
4. GFP should provide additional opportunities for WDMS to share their experience and expertise across the program at regional and statewide meetings.

Public and Staff Expectations**Findings:**

- Both the public and staff expressed the view that the goal of the WDM program is to resolve damage complaints, maintain positive relationships with landowners, and achieve high levels of customer satisfaction.
- The lack of measurable objectives for the program leaves substantial room for disagreement over what “customer satisfaction” or “positive landowner relationships” or “resolving damage complaints” means.
- Some public expectations are unrealistic.
- WMI found that WDMS are incredibly dedicated public servants. The level of dedication leads many WDMS to work uncompensated hours and make other personal sacrifices in order to fulfill their own, as well as public, expectations for the program. This can lead to job dissatisfaction and burn-out.

Recommendations:

1. Improve public, legislative and staff understanding of the extent (and limits) of current revenue and expenditures for the WDM program, the rationale for GFP allocation/use of WDM funds, and the level of satisfaction with the program.
2. Engage staff and stakeholders in mid-range budget forecasting to improve understanding of the extent and limits of current revenue and expenditures for the WDM program.

Policy Direction and Program Priorities**Finding:**

- GFP supervisory and administrative staff uniformly agree that resolving livestock depredation complaints is the highest priority for WDMS. However, some WDMS expressed

priorities were not clear when winter weather generates game damage complaints that far exceed their capacity.

Recommendation:

1. Develop a planning process that clarifies goals and objectives for the WDM program and provides reportable, outcome-based metrics for program performance to those goals and objectives.

WDMS Equipment Needs

Findings:

- WDMS expressed a need for increased access to thermal rifle sights. Thermal rifle scopes have greatly surpassed “night vision” equipment. Given the nocturnal nature of coyotes, thermal sights can enhance ground-based coyote removal. Not all WDMS use night-time shooting as a preferred tool, thus GFP might wish to assess demand for such tools on a case-by-case basis.
- WDMS expressed a need for increased use of “decoy” dogs. WDMS reported much greater success with both ground-based shooting and aerial control when dogs are employed to locate, lure, or flush coyotes. Several incidents were reported where aerial gunning during late summer to protect lambs on pasture would not have been successful without dogs.
- WDMS expressed a need for side-by-side/quad vehicles. When WDMS need to transport large numbers of traps or other equipment or decoy dogs in areas that are not accessible to a pick-up, these large ATVs provide improved access.
- WDMS expressed a need for snow machines. Deep winter snows effectively limit access to some areas for control. Snow machines reduce time to access these areas.

Recommendations:

1. A business case analysis should be developed to determine where/when decoy dog availability is recommended and supported. If supported, efficient methods to track and reimburse expenses should be developed.
2. Equipment inventory should be regularly checked for replacement of aging equipment and addition of tools that have become necessary to complete work activities.

Introduction

In March 2019, the Office of the Governor of the State of South Dakota issued a request for proposals to conduct an independent review of all components and services associated with the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks' (GFP) Wildlife Damage Management (WDM) program (RFP 1640; Appendix E). RFP 1640 identified nine questions to be answered related to both the scientific foundations and decision-making processes used by GFP for managing wildlife damage. The independent review was intended to identify strengths and weaknesses of current management systems and provide recommendations for improvement of those systems with attention to effective delivery of WDM services. The primary deliverable for this project was to be a comprehensive report that addressed each of the 9 questions in RFP 1640 and provided recommendations for improvement in the current wildlife damage management systems, in conformance with South Dakota law and reasonable allocation of future budgets and staff resources.

The Wildlife Management Institute (WMI) is a scientific and educational non-profit, established in 1911, with a mission to enhance the conservation and professional management of North America's wildlife and its habitat. WMI has a 108-year tradition of science-based wildlife management which values wildlife as a public trust resource, hunting as a legitimate and necessary management tool and recreational pursuit, habitat as necessary for wildlife, and conservation education. During our history, WMI has conducted more than 80 independent reviews of state and federal fish and wildlife programs.

WMI submitted a proposal to conduct the review using a team of academically trained and experienced wildlife professionals with a combined working experience in state and federal agencies in excess of 100 years. The team's expertise includes field surveys and research, data analysis, population modeling, population management, administration of predator control programs, and agency administrative experience in the states of Montana, Alaska, Texas, Kansas, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Michigan. In May 2019, the Governor's Office selected WMI to conduct the independent review under the terms of a contract between WMI and GFP (Appendix F).

Background

Management of predators and other wild animals that can be injurious to livestock, poultry, game, agriculture and the public health is a critical factor in the success of state fish and wildlife agencies. These species are a public trust resource in the United States, and the people of each state hold state government accountable for the management of their resources.

Effective wildlife damage management programs depend on successful integration of biological and social elements. The biological elements must be accurately measured, monitored, and analyzed

using scientifically sound techniques. The social elements require accurate assessment of people's values and interests and must provide meaningful ways for people to gain knowledge about wildlife damage management and participate in decision-making. Citizens have a range of wildlife-related values from mutualism (co-existing with wildlife) to utilitarian (Manfredo et al. 2018). For these reasons and others, wildlife damage management systems must consist of processes that are well defined, transparent, and understood by both the managers and the constituents they serve.

Wildlife governance principles require managing wildlife as a public trust, using science as the basis for gathering evidence, transparent and inclusive decision-making that provides all citizens a voice in the process, and equitable allocation of the benefits of wildlife resources (Decker et al. 2016).

Wildlife species that can cause damage to natural and altered habitats in South Dakota are highly visible, economically important and charismatically attractive to many citizens. Managing damage caused predators, big game species, waterfowl, prairie dogs, and other species presents unique biological and social challenges to management agencies. Effective management is equally important to agricultural producers whose private lands provide habitat for these species and other citizens who may have no direct connection to the damages caused. Managing big game populations at levels where the impact of crop damage, competition for forage, or livestock depredation is tolerated by landowners is important to the state economy and for maintaining the positive relationships between landowners, hunters and wildlife managers that are essential to providing access, hunting opportunity and desired harvest levels to achieve population management objectives.

South Dakota created an Animal Damage Control (ADC) Program in GFP by state law in 1939. Historic information is limited, but it appears that a small number of "extension trappers" worked on prairie dog control and instructed producers on how to trap problem animals from 1940 through 1973. In 1974, the South Dakota Legislature revised the ADC program purpose and funding to employ personnel to control coyotes, fox, prairie dogs, and other wild animals injurious to wildlife. The program employed specialists trained in resolving problems caused by these species that were colloquially referred to as "state trappers" by both staff and the public, reflecting their primary job of removing livestock predators and beavers causing property damage by means of foothold traps and snares.

Species other than those listed in ADC legislation can also cause damage. Growth of elk, deer, waterfowl, and turkey populations in the state created an increasing number of producer complaints about damage caused by these species over the past several decades. Conservation officers handled most of these wildlife damage complaints prior to 1999. In 1999, the South Dakota Legislature added a \$5 surcharge to most hunting licenses, in part, to provide additional funding to address wildlife damage to agriculture. One-half of the revenue from this surcharge was used to establish a Game Damage Management (GDM) Program. GFP used these funds to hire one full-time employee in each region who began to take on some of these duties.

From 1999 to 2009, the ADC and GDM programs were organizationally separate. In 2009, the ADC and GDM programs were combined to create a unified Wildlife Damage Management (WDM) Program. Expenditures for the WDM program totaled \$3,004,282 in fiscal year 2018.

Methods

WMI used a general logic model that included inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts to resolve the questions posed in RFP 1640 regarding the WDM program. WMI used the past 10 years as the timeframe of the review as specified in the RFP and contract. However, during the course of the review we recognized that the integration of the ADC and GDM programs into a single WDM program in 2009 raised several issues relevant to WDM program administration. Accordingly, WMI also examined how the ADC and GDM programs operated prior to the 10-year window established by the governor's office as part of this review.

On June 11, 2019, WMI's President and Midwest and Western Field Representatives met in Pierre, SD with officials from the Office of the Governor and GFP to discuss details of WMI's approach and logistics for conducting our review. Prior to this meeting, WMI requested GFP documents concerning wildlife damage management planning, surveys and analyses, recommendations, and budgetary and staffing information. WMI also requested GFP to provide a list of WDM program staff and stakeholders including both private individuals and organization leaders in South Dakota who could provide meaningful input for the review. In response, GFP provided documents on a secure Dropbox® location for our review and analyses and a list of staff and stakeholder names. WMI contacted each of the listed stakeholders up to seven times requesting an opportunity to conduct an interview with them.

WMI's review included analyses of the documents provided by GFP as well as interviews with three GFP Commissioners, 16 interested individuals and stakeholder representatives, and 23 selected GFP staff directly involved in the WDM program. The GFP employees included the Wildlife Division Director, WDM Program Administrator, four Regional Supervisors, four Regional Terrestrial Resource Supervisors (RTRS), three Regional Program Managers (RPM), and 13 Wildlife Damage Management Specialists (WDMS).

A standard list of questions based on literature review and prior experience of the review team was used to guide all interviews. Interviews were conducted by 1-3 WMI staff. Most of the interviews were conducted in-person in Pierre, Rapid City, and Brookings, SD between July 19 and July 23, 2019. One in-person interview was conducted in Minneapolis, MN on September 24, 2019. The rest of the interviews were conducted by telephone between July 26 and September 9, 2019. All stakeholder interviews, and all except one simultaneous interview of two WDMS, were conducted in private, and participants were assured that their comments would remain confidential to ensure candid responses to questions.

WMI conducted three web-based online surveys of South Dakota residents about the WDM program in the GFP. The first survey was directed to past recipients of services from GFP addressing complaints about wildlife damage in 2017 and 2018. WMI initially cross-referenced 3,050 names and addresses of service recipients provided by GFP with names, addresses and email addresses provided by Exact Data (33 N. Dearborn St., Ste. 200, Chicago, IL 60602; Exactdata.com) to generate a sample frame of 734 service recipient email addresses. WMI sent an email invitation to participate in the web-based survey to all 734 WDM email addresses. The survey opened September 9, 2019 and closed October 20, 2019. WMI received 100 responses (13.6%) to the email solicitation. To increase the sample of service recipients, WMI followed up the email invitations with postcard invitations to all 3,050 physical addresses provided by GFP. This postcard directed interested recipients to the same web-based survey referenced previously. One hundred fifty postcards were returned as undeliverable. One hundred twenty-six additional responses were collected from the postcard invitation, bringing the total service recipient sample size to 226 (7.4% of all service recipients in 2017-2018).

The second web-based online survey was directed to South Dakota residents that had previously self-identified to Exact Data as South Dakota “Agricultural Land Owners” or “Farm and Home Owners”. WMI sent emails to 7,471 email addresses inviting them to participate in the survey. The survey opened September 9, 2019 and closed October 20, 2019. WMI received 705 responses to this survey (9.4% response rate). Two filtering questions enabled WMI to determine that 320 of the 705 respondents were agricultural producers and 229 respondents were landowners but not agricultural producers. Results from these two groups are reported separately. The remaining 156 respondents either indicated that they were currently neither South Dakota landowners nor agricultural producers, or failed to respond to both screening questions. These responses were excluded from the analysis.

A third web-based online survey was a convenience sample (open to any interested party) that was provided to South Dakota residents via public announcement. The survey opened September 9, 2019 and closed October 3, 2019. WMI received a total of 454 responses to this survey. Of those responding to the survey, 89.9% indicated that they currently owned or leased land in South Dakota, and 74.1% self-identified as a current agricultural producer. The same questions were used in this sample as the landowner/agricultural producer survey. However, data were not pooled with other surveys because this sample was self-selected, not random.

Survey Results

The response rates for the WDM surveys are typical of surveys conducted online. The fact that a small portion of individuals contacted completed the surveys may indicate that most individuals did not have strong enough feelings about the WDM program to motivate them to respond. Complete survey responses are presented in Appendices A through D.

The service recipients, agricultural producers, landowners, and general public respondents reported having similar representations of agricultural operation types and statewide distribution. Almost half (49%) of the landowner survey respondents reported owning less than 20 acres, while more than 90% of respondents the other surveys reported owning more than 20 acres. This difference likely reflects a large percentage of “hobby farm” or “ranchette” owners among the landowner sample.

About 20% of the landowners surveyed reported suffering wildlife-associated damage to their lands, crops, livestock or property in 2017-2018. About 56% of the agricultural producers surveyed and 62% of general public survey respondents reported wildlife-associated damage. WMI assumed that 100 percent of service recipients in 2017 and 2018 had wildlife-related damage. These results indicate that wildlife-related damage is a common phenomenon, particularly in years with relatively severe winters.

Over 55 percent of responding service recipients and agricultural producers reported that recent wildlife damage on their property had been an ongoing problem for 5 years or more. Importantly, the majority (67 – 82%) of respondents in all surveys did not report these problems to GFP. The lack of reporting may be due to the fact that most respondents across all surveys were not very familiar with the information and services of the WDM program offered by GFP. It may also indicate that most residents accept that some amount of wildlife damage is an unavoidable consequence of living with wildlife in South Dakota.

More than 66% of all respondents (range 66 – 94%) indicated that they did not experience any difficulty contacting a GFP employee concerning their problem. Among those who contacted GFP, the majority of service recipient, agricultural producer, and general public respondents reported their interactions with GFP employees were “good” or “excellent;” few reported interactions that were “fair” or “poor.” Only five landowner respondents completed this question, so those results are not reported here.

The most accurate and precise measure of WDM effectiveness comes from the known customers in the last two complete years, 2017-2018. Over 53% of service recipients reported GFP’s efforts were “extremely effective” or “very effective” and an additional 34% reported the efforts were “somewhat effective.” Only 13% of respondents rated GFP efforts as “not so effective” or “not at all effective.” Although agricultural producer, landowner, and general public surveys had lower effectiveness ratings, we could not determine if these respondents had actually received service from GFP in previous years or if they were reporting what they thought without benefit of direct experience.

On all surveys, 72 - 82% of all respondents indicated that the services received from the WDM program were “adequate” or “more than adequate”. Similar scores were received for information provided by GFP to residents with wildlife damage. Lethal removal and exclusion of animals with fencing or other methods were the two most common services provided by WDM personnel.

Nearly 70% of service recipients who responded to the WMI survey were either “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the information and/or services of the WDM program offered by GFP. This result is

similar to that of Gigliotti (2006) who reported 64% of the respondents in a survey of landowners who received WDM services (mostly during 2004-2006) were satisfied with the WDM program. They also align with results from Longmire (2015) who reported that 80% of producers were satisfied overall with the ADC services they received. These results suggest that, in general, customer satisfaction is consistently high among WDM service recipients.

In contrast to the service recipients, the survey of agricultural producers showed only about 35% “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with WDM services. The fact that nearly 50% of agricultural producers reported being “neither satisfied or dissatisfied” may be due to a higher number of respondents who had neither requested nor received WDM services.

Agricultural producers ranked white-tailed deer as the species most responsible for wildlife damage they experienced (66-69.5% of respondents to agricultural producer survey and general public survey). This species was followed by coyotes (38-43%), raccoons (27-37%), and geese (18-27%). Service recipients also identified White-tailed deer (33%) as the most common cause of wildlife damage, followed closely by coyotes (31%), beavers (24%) and geese (23%).

The prominence of white-tailed deer as a species causing damage may also be a factor in the lower satisfaction ratings among agricultural producer respondents than service recipient respondents in the WMI surveys or the ADC service recipients in Longmire’s (2015) surveys. WDMS reported they generally have high success removing depredating coyotes, especially when aerial hunting support is available. WDMS reported it is much more difficult to resolve damage complaints due to deer depredation on standing crops or stored feed.

Over 46% of WDM service recipient, agricultural producer, and general public respondents to the surveys estimated the economic impact of wildlife associated as generally less than \$1,000 (range 46-58%). Results from the landowner survey were omitted due to small sample sizes. Over 80% of respondents to service recipient, agricultural producer and general public surveys estimated the economic impact of wildlife as less than \$5,000. Large losses (\$10,000 or greater) were reported by 4 – 8.4% of respondents on surveys. These high losses were mostly associated with white-tailed deer, elk, and waterfowl.

We asked survey recipients to assess the abundance of wildlife species found on their property and assigned “favorability” scores to assess whether these species were above or below desired population status. Favorability scores were weights attached to answer choices that indicated desirability (or lack of) for species presence on a property (e.g. a response of “much higher than desired” was weighted a -2; “About the right amount” was weighted a 0; “Much lower than desired” was rated a +2). These weights were multiplied by the cumulative responses and then summed to get an overall favorability score (a positive favorability score indicates that respondents generally wanted more of a particular species, and a negative favorability score indicated that they generally wanted fewer of a particular species). While mid-sized and small predators (coyote, raccoons, skunk) were least favorable, mule deer and elk populations appeared to be about in balance with social carrying capacity. White-tailed deer had a negative favorability rating by both service recipients and agricultural producers.

Respondents were asked what the best way is to address overabundant species that they had identified in previous questions. In general, respondents supported control by recreational trapping/hunting and control by private landowners over control by WDM personnel. The preference for trapping/hunting and control by private landowners is likely related to the high proportion of respondents that identified white-tailed deer as the species causing damage. With respect specifically to coyote control, WDM services recipients were equally divided between preferring recreational trapping and control by private landowners, while more agricultural producers thought private landowners should deal with the coyote problem than thought WDM personnel was the best approach. Exceptions to the preference for public trapping/hunting were beaver and wolves, where respondents identified WDM personnel as the best method of control.

Respondents were offered the opportunity to provide open-ended comments about the WDM program at the end of each survey. Not surprisingly, the responses ranged from harsh criticism to high praise for GFP in general, the WDM program, or specific individuals.² WMI did not conduct a detailed content analysis of the comments, but in general comments appeared in line with the results of the other survey questions.

Findings and Recommendations

The remainder of this report presents detailed findings and recommendations in response to the nine questions posed in RFP 1640 as well as several broader issues that surfaced in the course of the review. Because the findings and recommendations related to the specific questions overlap to some degree with those related to broader issues, the findings and recommendations in this review should be considered holistically.

Q1. Does the current organizational, administrative and program management structure of the WDM program in South Dakota lend itself to the delivery of effective WDM program services that meet the needs of agricultural producers, other state citizens, and sportsmen/women?

Findings

Wildlife damage management, including both ADC and GDM, is a significant component of GFPs administration of wildlife programs. Prior to 2009, the ADC and GDM programs were organizationally separate. ADC field staff, colloquially referred to as “extension trappers” or “state trappers,” worked exclusively on predator (coyote and fox), beaver, and prairie dog control. Until the mid-1990s, ADC staff reported to two field supervisors (one for East River and one for West

² WMI redacted individual names from both positive and negative comments.

River) while a statewide ADC Program Manager in Pierre administered the budget and program policy. Sometime in the mid-1990s ADC staff was integrated into the regional organizational structure, but continued to focus solely on ADC duties with minimal supervision, working in relative isolation from other regional wildlife management efforts.

From 1999 to 2009, GFP employed one, full-time GDM employee in each region to address conflicts involving deer, elk, or other game species with agriculture. Those individuals reported through to the regional office administrative structure and were assisted by local Conservation Officers when necessary.

GFP reorganized the ADC and GDM programs into the current, unified WDM program that incorporated all aspects of wildlife damage management in 2009. The former ADC and GDM positions were reclassified as Wildlife Damage Management Specialists (WDMS), responsible for both ADC and GDM duties within an assigned district. The positions were elevated one pay grade and incumbent ADC and GDM staff had to compete for the new positions.

These changes were made in response to both fiscal constraints and programmatic needs. The fiscal restraints related to the elimination of federal funding from USDA APHIS – Wildlife Services that had previously provided \$300,000 to \$700,000 per year for GFP's ADC program. The programmatic needs related to rising demand for game damage mitigation due to increasing deer, elk, and goose populations.

Any major change to an established organizational structure or job duties for existing staff can be disruptive. WMI found the way the reorganization was implemented and communicated to GFP staff and the public led to dissatisfaction among some ADC staff and some members of the public. A few former ADC staff left the agency at that time, or shortly thereafter. Lingering disagreement over the necessity for and benefits of the reorganization and the change of duties for WDMS underlies much of the current criticism of the WDM program and administration. To a substantial degree, the disagreement stems from differing beliefs about the primary goals of the ADC program.

WMI found that some individuals believe that the goal of the ADC program should be general suppression of coyote numbers to benefit both livestock producers and game, especially deer, populations. These individuals advocated for a return to the former organizational structure, under which "state trappers" concentrated their time, year-round on predator control. These individuals perceive that adding GDM responsibilities to the former ADC positions, along with changes in supervision and administration of the ADC program, reduce the effectiveness of predator control. (This issue is discussed further under Question 2.) These individuals cite information regarding coyote population size and trends in livestock depredation and sheep producer numbers as evidence that the changes implemented in 2009 were ill-advised.

In contrast, GFP administrative personnel, and most field staff including WDMS, expressed the goal of the ADC program as targeting specific coyotes or localized areas to resolve individual producers' depredation complaints. In this context, the ADC program is not designed or intended to "manage" or reduce the coyote population statewide. GFP points to high levels of producer satisfaction with

the responsiveness of the WDMSs and results of their targeted approach as evidence that the program is accomplishing its goal.

Research has demonstrated that broad-scale coyote population control is ineffective in regulating coyote numbers and that production costs and market factors play a larger role than predation in determining the number of sheep produced (Berger 2006). These findings support targeting specific coyotes and localized areas with chronic depredation complaints, as GFP does, as the basis for cost-effective predator control.

WMI found the current organizational, administrative, and management structure of the WDM program generally provides an effective and efficient response to wildlife damage complaints across South Dakota. Most wildlife damage calls/emails go directly to the WDMS. Complaints that come to other individuals in GFP are quickly communicated to the WDMS for response. Interview and survey results indicate that WDMS routinely return calls within 24 hours or less and provide timely service to solve problems in most cases. On-line survey responses indicate that customer satisfaction levels among service recipients are acceptable, with nearly 70% percent of service recipients either “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the information and/or services of the WDM program offered by GFP (Appendix D). This satisfaction measure was obtained after severe weather in spring of 2019 challenged staff resources to respond to both big game damage to stored feeds and predator damage to livestock.

The merging of ADC and GDM programs implemented in 2009 makes efficient use of WDMS’ time throughout the year as there is a seasonality to the types of wildlife damage requiring response. WMI examined how the WDMS spent their time during fiscal year 2019 (July, 2018 – June 2019). Overall, WDMS spent 53.4 percent of their time engaged in ADC activities, 15.9 percent of their time on WDM, 7.8 percent assisting with wildlife surveys, and 22.9 percent on “other” activities such as administrative duties, attendance at meetings, annual/sick leave (Table 1). The percentages varied between regions (Table 1) and East River versus West River (Table 2), due to the higher demand generally for GDM services in Regions 3 and 4 and East River. In Regions 1 and 2 and West River, WDMS spend less than 10 percent of their time on GDM duties. It is worth noting that the winter of 2018-19 was particularly severe and GDM complaints were higher than average. Thus, in years with less severe winters, WDMS would probably have more time to commit to ADC activities.

In addition to making efficient use of WDMS’s time, decentralization of the WDM program improves integration of damage management with other wildlife management and provides for greater program accountability. However, the broader range of duties now assigned to WDMS does have impacts on workload, necessary skill sets, and training needs that must be considered.

Table 1. Regional breakdown of WDMS' average time spent on various types of duties in fiscal year 2019.

	% ADC	% GDM	% SURVEY	% OTHER
REGION 1 AVERAGE	56.5	9.9	7.4	26.2
REGION 2 AVERAGE	58.8	7.5	10.9	22.8
REGION 3 AVERAGE	51.6	27.4	5.1	15.9
REGION 4 AVERAGE	46.6	17.7	8.8	26.8
OVERALL AVERAGE	53.4	15.9	7.8	22.9

Table 2. East River versus West River breakdown of WDMS' average time spent on various types of duties in fiscal year 2019.

	% ADC	% GDM	% SURVEY	% OTHER
East River	50.0	20.5	7.0	22.4
West River	59.3	8.7	8.0	24.0

The size and distribution of WDMS districts is generally appropriate, although the nature of game damage issues in some districts creates a workload that is larger than can be effectively managed by current staff. Demands for predator control in late winter and early spring, concurrent with calving and lambing, can compete with demands for wildlife damage response to deer and elk depredation on stored feeds to an extent that exceeds the capacity of the WDMS. This is a chronic issue in Region 3 and occurs in other regions during severe winters like the winter of 2018-19. At these times, Regional Supervisors provide additional support by assigning other regional staff, up to an “all hands-on deck” approach to assist with GDM duties. In some cases, however, lack of familiarity with equipment or procedures by staff assigned to help during “crunch” times limits the effectiveness of this approach. Redirecting other program staff can also have adverse impacts on those other programs.

In addition to the workload issues related to overlapping demands for predator control and game damage to stored feeds during winter/spring, conflicts related to elk depredation on growing crops and demands for predator control to reduce losses of lambs on summer pasture tax the capacity of WDMS in parts of Region 1. This is a chronic problem that needs to be addressed.

Supervision of ADC staff has evolved over the past two decades. Sometime in the mid-1990s, GFP transitioned from an administrative model with one centralized supervisor in Pierre and two field supervisors for the former ADC staff to a decentralized model with field supervision by the four Regionals Supervisors. Supervision was further modified sometime around 2005 when supervision was reassigned to the Regional Program Managers (RPM). In 2015, GFP added Regional Terrestrial Resource Supervisors (RTRS) to the field organizational structure. These changes were intended to provide, among other benefits, increased supervisory support to the WDMS. At the same time, they contributed to the perception that WDMS have too many supervisors providing direction and that the WDMS' supervisors lack adequate knowledge and experience related to WDMS' duties, especially related to predator control. (See response to Question 2 for further discussion on this issue.) In practice, the WDMS complete their work relatively independently, setting their own schedules and priorities. The RPMs provide day-to-day supervision, while the RTRS positions have very limited involvement in supervision of the WDMS. Regional Supervisors and agency leadership can and do provide direction about the program in general and for specific issues, but the number of supervisory levels above the WDMS is not a barrier to effective program management.

WMI found that GFP has effective programs for reporting time, activities and program outputs. Missing from the program management structure is regular measurement of the desired outcome of customer satisfaction. The current annual report summarizes outputs of effort rather than measures that were frequently mentioned as desired program outcomes. While surveys of service recipients have been done occasionally, this outcome should be monitored and reported annually.

Interviews revealed some complaints of subpar performance by some individuals. Employee performance reviews are to be conducted through the Accountability and Competency Evaluation System (ACES). Although expected annually, 17 of 27 WDM staff have not had a performance review since 2017.

Recommendations

- 1) Resolve confusion and/or debate regarding the goal of the ADC components of the WDM program. GFP should clearly communicate that the goal of the ADC program is to respond to and resolve individual producer's depredation complaints and not to reduce coyote numbers in general. GFP should work with producers, policymakers, and other constituents to establish quantifiable objectives related to desired outcomes to document and monitor the effectiveness of the program.
- 2) Review and adjust sizes and/or staffing of districts; consider additional FTE for WDMS.
- 3) Provide appropriate training for non-WDM staff who can reasonably be expected to be called upon to assist with GDM efforts when winter severity creates high demand for services.
- 4) Take steps to ensure RPMs complete annual performance reviews with all WDMS.
- 5) Take steps to ensure RTRS complete annual performance reviews with all RPMs
- 6) Clarify respective roles of RPM and RTRS within the field organization.
- 7) Clearly communicate the prioritization of resolving ongoing coyote depredation in relation to GDM duties (e.g. stored feed protection), and maintenance/preventative coyote control.

Q2: Do field supervisors have sufficient experience, education, training and knowledge to effectively supervise all field operations and associated staff? If not, please identify several recommendations that would enhance field supervisors' ability to be more effective.

Findings

Supervision was a frequent topic in interviews with staff, former staff, contractors and stakeholders. WMI's primary observation was that there are differing views of the relative priorities of damage problems, generally occurring when work exceeded the time available for WDMS in a district. Additional concerns expressed included the outcomes of the hiring and onboarding process for both WDMS and supervisors.

Field supervisors for the WDM Program include the RPM, RTRS, and Regional Supervisor. WMI interviewed all current field supervisors for this review, as well as 13 WDMS. The findings and recommendations reported here focus on the level of the RPMs because they have the most important supervisory relationship to WDMS. WDMS report directly to the RPM and the RPM is expected to manage the WDMS, along with other regional program staff.

In our interviews, supervisors clearly felt that the top priority for WDMS was removing problem predators that were killing livestock. However, it was less clear how WDMS should balance GDM work (e.g. haystack fencing) and "maintenance coyote control" (i.e. preemptive removal) in areas with historic predation issues. Factoring into the conversation were obvious differences of opinion among WDM staff, livestock producers, and contractors on what control tool would be most effective in a specific situation. While generally the public recognizes the skill of the onsite WDMS in determining the appropriate course of action, some view aerial control as the most effective while others prefer other techniques.

WMI found that concerns related to field supervision of the WDM Program centered on whether RPMs who lacked field experience as WDMS in general, and with trapping or predator control in particular, could effectively supervise WDMS. Some stakeholders and most of the WDMS interviewed expressed the belief that previous predator control experience was necessary to supervise WDMS effectively. At present, two of the four RPMs have experience with predator control.

Management literature and WMI experience documents that effective supervisors are those who have the required practical and expert knowledge to assist supervisees in their work, provide emotional support, and who have the qualities to develop positive working relationships. Previous experience as a trapper and/or WDMS is one way for RPMs to gain the practical and expert knowledge necessary to effectively supervise WDMS, but it is not the only way. WMI believes

individuals without prior experience as a trapper or WDMS can effectively supervise the WDM Program and the WDMS if they are provided adequate training and spend sufficient time in the field with WDMS to gain an understanding of the demands of the job. Importantly, given that none of the WDMS interviewed expressed any interest in moving into a supervisory position, it is unlikely GFP will be able to fill all RPM positions with individuals who served as WDMS or have direct experience with predator control.

Individuals in any organization should receive supervisory training prior to beginning a supervisory role. South Dakota GFP has several supervisory training modules available, and some are required for new supervisors. Each of the RPMs interviewed indicated they had taken required training courses, but WMI did not find evidence of follow-up evaluation of specific supervisory performance. This is needs to be addressed.

WMI found that field supervisors at all levels recognize and respect the highly technical skills of WDMS and generally have confidence in the WDMS' ability to fulfill their responsibilities with limited oversight. This degree of confidence, combined with other supervisory demands of the RPMs and the highly independent nature of the WDMS has resulted in the RPMs spending relatively little time in the field with the WDMS. The limited amount of one-on-one time does not provide RPMs without prior experience adequate knowledge of the working conditions of the WDMS and undermines WDMS' confidence in their supervisors.

WMI also found that turnover at all levels is a contributing factor to the level of experience and knowledge of RPMs. None of the three current RPMs have been in that position for more than three years. The prior incumbent in the now-vacant RPM position served in that role less than 2 years. The next level of field supervision, the RTRS, was only created a few years ago, so individuals in these positions are still relatively new to that role. All four regional supervisors have years of experience with the agency, its programs including WDM, and in personnel management and supervision, but Regional Supervisors have little direct involvement with supervision of the WDMS. WMI believes the lack of tenure and stability in supervisors at the RPM and RTRS level is a more significant factor than the lack of prior experience with predator control or as WDMS.

Recommendations:

- 1) Take steps to ensure RPMs spend additional time in the field with WDMS to gain first-hand knowledge of the working conditions and needs of the WDMS. This may require review of RPM's workload and/or embedding this requirement in job descriptions and annual performance plans/reviews.
- 2) For RPMs that have little or no personal experience with trapping, consider having them attend the same "trapping college" as newly-hired WDMS with limited trapping experience.
- 3) Provide RPMs and RTRSs additional supervisory training.
- 4) Provide potential future supervisors with training prior to assignment.
- 5) Keep ACES evaluations current.
- 6) Good practice in employment would indicate the routine use of annual appraisal which could include a review of how the supervision process has worked both structurally and

functionally over the period. This might involve comments from both the supervisor and the supervisee, with suggestions about how things could be improved. The purpose of this is not mutual criticism but mutual improvement for the benefit of people who use WDM services. The addition of the RTRS level to field supervision was a logical step to provide Program Managers additional time to focus on supervision and support of WDMS.

Q3: Are current budget revenue sources used to deliver WDM program services sufficient and are the sources of these revenues appropriate given the diversity of program management needs across GFP?

Findings:

GFP depends on several funding mechanisms for delivering WDM programs. One major mechanism is a \$0.06 per-head tax on cattle and a \$0.25 per-head tax on sheep, collected at the county level, that is matched 2:1 from GFP's license account (codified law 40-36-11). These funds can be used for coyote, fox, beaver, and prairie dog control under the ADC program. The South Dakota Legislature added a one-dollar surcharge to most hunting licenses to provide additional ADC program funding in 2013. In 2017, the Legislature increased the transaction fee for the sale of licenses purchased online and a portion of those fees (\$200,000) went to the ADC program. Combined, these sources currently generate approximately \$1.6 million annually for the ADC program.

In addition to these funds, the South Dakota Department of Agriculture has periodically contributed funding to the ADC program for prairie dog control. However, the amount of this funding has been variable and it is not a reliable source of support.

The major funding source for the GDM program is a five-dollar surcharge applied to most hunting licenses that was added in 1999 to address wildlife damage to agriculture and to provide more hunter access to private lands. Proceeds from the sale of "Special Buck" licenses are also added to these funds. In 2017, the South Dakota Legislature increased the transaction fee for the sale of hunting licenses which provided additional revenue (\$200,000) for game damage management. Combined, these sources currently generate approximately \$1.5 million annually for the GDM program.

The funding mechanisms described above distribute the costs between producers and license buyers. Whether the makeup of these funding sources is "appropriate" is a value judgment best made by South Dakota's elected and appointed officials, as long as the mechanisms are consistent with federal aid assent legislation. WMI did not find that the current expenditures constitute a potential diversion under the WSFR rules.

South Dakota also has local Predator Control Districts (PCDs) that are created to address producer wildlife damage problems from fox and coyote. While these districts are independent of GFP, they

often provide services above and beyond what GFP can provide. GFP has good relationships with most PCDs and provides some cost share assistance. PCDs conduct additional aerial hunting efforts to the state effort and support coyote calling contests. In some cases, PCDs have provided equipment to WDMS. All people interviewed recognized the financial commitment of producers and counties to wildlife damage management. Providing ADC funds as a cost share to PCDs appears appropriate.

Based on the online survey levels of public, landowner, producers and service-recipient satisfaction, current budgets and revenues are adequate to provide a reasonable level of service. That said, revenue streams are likely to decline with the ongoing decline in hunter numbers/license revenue and an unrelated decline in livestock producers. These declines indicate that the current revenue model may need to be re-examined as service-delivery costs increase.

Service-delivery costs are likely to continue to increase as a function of inflation and as additional regulations are incorporated. For example, a policy decision to have staff obtain permission from surrounding landowners before aerial control efforts are implemented increased staff costs and reduced timeliness of response. Safety issues are paramount in WDM efforts, and GFP should anticipate additional training costs and potentially loss of tools (such as M-44 cyanide devices) which could affect the effectiveness of agency responses.

WMI believes GFP management exercises appropriate discretion with respect to use of ADC funds (i.e. those derived from the per-capita tax on livestock and matching license funds) and other revenue sources. For many years, GFP has not charged any supervisors' time to the ADC account and recently made coding changes to re-assign some former ADC costs (i.e. beaver-related activities) to GDM. Both of these actions maximize the amount of funding available for coyote control.

WMI found that some staff and public have developed expectations that every producer's complaint will be resolved to their satisfaction. No amount of money will be sufficient if that expectation is the standard of review.

Sufficiency of current funds can only be determined if realistic program goals and related metrics are defined and measured. WMI found there are a diverse set of output measures used to evaluate performance of the WDM program (e.g. number of coyotes removed, often described with metrics of kill per hour, kill per employee, kill by technique etc.). The annual WDM report provides numerous measures of outputs by staff such as expenditures, requests for assistance, miles driven and animals removed. However, simply reported as outputs without reference to desired outcomes or quantitative objectives, these figures do not provide a firm basis for program evaluation.

WMI found that the primary measure of program effectiveness and sufficiency was customer satisfaction. This metric boiled down to a question: "Did the WDMS quickly and effectively address the landowner/producer problem?" We found that measure of landowner/producer satisfaction as a program outcome has been done infrequently. However, when measured, the program consistently achieves good marks for customer satisfaction.

On-line survey responses indicate that customer satisfaction levels among service recipients are

acceptable, with an estimated 69.8 percent of service recipients either “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the information and/or services of the WDM program offered by GFP (Appendix D). This satisfaction measure was obtained after severe weather in spring of 2019 challenged staff resources to respond to both big game damage to stored feeds and predator damage to livestock.

Recommendations:

- 1) Develop outcome-based objectives and associated metrics for ADC and GDM programs.
- 2) Develop a cost-effective means of evaluating customer satisfaction.
- 3) Support growth and development of predator control districts which benefit from producers influencing direction of predator control programs
- 4) Review and adjust sizes and/or staffing of districts; consider additional FTE for WDMS as necessary.

Q4: Do current staffing levels and budget allocations within the WDM program provide effective use of budget resources and man-power and efficient and effective delivery of WDM program services, considering the needs for the entire spectrum of WDM program services across the State?

Findings:

WDM program staffing has increased from 21 in 2009 to the current level of 28 field staff. The addition of the RTRS positions were intended to address on-going growth of agency professionalism and integration of varied wildlife management programs into a unified Wildlife Division strategic direction. While supervisors felt considerable progress has been made, some staff expressed skepticism that agency conditions have improved for the WDM program. Where leadership has been constant and stable, there is a general feeling of positive change. Where leadership has had high turnover, there is less confidence of positive change. Most of the concern seemed related to the addition of job duties caused by consolidation of GDM and ADC.

Current staffing levels are generally adequate, but in some areas – particularly in Region 1 – the size of some WDMS’ districts, combined with unrealistic expectations about the expected level of service, contribute to excessive workloads for some WDMS. In Region 3 during most years and across the state in severe winters (e.g. 2019), demand for game damage services (e.g. fencing stack yards), exceeds the capacity of WDM Program staff. Regions find it difficult to secure short-term workers to fill this need, resulting in re-assignment of other programs’ staff to GDM duties. This approach, while necessary to meet agency and public expectations related to game damage management, has adverse impact of other agency programs when staff is re-directed.

In prior years, restrictions on the number of hours that could be allocated to ADC vs GDM placed an administrative burden on staff and constrained WDMS’ ability to respond to real-time demands of the job. That historic problem has been eliminated by giving WDMS flexibility to manage their

schedules in response to landowner/producer complaints without limits on how they code their hours between ADC and GDM. However, overtime approval remains an issue for some WDMS in both the amount allowed annually and the approval pathway.

WMI found demand for aerial support for coyote control during the period from mid-January through April exceeds the current capacity of two pilot/gunner teams. Several WDMS reported that it can take up to 2 weeks to get a pilot/gunner team on site during this time period. During the remainder of the year, aerial support is adequate.

WMI found substantial variability and uncertainty with respect to how GFP addresses the issue of compensating WDMS for maintaining “decoy dogs” for use in coyote control. These dogs can significantly increase the effectiveness of shooting coyotes from the ground and are nearly essential for aerial control during snow-free months. Several WDMS reported that they had to cover a significant portion of the cost of veterinary care and food for these animals. Given the value they provide to the program, employees should not be expected to pay these costs any more than they should be expected to pay the cost of ammunition, traps, snares, or fuel for their vehicles.

WMI found that there is only one WDMS who has the experience and dogs needed to respond to complaints related to lion depredation or threats to public safety. With the increasing number and distribution of lions in South Dakota, demands for this WDMS to handle complaints statewide impacts his ability to respond to wildlife damage complaints within his district. The fact that this individual is likely to retire within the foreseeable future adds vulnerability to current program management.

Current staffing levels, combined with a lack of an effective mentoring program for newly hired WDMS, contributes to lower-than-desired effectiveness, internal and external dissatisfaction, and potentially staff turnover.

Solutions to this issue of adequate ADC funding are not obvious. Some current and former WDMS and some public believe GFP should commit additional license dollars to ADC efforts. Opinions differ with respect to GFP’s ability to supplement the ADC account with license dollars beyond those specified in statute.

Recommendations

- 1) Review and adjust sizes and/or staffing of districts; consider additional FTE for WDMS as necessary.
- 2) Secure the services of 1 or 2 private contract pilot/gunner teams to fly up to a total of 300 hours to provide additional capacity during the period from mid-January through April. Contracting private pilot/gunner teams that do not have to comply with state and federal training requirements offers greater flexibility for meeting this seasonal demand. To the extent practical, delegate coordination of contract pilot/gunner teams to RPMs for most efficient use of this resource.
- 3) State employees should not sign for private contract pilots to limit liability in case of an accident.

- 4) GFP should develop additional capacity to address lion complaints to reduce the demands on the current WDMS and prepare for his eventual retirement.
- 5) GFP should review its policies and standards for offsetting the costs associated with maintaining dogs for use in coyote control to ensure more equitable compensation and increase the number of WDMS who have this capacity.

Q5: Is GFP the appropriate agency to deliver WDM program services or are there other more effective and capable alternatives for delivering these services, given the constraints of current and projected future budget revenues.

Findings

Effective management of predators and other wild animals that can be injurious to livestock, poultry, game, land and the public health is a critical factor in the success of state fish and wildlife agencies. These species are public trust resources in the United States, and the people of each state hold state government accountable for the management of their resources. Within state government, the wildlife agency typically has the best understanding of the science of wildlife management and the tools for managing the wide diversity of wildlife damage issues. Accordingly, GFP is the appropriate agency to take the lead for delivery of WDM services in South Dakota.

GFP has designed the current WDM program to provide specialized responses to a broad range of wildlife damage issues including both predator control to reduce livestock depredation and game damage to agriculture and property. South Dakota is the only state in the region that has agency staff engaged in predator control. In MT, ND, and WY, USDA-APHIS-Wildlife Services conducts predator control in response to livestock depredation. In some of these states, the wildlife agency contributes funding to federal predator control efforts.

WDM, like most wildlife management programs, is best delivered through a partnership between the state wildlife agency, other state and federal agencies, private landowners and the public. Potential partners for GFP in delivery of WDM include USDA-APHIS- Wildlife Services, the South Dakota Dept. of Agriculture, and local Predator Control Districts (PCDs) authorized in statute statutes.

GFP currently partners with APHIS-WS for delivery of ADC services. APHIS-WS provides one full-time pilot, aircraft, and gunner in Spearfish, SD. This pilot/gunner team is funded and supervised by APHIS-WS, but operates under day-to-day direction of GFP to support WDMS, primarily West River. APHIS-WS also provides a pilot and aircraft in Pierre. Costs for the aircraft and pilot are covered by GFP, and GFP employs a full-time gunner for this aircraft.

Transferring all responsibility for predator control to APHIS-WS would be consistent with the role USDA-APHIS-WS has in surrounding states and would re-establish predator control as a “stand-

alone” program with a narrow focus, as recommended by some stakeholders.

However, such a transfer would raise several issues, including:

- The need to negotiate an agreement with APHIS-WS to assume this responsibility. Given the current federal budget environment, APHIS-WS may be reluctant or unable to assume this responsibility without full funding from the state.
- Funding a program administered and implemented by APHIS-WS could alter the US Fish and Wildlife Service’s (USFWS) interpretation with respect to whether use of license dollars to pay for coyote control represents a “diversion” under WSFR. Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks was found to be in diversion of license dollars when it transferred funding to APHIS-WS through the Montana Department of Livestock for coyote control. If the USFWS made a similar determination for SD, the total funds available for coyote control would be substantially reduced.
- Increased administrative costs associated with a contract between GFP and APHIS-WS.
- Reduced interactions between GFP staff and producers, which could lead to reduced support for the agency or hunter access.
- Removing coyote control responsibilities from the duties of the WDMS would alter workload substantially, potentially resulting in the need to reassign or lay off some current WDMS.

Transferring some, or all, of the WDM Program responsibilities to the SD Dept. of Agriculture would be logical, given the degree to which the WDM program benefits agriculture. However, many of the same issues that would accompany a transfer of predator control responsibilities to APHIS-WS would surface, along with these additional considerations:

- The SD Dept. of Agriculture has no experience with, or staff prepared to take on, the responsibilities of the WDM program.
- The SD Dept. of Agriculture does not have the fiscal resources to take on WDM.
- Transferring license revenue to the SD Dept. of Agriculture would be a clear diversion of license dollars.
- Legislative action could be necessary to implement such a transfer.

Predator Control Districts (PCD) authorized under SD statutes are a current partner with GFP in predator control aspects of the WDM program. WMI found that some established PCDs provide an important supplement to GFP predator control efforts. Conditions that contribute to an effective partnership include adequate funding of the PCD by the counties involved, availability of qualified pilot/gunner teams and close coordination with GFP WDMS, as required by law. Other PCDs exist in name but are either inactive or do not provide meaningful additional benefit to the GFP program. The role of PCDs could be expanded, but WMI does not believe any single PCD has the capacity to administer a statewide predator control program.

Recommendations:

- 1) GFP should evaluate the status and effectiveness of PCDs. In counties where no PCD currently exists, or the existing PCD is not providing meaningful services, GFP should work with producers to establish or re-vitalize a PCD to increase the degree to which producers have a financial stake in coyote control efforts
- 2) GFP should maintain, and if necessary memorialize, working relationships with existing agency partners. Publicly available memorandums add transparency to the public and employees.
- 3) Based on current revenue streams, which include fees related to hunting licenses, the WDM program should remain in GFP.

Q6: Does GFP appropriately consider the potential for wildlife damage to private property in establishing wildlife harvest objectives, employing wildlife harvest strategies and employing other management regulations, tools and techniques to ensure various wildlife populations are effectively managed for all SD citizens? If not, what additional mechanisms, techniques or strategies could be employed to ensure wildlife populations are more effectively managed within landowner tolerance while at the same time meeting sportsmen's expectations for the availability of these resources for hunting or the public's expectations for wildlife viewing opportunities?

Findings:

WMI found that "landowner tolerance" is a significant factor in the establishment of GFP's wildlife population objectives, harvest strategies and use of game damage management tools and techniques. Policy direction from the Secretary's Office is clear in this regard. GFP personnel at all levels recognize the importance of managing wildlife populations within the limits of landowner tolerance to maintain hunting access and opportunity. GFP's approach to WDM serves as an example and a reminder to GFP staff and other agencies to recognize the significance of private lands in wildlife management and the importance of good agency relationships with private landowners.

The variability of winter weather makes it impossible to avoid having populations that producers think are "too high" when winters are severe or that are "too low" to satisfy hunters during periods of mild winters. Ongoing changes to South Dakota's climate will likely increase the variability of winter severity, further complicating efforts to maintain "ideal" population levels. Wildlife populations are also affected by weather variability during winter and spring seasons in mortality and reproductive rates.

Management regulations are developed annually well in advance of knowing actual status of

fall/winter wildlife populations and what winter conditions will occur. Managers generally examine recent trends in population-related information and prepare recommendations to ensure effective management of wildlife populations. This process requires the availability of a set of tools that can be applied when conditions or current populations necessitate additional measures to address constituent wildlife damage concerns. Most tools are nonlethal, such as haystack fencing for big game damage or propane cannons for scaring birds from sunflower fields, although managers have become more willing to use lethal tools. For example, GFP was initially more conservative than necessary with issuance of kill permits to address goose depredation. Today, with a reduced resident goose population, we found GFP's use of kill permits and other measures to mitigate goose depredation is appropriate. GFP also offers damage hunts on an as-needed basis.

GFP has created a set of specific tools for elk depredation that includes food plots and hayland contracts to address landowners' concerns. This tool kit also includes 7 elk access contracts to allow elk hunting access to nearly 27,000 acres (as reported in 2017 and 2018 annual reports.) GFP provides cost-share for fence materials and elk cable to repair damage caused by elk. The provision of an elk tag to some landowners has improved relationships, but also led to requests for transferrable tags and more harvest tags for landowners.

WMI found that human-wildlife conflicts involving black bears are increasing in and around the Black Hills as a result of the increasing black bear population and lack of effective handling of garbage and other attractants. This is placing additional strain on the WDMS responsible for this district.

WMI found that GFP has developed a comprehensive approach to wildlife damage management that exceeds most natural resource agencies in the region because of WDMS staff and current leadership support. Based on our interviews, existing staff and new hires identify and test new approaches that may increase the efficiency and effectiveness of agency responses. However, thorough testing is generally recommended to ensure the "latest trick" has benefits to justify the investment.

Recommendations:

- 1) GFP should continue to use Human Dimensions research and effective tools for public engagement to develop, monitor implementation of, and adjust management plans for deer, elk, and pronghorn. Regular measurement of landowner and hunter/public satisfaction should be integral to this process.
- 2) GFP should communicate the impacts of variable winter severity to establish realistic public expectations regarding their ability to optimize ungulate populations.
- 3) GFP should initiate an outreach effort to reduce human-bear conflicts in and around the Black Hills. The Southeastern Association of Fish and Wildlife Association "BearWise" program, the Southwest Montana Bear Education Working Group, and the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee can serve as models and information sources for such a program. Such efforts would logically be included in a black bear management plan.

Q7: Is there sufficient opportunity for appropriate staff input at all levels of GFP to help ensure effective delivery of WDM program services? Do WDM program supervisors and administrators provide an appropriate level of supervision, oversight and review in making decisions regarding the allocation of staff and budget resources and the establishment of guidelines for the delivery of WDM program services?

Findings:

WMI found that GFP provides numerous opportunities for staff participation in regional and statewide meetings. Regional meetings are held regularly and cover topics including WDM. WDM statewide program staff meets annually to discuss current issues, policy, and training needs. Breakout sessions during these multiday meetings are a means to encourage greater participation and input. The 2019 meeting had an extended 4-hour session on coyote control which engaged all attendees in discussion with Secretary Hepler.

Most supervisors reported sufficient guidance was available for effective delivery of services. Some interviewees felt the organization was less effective when specific stakeholders' concerns were elevated to the Pierre office. WDMS reported concerns with direction when they perceived such direction as inconsistent with established protocol, such as prioritization of customer requests. Staff believed such direction reduced effective and timely services to producers.

WMI found that performance evaluations were not being completed in a timely manner. As noted earlier, performance review through the Accountability and Competencies Evaluation (ACE) system is one means for supervisors to share and learn ideas for more effective delivery.

WMI believes WDMS historically had limited awareness of budget and policy development. We observed indications that greater opportunities for involvement are being made.

Recommendations:

- 1) Efforts to have greater inclusion of staff to ensure an opportunity to contribute to improving delivery of WDM services should continue.
- 2) The WDM program should be represented in development of species plans.
- 3) Pierre administrators should notify chain of command when significant concerns from a producer come in and allow the field structure to resolve the concerns.

Q8: Does GFP conduct effective communication, outreach and engagement with regard to the various constituents or recipients of WDM program services and other important stakeholders? If not, what changes could GFP make to more effectively engage stakeholders and improve the delivery of WDM program services.

Findings:

Online surveys of agricultural producers and the general public survey indicated that 30-60 percent of these respondents were “not very familiar” or “not at all familiar” with the services of the WDM program. This level of awareness is likely consistent with other human dimension surveys about any specific topic. Because these surveys also showed over half of respondents also reported suffering wildlife-associated damage in the past two years, increasing awareness of the program would be beneficial.

WMI found that GFP has outreach programs to producers and other residents regularly. WDMS are usually well-known in the community and programs are well-received. GFP staff attends many producer meetings to share information and to hear concerns. We found that attendance at such meetings is generally acceptable and appreciated, although we heard about less successful engagement/appreciation in the past.

If a landowner contacts GFP about a wildlife-associated issue, it appears that the agency provides timely and effective responses. An estimated 69.8 percent of service recipients were either “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the information and/or services of the WDM program offered by GFP. In comparison, the survey of agricultural producers had 34.7 percent either satisfied or very satisfied with 49.7 percent “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.” Many in the latter group may be unaware of what the WDM program has to offer.

WMI found that WDMS are highly motivated to return calls to producers within 24 hours, if not the same day. One WDMS reported that being onsite the first night after a livestock loss often is the most successful way to remove the predator. Problem identification and appropriate solutions are usually offered in person and accepted. Producers seem appreciative of the timeliness of response.

WMI understands that GFP is responsive to requests for information or presentations to the South Dakota legislature. Because many elected officials are very responsive to local issues, often landowner/producer concerns are shared with elected officials as a means of seeking assistance in solving the concerns.

The WDM annual report is well-written and comprehensive in nature. Some constituents had requested more detailed information than the report provides and expressed frustration about inability to get information they desired.

We heard some concerns about the reliability of information presented. For example, a constituent questioned whether the number of fox and coyote removed included the number of animals removed by predator control districts. In our experience, such questions will continue to be asked if not addressed, and potentially affect program credibility.

Recommendations:

- 1) Leadership should recognize that WDMS are the face of the WDM program. Managers should ensure that WDMS staff have current information and are aware of the “why” of policy decisions in addition to knowledge of technical solution.
- 2) WDMS should continue engagement with agricultural producers, landowners and the communities in their area. These efforts help make the public aware of GFP efforts to manage wildlife resources and address wildlife issues in the state.
- 3) Develop a cost-effective means of evaluating customer satisfaction (also in Q2 recommendations.)
- 4) The WDM program should continue to use a centralized database for tracking program outputs as supplementary information to inform variations in customer satisfaction metrics (recommended to be developed). Consistency in reporting results and use of documented methods and metrics will address data concerns.
- 5) Where possible, and if resources are available, incorporate automated query routines to address recurring questions. Frequently asked questions or follow-up questions about existing information often help identify issues that the WDM annual report can address proactively and responsively.

Q9: Does GFP provide a sufficient level of transparency and accountability regarding WDM programs and services to constituents and stakeholders?

Findings:

WMI found that the WDM program is highly transparent and accountable to the producers experiencing wildlife-related damage. Producers expect and receive prompt service. Generally, the producer has a clear understanding of how the local WDMS will address the problem. WDMS resolve a high percentage of the problems reported to them and landowners are typically satisfied. In cases where they are not, landowners do not hesitate to elevate their concerns to higher levels in GFP or to their legislator.

Concerns that were expressed by a few stakeholders can be traced back to the expectations of the WDM program. Those who believe that the ADC program should return to a separate structure and strive to reduce the overall coyote population are generally dissatisfied with the level of service and believe the program lacks accountability in achieving that goal. Those who believe that the WDM

program should address individual producer's wildlife damage problems are largely satisfied with the current program. There is opportunity to improve service recipient satisfaction from current measured levels, although more work needs to be done on creating appropriate metrics for customer satisfaction.

GFP regularly provides information about the WDM program to the general public in the form of annual reports, press releases, newsletters, etc. One WDMS reported that he has written a column in a local weekly newspaper for most of his career. The WDM annual report provides a great deal of information about program outputs and operations. Local community speaking engagements provide an opportunity for face-to-face conversations about issues.

WMI found one instance where GFP was less responsive to a constituent's request for information than it could have been. In our experience, providing as much information as possible (within financial and staff availability constraints) is better than being perceived as withholding information.

Recommendations:

1. Develop outcome-based goals and associated metrics for ADC and WD management programs.
2. Develop a cost-effective means of evaluating customer satisfaction (also in Q2 recommendations.)
3. Incorporate outcome-based goals and associated metrics into communication and outreach materials.

Additional Findings and Recommendations

Recruitment, Orientation, and Training

Findings

WDMS are the "front line" of GFP's WDM program. They interact directly with the public in response to wildlife damage complaints and are expected to provide a wide range of services over large districts with minimal support and supervision. The job requires a unique set of skills ranging from the ability to trap, snare, and shoot coyotes, to coordinating aerial shooting, to trapping beavers and other nuisance animals, to securing both standing and stored crops from game animals such as geese and elk. WDMS must be self-motivated and capable of working independently, yet have excellent inter-personal and communication skills. For the WDM program to accomplish its goals, GFP needs to recruit, orient and train WDMS that represent the agency well to the public.

WMI found that some current WDMS have a family history and personal experience in predator control prior to joining GFP. New hires with such experience are valuable but are dwindling in

availability. Most recent hires in WDMS positions had some previous experience as a recreational trapper or an as intern doing wildlife damage management activities, and likely need more development of skills. Given the importance of predator control in most WDMS' districts, the limited experience of recent hires creates a training need. Several WDMS described the differences in methods and tactics between recreational trapping and damage control efforts. However, previous experience in recreational trapping appears to create interest in working in animal damage control programs.

WMI found that most interview panels focus on candidates that have adequate professional training to be a wildlife professional in the GFP organization. Supervisors reported that they were generally satisfied with the pools of candidates from which to select WDMS. The exception was in some districts in Region 1 where remoteness and isolation contribute to lower applicant interest and more frequent turnover.

Given the degree to which WDMS interact with the public, most supervisors consider interpersonal and communication skills equally important to technical skills. Supervisors expressed the view that new hires could be trained to perform the more technical WDMS tasks, including trapping coyotes. WMI agrees with this and would point out that this has implications for how new hires are oriented and trained.

WMI found that the orientation process for new hires could be greatly enhanced. At present, most newly hired WDMS spend their first week in their regional office being oriented to administrative duties (e.g. submitting time sheets, entering information into databases, etc.), securing a vehicle and equipment, and being informed of relevant GFP policies. Following this minimal onboarding, most WDMS head off to their district where they may, or may not, get help from their supervisor, other regional staff, or WDMS in neighboring districts in getting to know landowners in the district, enhancing trapping skills or other important aspects of the job.

Some new hires have been sent to "trapping college" to improve their trapping skills and sharing knowledge and skills among WDMS is informally encouraged and occasionally provided as part of WDM program staff meetings.

Recommendations:

1. GFP should continue to encourage young people to participate in recreational trapping as a way to sustain interest and skills for future applicant pools.
2. Develop and implement a process for "onboarding" and mentoring of newly hired WDMS that takes advantage of the knowledge, skills, and abilities of experienced WDMS. This will require active involvement of the RPM to ensure experienced WDMS' workloads are adjusted to provide time for mentoring new hires. This process could mirror the way law enforcement uses "field training officers" to develop real-world skills and to mentor junior officers.
3. GFP should continue to provide new WDMS with limited experience in predator control opportunities to learn from experienced trappers within and outside the ranks of GFP.

4. GFP should provide additional opportunities for WDMS to share their experience and expertise across the program at regional and statewide meetings.

Public and Staff Expectations

Findings

WMI found that “customer satisfaction” is a major goal of the WDM program. Expectations are the critical determinant of satisfaction. Satisfaction increases when expectations are met or exceeded and declines when expectations are not met. If expectations are too high, satisfaction is likely to be low. WMI found several issues with respect to public and staff expectations that contribute to dissatisfaction and the questions that led to this review.

WMI found that expectations of some members of the public and stakeholders are unrealistic, or – perhaps better stated – unbounded. GFP’s exceptional level of responsiveness to wildlife damage complaints and unparalleled efforts to resolve problems has created the expectation among some producers that GFP should be responsible for resolving every problem right away. That is an unreasonable standard the WDM program cannot achieve with any amount of resources, let alone the current level of staffing and funding. Clearly there are some who expect GFP efforts on coyote control to affect population size while most expect GFP efforts on coyote control to resolve specific producer problems.

WMI also found that WDMS are incredibly dedicated to the public they serve, the agency, and the resources they help manage. More than a few WDMS reported that they do not log all the hours they commit to the job. They “contribute” this time to the program out of their sense of duty and their largely self-imposed expectation that they will do everything within their power, including sacrificing personal time and resources to serve the public. This level of dedication is admirable, but it is unfair to the employees, not to mention a potential violation of the Fair Labor and Standards Act, and contributes to employee burnout and job dissatisfaction.

Recommendations:

1. Improve public, legislative and staff understanding of the extent (and limits) of current revenue and expenditures for the WDM program, the rationale for GFP allocation/use of WDM funds, and the level of satisfaction with the program.
2. Engage staff and stakeholders in mid-range budget forecasting as a means to improve understanding of the extent and limits of current revenue and expenditures for the WDM program.

Policy Direction and Program Priorities

Finding

WMI found that agency management uniformly agrees that resolving livestock depredation complaints is the highest priority of the WDM program. At the same time, WMI found some uncertainty among the ranks of the WDMS with respect to how they were expected to allocate their time between predator control and responding to GDM complaints during the winter of 2018-19 when deep snow across much of the state led to high demand for WDMS' time protecting stored feed. This uncertainty is exacerbated when the predator control work falls into what is commonly called "maintenance" to reduce numbers right before or during calving/lambing season to reduce the risk of losses versus responding to an ongoing depredation event in an attempt to prevent further losses.

Recommendation

1. Develop a planning process that clarifies goals and objectives for the WDM program and provides reportable, outcome-based metrics for program performance to those goals and objectives.

WDMS Equipment Needs

Findings

WMI found that most WDMS are satisfied with the amount and types of equipment they are provided. WDMS also identified several ways they could improve effectiveness and efficiency. These included:

- Increased support for "decoy" dogs. WDMS reported much greater success with both ground-based shooting and aerial control when dogs are employed to locate, lure, or flush coyotes. Several incidents were reported where aerial gunning during late summer to protect lambs on pasture would not have been successful without dogs.
- Increased access to thermal rifle sights. Thermal rifle scopes have greatly surpassed "night vision" equipment. Given the nocturnal nature of coyotes, thermal sights can enhance ground-based coyote removal. Not all WDMS use night-time shooting as a preferred tool, thus GFP might wish to assess demand for such tools on a case-by-case basis.
- Availability of side-by-side/quad vehicles. When WDMS need to transport large numbers of traps or other equipment or decoy dogs in areas that are not accessible to a pick-up, these larger ATVs provide improved access.
- Availability of snow machines. Deep winter snows effectively limit access to some areas for control. Snow machines reduce time to access these areas.

Recommendations

- 1) GFP should identify where/when additional support for decoy dogs is justified. Efficient methods to track and reimburse expenses related to maintaining dogs should be developed.
- 2) Current equipment inventory should be regularly checked for replacement of aging equipment and additional tools that could increase efficiency should be provided to WDMS.

Literature Cited

- Berger, K.M. 2005. Carnivore-livestock conflicts: effects of subsidized predator control and economic correlates on the sheep industry. *Cons. Biol.* 20(2): 751-761.
- Decker, D.J, C.A. Smith, A. Forstchen, D. Hare, E. Pomeranz, C. Doyle-Capitman, K. Schuler and J. Organ. Governance Principles for Wildlife Conservation in the 21st Century. *Conservation Letters.* 9(4):290-295.
- Gigliotti, L.M. 2006. Wildlife Damage Management Program: 2006 Landowner Survey / Evaluation Report ID# HD-5-07.AMS. Pierre, SD: South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks.
- Longmire, C. L. 2015. Animal Damage Control Services: Customer Satisfaction Survey Results ID# HD-5-15.AMS. Pierre, SD: South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks.
- Manfredo, M.J., Sullivan, L., Don Carlos, A.W., Dietsch, A.M., Teel, T.L., Bright, A.D., and Bruskotter, J. 2018. America's Wildlife Values: The Social Context of Wildlife Management in the U.S.. National Report from the research project entitled "America's Wildlife Values." Fort Collins, CO: Colorado State University, Department of Human Dimensions of Natural Resources.

Appendix A: Agricultural Producer Survey Responses

**Responses of 320 individuals who reported they were currently agricultural producers
in South Dakota.**

Table 1. How would you describe your agricultural operation?		
Type of Operation	Percent	N
Exclusively farming	25.2%	80
Mostly farming with some ranching	18.2%	58
Farming and ranching are equal	23.9%	76
Mostly ranching with some farming	15.7%	50
Exclusively ranching	12.0%	38
Other (please specify)	5.0%	16
Total responding*	100%	318
* Two respondents skipped this question.		

Table 2. How many acres do you own or lease in South Dakota? (Q4)		
Acres	Percent	N
Less than 20 acres	4.2%	13
21-159 acres	9.6%	30
160-320 acres	13.1%	41
321-640 acres	10.3%	32
641-1280 acres	17.3%	54
1281-3840 acres	26.9%	84
3841 or more acres	18.6%	58
Total responding*	100%	312
* Eight respondents skipped this question.		

Table 3. In what county do you primarily own or lease land in the state of South Dakota? (Q5)

Location of Land	Percent	N
Region 1	20.8%	65
Region 2	24.4%	76
Region 3	26.3%	82
Region 4	28.5%	89
Total*	100.0%	312
* Eight respondents skipped this question.		

Table 4. In what other counties do you own or lease land in the state of South Dakota? (Q6)

Location of Land	Percent	N
Region 1	20.0%	25
Region 2	22.6%	35
Region 3	36.8%	57
Region 4	24.5%	38
Total*	103.9%	155
* 125 respondents answered this question and 165 skipped it. Total percentage exceeds 100% since some respondents indicated ownership in more than one additional county.		

Table 5. In general, how familiar are you with the information and services of the Wildlife Damage Program offered by South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks? (Q7)

Response	Percent	N
Extremely familiar	2.9%	9
Very familiar	6.1%	19
Somewhat familiar	28.2%	88
Not very familiar	37.8%	118
Not at all familiar	25.0%	78
Total responding*	100%	312
* Eight respondents skipped this question.		

Q8: Have you suffered any wildlife-associated damage to your lands, crops, livestock or property in the past 2 years (2017-2018)?

- 310 respondents answered this question, and 10 respondents skipped it.
- 55.8% (173) of respondents indicated “Yes”
- 44.2% (137) of respondents indicated “No”

Table 6. Was this wildlife-associated damage a new or recurring problem? (Q9)

Response	Percent	N
New problem	5.8%	10
Recurring problem this year	6.9%	12
Recurring problem over last 2-4 years	19.1%	33
Recurring problem for 5 years or more	68.2%	118
Total responding*	100%	173
* 147 respondents skipped this question.		

Q10: Did you contact or attempt to contact the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks regarding your wildlife-associated damage?

- 171 respondents answered this questions, and 149 respondents skipped it.
- 32.75% (56) of respondents indicated “Yes”
- 67.25% (115) of respondents indicated “No”

Q11: Did you have any difficulty contacting a South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks employee concerning this problem?

- 56 respondents answered this questions, and 264 respondents skipped it.
- 14.3% (8) of respondents indicated “Yes”
- 85.7% (48) of respondents indicated “No”

Table 7. In general, how would you describe your interaction with the South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks employee concerning this wildlife problem? (Please provide a rating for all attributes) (Q12)

Response	Poor		Fair		Average		Good		Excellent	
	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N
Fairness	8.9%	5	10.7%	6	19.6%	11	32.1%	18	28.6%	16
Professional	7.1%	4	7.1%	4	17.9%	10	28.6%	16	39.3%	22
Responsive	16.1%	9	8.9%	5	17.9%	10	25.0%	14	32.1%	18
Courteous	7.1%	4	5.4%	3	14.3%	8	28.6%	16	44.6%	25
Positive attitude	8.9%	5	5.4%	3	19.6%	11	23.2%	13	42.9%	24

* 56 respondents answered this question, and 264 respondents skipped it.

Table 8. How would you rate the effectiveness of the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks in addressing your wildlife damage complaint? (Q13)

Response	Percent	N
Extremely effective	3.6%	2
Very effective	25.0%	14
Somewhat effective	35.7%	20
Not so effective	23.2%	13
Not at all effective	12.5%	7
Total responding*	100%	56
* 264 respondents skipped this question.		

Table 9. Which species were responsible for wildlife damage that caused you to request the services of the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks Wildlife Damage Management Program? (Q14)

Wildlife species	Number of producers that listed each species	Percent
White-tailed deer	116	69.5%
Coyotes	70	41.9%
Raccoons	63	37.7%
Geese	45	27.0%
Skunks/mink/other small mammals	27	16.2%
Beavers	26	15.6%
Mule deer	23	13.8%
Pheasants	16	9.6%
Blackbirds/starlings	15	9.0%

Turkeys	11	6.6%
Pronghorns	11	6.6%
Foxes (red, gray, swift)	9	5.4%
Elk	5	3.0%
Mountain lions	4	2.4%
Ducks	3	1.8%
Grouse	0	0.0%
Sandhill cranes	0	0.0%
Wolves	0	0.0%
Black bears	0	0.0%
Total cases reported by 167 respondents*	444	
* 153 respondents skipped this question.		

Table 10. What was the estimated economic impact to the wildlife-associated damage that you experienced during the past two years (2017-2018)? (Q15)

Species	\$1,000 or less		\$1,001 to \$4,999		\$5,000 to \$9,999		\$10,000 or greater		Total
	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	
White-tailed deer	46.1%	53	39.1%	45	10.4%	12	4.4%	5	115
Coyotes	51.4%	36	37.1%	26	8.6%	6	2.9%	2	70
Raccoons	79.4%	50	15.9%	10	4.8%	3	0.0%	0	63
Geese	48.9%	22	31.1%	14	11.1%	5	8.9%	4	45
Skunks/mink/other small mammals	81.5%	22	18.5%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	27
Beavers	61.5%	16	34.6%	9	3.9%	1	0.0%	0	26
Mule deer	60.9%	14	30.4%	7	8.7%	2	0.0%	0	23
Pheasants	66.7%	10	26.7%	4	0.0%	0	6.7%	1	15
Blackbirds/starlings	53.3%	8	20.0%	3	6.7%	1	20.0%	3	15
Pronghorns	63.6%	7	36.4%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	11
Turkeys	63.6%	7	18.2%	2	18.2%	2	0.0%	0	11

Foxes (red, gray, swift)	77.8%	7	22.2%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	9
Elk	40.0%	2	40.0%	2	20.0%	1	0.0%	0	5
Mountain lions	0.0%	0	50.0%	2	50.0%	2	0.0%	0	4
Ducks	66.7%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	33.3%	1	3
Grouse	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Sandhill cranes	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Wolves	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Black bears	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Bobcats	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Total responses*	58%	256	31%	135	8%	35	4%	16	442
* 166 respondents answered this question, and 154 skipped it.									

Q16: Have you received information from the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks in the past two years (2017 & 2018)?

- 301 respondents answered this questions, and 19 respondents skipped it.
- 18.3% (55) of respondents indicated “Yes”
- 81.7% (246) of respondents indicated “No”

Table 11. How would you rate the information provided by the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks? (Q17)		
Response	Percent	N
More than adequate	12.7%	7
Adequate	76.4%	42
Less than adequate	1.8%	1
No opinion	9.1%	5
Total responding*	100%	55
* 265 respondents skipped this question.		

Q18: Have you received services from the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks in the past two years (2017 & 2018)?

- 301 respondents answered this questions, and 19 respondents skipped it.
- 13.3% (40) of respondents indicated “Yes”
- 86.7% (261) of respondents indicated “No”

Table 12. How would you rate the services provided by the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks? (Q19)

Response	Percent	N
More than adequate	17.5%	7
Adequate	65.0%	26
Less than adequate	15.0%	6
No opinion	2.5%	1
Total responding*	100%	40
* 280 respondents skipped this question.		

Table 13. What type of services were provided to you by the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks? (Q20)

Types of services provided	Percent	N
Lethal removal of nuisance animal(s)	65.0%	26
Alteration of the habitat to discourage nuisance animal(s)	7.5%	3
Exclusion of nuisance animal(s) with fencing or other methods	35.0%	14
Deterring nuisance animal(s) with noise, visual, or chemical methods	10.0%	4
Other (please specify)	10.0%	4
Total responding*	127.5%	51
* 40 respondents answered this question, and 280 skipped it. N>40 since some respondents were provided more than one service.		

Table 14. In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the information and/or services of the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks? (Q21)

Response	Percent	N
Very satisfied	4.8%	8
Satisfied	29.9%	50
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	49.7%	83
Dissatisfied	10.2%	17
Very dissatisfied	5.4%	9
Total responding*	100%	167
* 299 respondents answered this question, and 21 skipped it. Of the 299 respondents, 44.2% (132) answered "did not request or receive information or services." Percentages shown above are of those that responded as receiving services or information.		

Table 15. For the following species, please indicate your assessment of their abundance on your land. (Q22)											
Species	Much lower than desired (+2)		Slightly lower than desired (+1)		About the right amount (0)		Slightly higher than desired (-1)		Much higher than desired (-2)		Favorability*
	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Coyotes	1.4%	4	1.8%	5	20.3%	57	31.0%	87	39.2%	110	-26.2%
Raccoons	1.4%	4	1.8%	5	23.5%	66	33.5%	94	35.9%	101	-25.2%
Skunks/mink/other small mammals	2.9%	8	1.8%	5	33.0%	92	31.2%	87	27.6%	77	-19.7%
Blackbirds/starlings	2.6%	7	1.1%	3	40.5%	111	27.0%	74	21.2%	58	-15.8%
Beavers	2.6%	7	1.1%	3	18.2%	49	15.6%	42	14.1%	38	-9.4%
Mountain lions	2.2%	6	0.0%	0	7.0%	19	9.5%	26	9.5%	26	-6.0%
White-tailed deer	6.3%	18	18.5%	53	35.5%	102	17.1%	49	17.8%	51	-5.4%
Geese	6.8%	19	5.7%	16	35.5%	99	13.3%	37	12.9%	36	-4.9%
Wolves	0.0%	0	0.4%	1	2.6%	7	1.8%	5	4.0%	11	-2.4%
Black bears	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2.2%	6	0.0%	0	1.5%	4	-0.7%
Elk	4.0%	11	1.1%	3	3.7%	10	0.4%	1	1.8%	5	1.3%
Pronghorns	5.5%	15	4.8%	13	9.5%	26	2.6%	7	3.3%	9	1.6%

Bobcats	4.8%	13	5.2%	14	15.9%	43	3.3%	9	1.9%	5	1.9%
Sandhill cranes	5.6%	15	3.4%	9	21.2%	57	2.2%	6	1.5%	4	2.3%
Ducks	9.0%	25	10.1%	28	44.4%	123	10.1%	28	2.9%	8	3.1%
Turkeys	9.4%	26	10.1%	28	27.5%	76	6.9%	19	2.2%	6	4.4%
Foxes (red, gray, swift)	11.9%	33	13.7%	38	38.5%	107	11.5%	32	3.6%	10	4.7%
Mule deer	11.8%	32	9.6%	26	21.3%	58	2.6%	7	4.0%	11	5.6%
Grouse	24.3%	66	13.6%	37	21.3%	58	0.4%	1	0.4%	1	15.3%
Pheasants	36.1%	104	25.4%	73	26.4%	76	1.0%	3	1.0%	3	23.6%
<p>* Favorability was calculated by averaging the weighted categorical percentages (+2, +1, 0, -1, -2). Negative favorability generally indicates the species is not desired by agricultural producers, while positive favorability generally indicates that the species is desired by agricultural producers. 295 respondents answered this question, and 25 respondents skipped it.</p>											

Table 16. In the previous question (Q22), you indicated that there are more of these species than desired on your property. What do you think is the best way to address these over-abundant species? (Q23)

Species*	Control by recreational hunters or trappers		Control by WDM personnel		Control by private landowners		Control by predator control district		Don't know/No opinion		Total
	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	N
Coyotes	28.1%	54	14.1%	27	38.0%	73	8.9%	17	10.9%	21	192
Raccoons	27.9%	53	9.0%	17	46.8%	89	4.7%	9	11.6%	22	190
Skunks/mink/other small mammals	22.5%	36	11.3%	18	49.4%	79	3.1%	5	13.8%	22	160
Blackbirds/starlings	8.7%	11	18.9%	24	38.6%	49	2.4%	3	31.5%	40	127
Beavers	17.7%	14	29.1%	23	38.0%	30	3.8%	3	11.4%	9	79
Mountain lions	22.0%	11	22.0%	11	40.0%	20	2.0%	1	14.0%	7	50
White-tailed deer	45.0%	45	5.0%	5	41.0%	41	0.0%	0	9.0%	9	100
Geese	34.7%	25	5.6%	4	37.5%	27	0.0%	0	22.2%	16	72
Wolves	12.5%	2	25.0%	4	37.5%	6	0.0%	0	25.0%	4	16
Black bears	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	50.0%	2	4
Elk	33.3%	2	0.0%	0	66.7%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	6
Pronghorns	25.0%	4	18.8%	3	50.0%	8	0.0%	0	6.3%	1	16

Bobcats	30.8%	4	23.1%	3	38.5%	5	0.0%	0	7.7%	1	13
Sandhill cranes	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	70.0%	7	0.0%	0	30.0%	3	10
Ducks	25.0%	9	5.6%	2	27.8%	10	2.8%	1	38.9%	14	36
Turkeys	20.0%	5	8.0%	2	60.0%	15	0.0%	0	12.0%	3	25
Foxes (red, gray, swift)	38.5%	15	15.4%	6	30.8%	12	7.7%	3	7.7%	3	39
Mule deer	33.3%	6	5.6%	1	50.0%	9	0.0%	0	11.1%	2	18
Grouse	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	50.0%	1	2
Pheasants	16.7%	1	0.0%	0	66.7%	4	0.0%	0	16.7%	1	6
* Species are rank ordered based on the Desirability score assigned in Table 15. 259 respondents answered this question, and 61 respondents skipped it.											

Table 17. Additional comments provided for the Agricultural Producer Survey (Q24)
Need to have better access to planes when problems occur. Plane was here last month, and they killed 27 coyotes.
Need to feed the deer more and fly for coyotes before they become a problem
GFP is the poorest managers and the worst government office in South Dakota. They do nothing to help the ranchers. I have hundreds of big game animals on my place and not once offered a free landowners license or even bale of hay. They leave it all up to landowner to feed and take care of 'their animals'. We burden all of the expense and GFP takes all of the profit. Their idea of management is they will come in and shoot the wildlife. Instead of feeding them or offering to ranchers to feed them. They would rather watch them starve and die. Until they decide to build a relationship with the ranchers, the best thing they can do is stay home and count their greedy money that they make off from us. I am not interested in any of their programs. They have alienated themselves from the ranchers, so until things change there is no outside hunting on my place.
Just any type of understanding on the over population of the deer. Needs to be addressed.
Can be of little help. I am just not familiar with the program and have little need. I primarily work with the department to increase all wildlife!
We provide the homes and food for all wildlife but get no revenue. The state ins other economic interests in the state get the revenue. Not fair. Where is the incentive for us?
I can absorb normal feeding by animals as part of living along side of wildlife. I enjoy wildlife, so I'm not complaining about their natural feeding.
Usually call state trapper if I have a serious problem.
when the GFP officers start to, listen to, landowners versus there pals things will move forward!
The chemicals that we use pretty much kill everything.
It would be nice to be notified of programs that pertain to our operations.
On the previous question not only trapping and or license. The landowner should be able to control without the fear of losing their hunting privileges for trying to control or protect their living.
I'm not sure what's going on and we let anyone hunt our ground that asks but the turkeys eat the corn when it's coming out of the ground and later on the deer and coons really raise hell in it when the ears are set maybe the worst this year than any other and mostly in the twin brooks area is the worst for us not sure what to do I'm just guessing with the slow going conditions this year the ears must have been better for eating longer and boy did They eat and I have no clue what to do about it

Table 17. Additional comments provided for the Agricultural Producer Survey (Q24)

I have land with mule deer that I could not get tags for. They are hard on hay bales and this year the corn has had severe damage. Where I live the white tail, ruin tree belts, invade feed areas and contaminate what they do not eat, the Pheasants from neighboring landowners go down the corn row and eat the corn seed in the ground. My family has harvested 15 deer from my home quarter in the past, now the most will be 6, they also have had mule tags but not this year. More deer for damages next year.
There are areas where deer (white. tail) congregate in large numbers and cause damage to haystacks. Also, there are areas where the deer may be starving. The department should work with farmers and ranchers to deal with those situations.
We've had calf loss from coyotes, but not sure if there are wolves or lions that have bothered anything they have been sighted in the coulee, but not sure on any livestock damage.
No road hunting! They damage township roads that townships can't afford to fix and then is left to the landowners to fix because they need access to fields. Also, non-landowners need to specify where they are hunting big game. I see an increase in big game road hunting or trespassing! Game fish land is a waste of taxpayer's money! Tax the hunting lodges more but give them a tax incentive for access for local non landowners to hunt.
Haven't needed assistance with problem wildlife for a few years but quite some time ago we asked for help keeping deer out of our winter livestock feed and very little was done.
We don't have crops that are damaged by wildlife, but we would like to see more wildlife on our land.
never get a call back when I complained and deer bunch up after hunting season causing damage. why not give a landowner special tag, late January or February to harvest
place more bounties on the furbearer / predator
14 needs another answer to check. Let nature take its course and the population will adjust. Humans don't always have to interfere.
more public notice what you're doing with regards to predators
The department got rid of the woodchucks by my garden last year! That was appreciated immensely!!
bank beavers cause flooding in spring creek by damming up with cat tails. I had state trapper out several different years and up to now he has controlled the population.

Table 17. Additional comments provided for the Agricultural Producer Survey (Q24)

no improvements needed. All is good in Spink county
I think overall the dept of fish and wildlife are doing a good job. Would like more pheasants and less skunks, raccoons and possums keep the programs going. I think we have a good balance. We work hard to establish trees and drain out our culverts, ditches, etc. to reduce some of the predators ruining our pheasant numbers.
██████████ is our game warden and he has been great to deal with. He always goes above and beyond to make us feel like we matter. I also feel that the state should bring back a state trapper and make the regions smaller as to control the number of predators in areas where they have run the deer out and now feed on livestock.
I haven't heard much talk of woodchuck control they a going to be a big problem with the large amount of water, poor weed control and vacant buildings
Create more incentive to hunt or trap nest raiders or any predators that impact pheasants. Birds of prey are also an issue that nobody wants to address.
I'd take any suggestions to better control the coyote population. I lose young calves every spring, and they affect the pheasant population as well. GFP trapping, when requested, has taken some animals, but there's so many in the area. Trapping/hunting enthusiasts have had some success as well, but again, the established population is too high.
Deer season should be the same as the tribe, for the tribal licensed hunters run them out of our community and then they are unable to find.
My biggest complaint is the damage done every year by deer to tress both in our yard and shelter belts. The coyotes, raccoons, foxes and skinks are the cause of no pheasants. They are overly abundant everywhere. When you turn our pheasants, we have noticed that within a week or two they are gone. The predators are thick.
not enough state trappers
NEED Prairie Dog controls - overrun regardless of efforts to control
Do really know how I could help.
Deer depredation should not be paid to anyone who will not let people hunt without charge.
Would like to see a pronghorn hunting season in Edmunds County.

Table 17. Additional comments provided for the Agricultural Producer Survey (Q24)

Put out more information about what is available for assistance with deer feeding in hay yards and farmyards. I've seen fences put up around hay yards but never been given info on how to get one put up or cost share program!
I would like to see the GF&P reevaluate their management plans and identify strategies that will be more effective in maintaining original native carrying capacities. I would like GF&P to be more collaborative and innovative in enacting proactive methods for minimizing the impact of wildlife damage.
Prairie Dogs are the animal that is causing the most destruction on my property. They keep moving in and destroying pastureland.
We have too many white tail deer on our land, if the state would not kill so many coyotes on neighboring land maybe the coyotes could keep them in manageable levels. Deer are very hard on hay bales in the fall and winter. When the state does coyote control in our area, they kill too many coyotes which would help in the deer and prairie dog issues.
would like a larger Canada goose season. Duck season always runs into harvest also no time to hunt, maybe a spring season
Hunters do more damage to fences/land than most wildlife.
When we have approximately 150 head of elk pass through our property it really takes a toll on fences, grazing, and how we can rotate our cattle, not to mention the damage they can do to our haybales
The balance of nature has been upset. Whenever you change one thing, it has a tendency to change everything else. Leave it alone and let nature find its own balance.
They congregate here during the winter, have their little ones and don't have enough to eat.
The deer really destroy a lot of my trees.
I am strongly opposed to the governor's bounty on our native fur bearing species!!
GFP needs to keep their deer off the public highways and off private land or stop charging people to shoot them!!!
Falcons eagles and hawks kill 60 to 70% of pheasants. I have seen it firsthand every year and every year there are more and more feeding on pheasants. We release 1000s of birds and have wonderful habitat.

Table 17. Additional comments provided for the Agricultural Producer Survey (Q24)

There needs to be ALOT more whitetail deer tags given out in Lincoln county. When I can more than 50 deer on a field in a drive by that is way too many. It is normal to see well over 100 deer in a 5 miles drive. They are doing \$100000's of thousands of dollars in damage in the Newton Hills area every year.
Not including beaver or big game species that limited tags prohibit removal of we can take care of our own
Largest issue is number of white tail deer. Need to open antlerless season in later winter for optimal control of problem.
Have the landowner or lease have more control with management of overpopulated wildlife. Sometimes having other hunters or trappers on our land has caused more headaches than the wildlife. Also, we have a neighbor who tries to control wildlife in his adjoining land which causes us more problems than anything
Can you recommend coyote and racoon control? Live traps have not worked.
If you want to determine the white tail deer population in Gregory county you need to east of Bonesteel. They thrive on our corn and bean crop. As far as I am concerned landowners should be able control the deer population on their property it should not be a charged a fee to harvest a deer, buck or doe. We as landowners feed the deer so I'm tired of having to pay a fee to Harvest one. You make enough money from out of state pheasant hunters to provide enough money for the state without charging in state landowners a fee to hunt any species.
To many deer and too many sets of twins. We understand that the last winter was rough.... but we had over 150 deer in our yard by the house every night causing damage to trees etc.
I know and believe that the incessant use of chemicals is clearly damaging to the life of the soil, the water and the air which results in severely limiting the health and reproduction of all living things great and small! This is the only earth we know of and presently can support life. Caring for its healthy future needs to have priority first and not cheaply garnered profits. Thanks for asking.
way too many whitetail in the state, Department don't seem to confide with the people anymore.
Getting rid of our governor
In our area road ditch to road ditch farming along with huge amount of chemicals applied has created an environment where most of our wildlife has basically disappeared
Be honest in your dealings with landowners!!!

Table 17. Additional comments provided for the Agricultural Producer Survey (Q24)

Lived in S. Dak in 49-50 while in college in Brookings, hunted Pheasants every chance I got, and they were quite a few in the Brookings area. Would like to see more.

Appendix B: Landowner Survey Responses

Responses of 229 individuals that reported they were currently landowners but NOT agricultural producers in South Dakota.

Table 1. How many acres do you own or lease in South Dakota? (Q4)		
Acres	Percent	N
Less than 20 acres	49.3%	113
21-159 acres	21.0%	48
160-320 acres	14.0%	32
321-640 acres	9.6%	22
641-1280 acres	1.8%	4
1281-3840 acres	3.9%	9
3841 or more acres	0.4%	1
Total responding*	100%	229
* Five respondents skipped this question.		

Table 2. In what county do you primarily own or lease land in the state of South Dakota? (Q5)		
Location of Land	Percent	N
Region 1	26.7%	60
Region 2	13.8%	31
Region 3	33.8%	76
Region 4	25.8%	58
Total*	100.0%	225
* Nine respondents skipped this question.		

Table 3. In what other counties do you own or lease land in the state of South Dakota? (Q6)		
Location of Land	Percent	N
Region 1	18.6%	11
Region 2	23.7%	14
Region 3	28.8%	17
Region 4	28.8%	17
Total*	100%	59
* 50 respondents answered this question and 184 skipped it.		

Table 4. In general, how familiar are you with the information and services of the Wildlife Damage Program offered by South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks? (Q7)

Response	Percent	N
Extremely familiar	1.8%	4
Very familiar	3.6%	8
Somewhat familiar	22.6%	50
Not very familiar	32.1%	71
Not at all familiar	39.8%	88
Total responding*	100%	221

* 13 respondents skipped this question.

Q8: Have you suffered any wildlife-associated damage to your lands, crops, livestock or property in the past 2 years (2017-2018)?

- 219 respondents answered this questions, and 15 respondents skipped it.
- 20.5% (45) of respondents indicated “Yes”
- 79.5% (174) of respondents indicated “No”

Table 5. Was this wildlife-associated damage a new or recurring problem? (Q9)

Response	Percent	N
New problem	17.0%	8
Recurring problem this year	12.8%	6
Recurring problem over last 2-4 years	31.9%	15
Recurring problem for 5 years or more	38.3%	18
Total responding*	100%	47

* 187 respondents skipped this question.

Q10: Did you contact or attempt to contact the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks regarding your wildlife-associated damage?

- 47 respondents answered this questions, and 187 respondents skipped it.
- 12.8% (6) of respondents indicated “Yes”
- 87.2% (41) of respondents indicated “No”

Q11: Did you have any difficulty contacting a South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks employee concerning this problem?

- 6 respondents answered this questions, and 228 respondents skipped it.
- 33.3% (2) of respondents indicated “Yes”
- 66.7% (4) of respondents indicated “No”

Table 6. In general, how would you describe your interaction with the South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks employee concerning this wildlife problem? (Please provide a rating for all attributes) (Q12)

Response	Poor		Fair		Average		Good		Excellent	
	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N
Fairness	20.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	40.0%	2	40.0%	2
Professional	20.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	40.0%	2	40.0%	2
Responsive	20.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	20.0%	1	60.0%	3
Courteous	20.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	20.0%	1	60.0%	3
Positive attitude	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	20.0%	1	20.0%	1	60.0%	3
* 5 respondents answered this question, and 229 respondents skipped it.										

Table 7. How would you rate the effectiveness of the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks in addressing your wildlife damage complaint? (Q13)

Response	Percent	N
Extremely effective	0.0%	0
Very effective	20.0%	1
Somewhat effective	60.0%	3
Not so effective	20.0%	1
Not at all effective	0.0%	0
Total responding*	100%	5
* 229 respondents skipped this question.		

Table 8. Which species were responsible for wildlife damage that caused you to request the services of the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks Wildlife Damage Management Program? (Q14)

Wildlife species	Number of producers that listed each species	Percent
White-tailed deer	27	60.0%
Skunks/mink/other small mammals	12	26.7%
Raccoons	11	24.4%
Mule deer	7	15.6%
Pheasants	6	13.3%
Coyotes	4	8.9%
Turkeys	3	6.7%
Mountain lions	3	6.7%
Foxes (red, gray, swift)	3	6.7%
Beavers	3	6.7%
Blackbirds/starlings	2	4.4%
Geese	1	2.2%
Elk	1	2.2%
Pronghorns	1	2.2%
Wolves	1	2.2%
Grouse	0	0.0%
Ducks	0	0.0%
Sandhill cranes	0	0.0%
Black bears	0	0.0%
Total cases reported by 45 respondents*	85	
* 189 respondents skipped this question.		

Table 9. What was the estimated economic impact to the wildlife-associated damage that you experienced during the past two years (2017-2018)? (Q15)

Species	\$1,000 or less		\$1,001 to \$4,999		\$5,000 to \$9,999		\$10,000 or greater		Total
	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	
White-tailed deer	68.0%	17	32.0%	8	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	25
Skunks/mink/other small mammals	83.3%	10	0.0%	0	8.3%	1	8.3%	1	12
Raccoons	100.0%	11	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	11
Mule deer	100.0%	7	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	7
Pheasants	83.3%	5	16.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	6
Coyotes	100.0%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	4
Turkeys	100.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3
Mountain lions	66.7%	2	33.3%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3
Foxes (red, gray, swift)	100.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3
Beavers	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	0.0%	0	33.3%	1	3
Geese	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1
Elk	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	1
Pronghorns	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1
Wolves	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1
Blackbirds/starlings	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1
Grouse	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Ducks	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Sandhill cranes	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Black bears	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Bobcats	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Total responses*	80.5%	66	14.6%	12	2.4%	2	2.4%	2	82

* 43 respondents answered this question, and 191 skipped it.

Q16: Have you received information from the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks in the past two years (2017 & 2018)?

- 217 respondents answered this questions, and 17 respondents skipped it.
- 12.9% (28) of respondents indicated “Yes”
- 87.1% (189) of respondents indicated “No”

Table 10. How would you rate the information provided by the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks? (Q17)		
Response	Percent	N
More than adequate	17.9%	5
Adequate	78.6%	22
Less than adequate	0.0%	0
No opinion	3.6%	1
Total responding*	100%	28
* 206 respondents skipped this question.		

Q18: Have you received services from the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks in the past two years (2017 & 2018)?

- 215 respondents answered this questions, and 19 respondents skipped it.
- 3.3% (7) of respondents indicated “Yes”
- 96.7% (208) of respondents indicated “No”

Table 11. How would you rate the services provided by the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks? (Q19)		
Response	Percent	N
More than adequate	37.5%	3
Adequate	50.0%	4
Less than adequate	0.0%	0
No opinion	12.5%	1
Total responding*	100%	8
* 226 respondents skipped this question.		

Table 12. What type of services were provided to you by the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks? (Q20)

Types of services provided	Percent	N
Lethal removal of nuisance animal(s)	33.3%	2
Alteration of the habitat to discourage nuisance animal(s)	0.0%	0
Exclusion of nuisance animal(s) with fencing or other methods	33.3%	2
Detering nuisance animal(s) with noise, visual, or chemical methods	16.7%	1
Other (please specify)	16.7%	1
Total responding*	100%	6
* 228 respondents skipped this question.		

Table 13. In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the information and/or services of the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks? (Q21)

Response	Percent	N
Very satisfied	5.1%	5
Satisfied	29.6%	29
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	60.2%	59
Dissatisfied	2.0%	2
Very dissatisfied	3.1%	3
Total responding*	100%	98
* 214 respondents answered this question, and 20 skipped it. Of the 214 respondents, 54.2% (116) answered "did not request or receive information or services." Percentages shown above are of those that responded as receiving services or information.		

Table 14. For the following species, please indicate your assessment of their abundance on your land. (Q22)											
Species	Much lower than desired (+2)		Slightly lower than desired (+1)		About the right amount (0)		Slightly higher than desired (-1)		Much higher than desired (-2)		Favorability*
	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Skunks/mink/other small mammals	2.7%	5	1.6%	3	32.3%	61	28.6%	54	16.4%	31	-13.6%
Raccoons	0.5%	1	3.7%	7	31.8%	60	24.9%	47	16.4%	31	-13.2%
Coyotes	2.7%	5	2.7%	5	26.2%	49	19.3%	36	18.7%	35	-12.2%
Blackbirds/starlings	2.09%	4	2.1%	4	46.6%	89	22.5%	43	15.2%	29	-11.7%
Beavers	1.6%	3	1.6%	3	13.5%	25	4.9%	9	4.3%	8	-2.2%
Mountain lions	0.5%	1	1.1%	2	13.8%	26	3.7%	7	2.1%	4	-1.5%
Black bears	0.5%	1	0.0%	0	2.7%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.3%
Wolves	2.1%	4	0.5%	1	4.3%	8	0.5%	1	0.5%	1	0.8%
Pronghorns	2.1%	4	0.5%	1	8.0%	15	1.1%	2	0.0%	0	0.9%
Sandhill cranes	3.8%	7	3.8%	7	9.2%	17	1.6%	3	0.0%	0	2.4%
Bobcats	5.4%	10	2.7%	5	8.1%	15	1.1%	2	0.0%	0	3.1%
Mule deer	7.5%	14	6.4%	12	13.3%	25	4.3%	8	1.1%	2	3.7%
Elk	6.3%	12	4.2%	8	3.2%	6	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	4.2%
White-tailed deer	14.4%	28	12.3%	24	39.5%	77	9.7%	19	7.2%	14	4.2%
Foxes (red, gray, swift)	10.6%	20	8.0%	15	34.6%	65	8.0%	15	1.1%	2	4.8%
Geese	10.4%	20	7.3%	14	24.5%	47	4.2%	8	0.0%	0	6.0%
Turkeys	13.0%	25	5.7%	11	23.4%	45	4.7%	9	1.0%	2	6.3%
Ducks	13.2%	25	6.3%	12	24.7%	47	3.7%	7	1.6%	3	6.5%
Grouse	16.4%	31	6.9%	13	7.4%	14	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	9.9%
Pheasants	28.6%	57	12.6%	25	23.1%	46	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	17.5%
* Favorability was calculated by averaging the weighted categorical percentages (+2, +1, 0, -1, -2). Negative favorability generally indicates the species is not desired by agricultural producers, while positive favorability generally indicates that the species is desired by agricultural producers. 204 respondents answered this question, and 30 respondents skipped it.											

Table 15. In the previous question (Q22), you indicated that there are more of these species than desired on your property. What do you think is the best way to address these over-abundant species? (Q23)

Species*	Control by recreational hunters or trappers		Control by WDM personnel		Control by private landowners		Control by predator control district		Don't know/No opinion		Total
	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	N
Skunks/mink/other small mammals	22.62%	19	11.90%	10	45.24%	38	1.19%	1	19.05%	16	84
Raccoons	25.97%	20	7.79%	6	50.65%	39	0.00%	0	15.58%	12	77
Coyotes	38.03%	27	11.27%	8	30.99%	22	2.82%	2	16.90%	12	71
Blackbirds/starlings	8.45%	6	11.27%	8	39.44%	28	4.23%	3	36.62%	26	71
Beavers	11.76%	2	17.65%	3	47.06%	8	5.88%	1	17.65%	3	17
Mountain lions	45.45%	5	9.09%	1	9.09%	1	0.00%	0	36.36%	4	11
Black bears	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
Wolves	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	50.00%	1	50.00%	1	2
Pronghorns	50.00%	1	0.00%	0	50.00%	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	2
Sandhill cranes	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	33.33%	1	0.00%	0	66.67%	2	3
Bobcats	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	50.00%	1	0.00%	0	50.00%	1	2
Mule deer	40.00%	4	20.00%	2	20.00%	2	0.00%	0	20.00%	2	10
Elk	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
White-tailed deer	42.42%	14	12.12%	4	33.33%	11	0.00%	0	12.12%	4	33
Foxes (red, gray, swift)	47.06%	8	5.88%	1	29.41%	5	0.00%	0	17.65%	3	17
Geese	25.00%	2	12.50%	1	12.50%	1	0.00%	0	50.00%	4	8
Turkeys	27.27%	3	18.18%	2	27.27%	3	0.00%	0	27.27%	3	11
Ducks	10.00%	1	0.00%	0	30.00%	3	0.00%	0	60.00%	6	10
Grouse	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
Pheasants	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0

* Species are rank ordered based on the Desirability score assigned in Table 15. 139 respondents answered this question, and 95 respondents skipped it.

Table 16. Additional comments provided for Q24 of the Landowner Survey
Visit with landowners and get their input. Ag producers need to be putting their input in also. Landowners should have more of a part in discussions and decisions.
Please email me info on this as I haven't heard of it before. Thank you!
I think we should have a bounty on coyotes
Was not a big fan of the raccoon bounty
Glad they're around to help trap unwanted coyotes but also like the WIA.
Deer issue is mainly a complaint about the number hit on the roads. I don't know that anything can be done, but feel that generally, fewer of them would result in fewer road collisions.
I do not think coyotes should be in discriminately shot from the airplane only under damage circumstances
Allow landowners to hunt on their own private land without obtaining a wild game license.
I no longer live in the country, but we have an abundance of wildlife here in town.
I'd like to see elk spread more in the area.
we need to control the predators to get the pheasant population back.
We own land but do not live on that land; therefore, my responses to the previous question (regarding wildlife on the land) may or may not be accurate. I cannot determine the correct answers because I am not there to make observations.
Get surrounding landowners to quit feeding the damn deer - they are conditioned so much to receiving handouts they are almost tame. Feeding wildlife should be frowned upon just as baiting is.
I have rented out my land or it is in CRP! Also I have been out of commission for a few years going thru terrible pain, but after being on pain pills and trying a pain pump and those didn't work, I finally had back fusion surgery and now I am 2 years out of that and I am getting around again, but can't afford gas , to go and look at wildlife, like I LOVE to do!! But I just know from when I do get too look at my land at the right time of day, that there is not the wildlife like there used to be!! I guess it is just a period that nature is going thru! Just like the name of the township that my land is located in is called "ANTELOPE VALLEY" They were once roaming around this area years and years ago!!! Go figure!! I think it is just GOD's wish!!!
Unaware of the program(s). I generally consult with MInnehaha Conservation district for all questions related to land issues and they advise or direct me to alternative resources
No opinions really, just worried about having to burn again in the next couple years. Weeds are under control, blue stem grasses are coming back, have lots of good cover and food for pheasants and deer. Burning is just such a waste of time, expense, cover, food, and detours the wildlife we try so hard to keep. Don't get it...
They were here before I was. Leave them alone, they can do just fine without your so-called management programs!
So many drowned nests of pheasants this year and winter Jill from cold.
People within the city limits need to quit feeding the deer. They do not belong in town and should be afraid of you and your vehicles. They are not domesticated animals or pets. They are way to tame.

Table 16. Additional comments provided for Q24 of the Landowner Survey

Where is the office? How do people know about Wildlife Damage Management program? I've never heard of it.
Over the counter sales of deer tags especially female/ does. Stop the local removal of surplus deer count in and around city, currently allowed in SD. Free hunting tags for long time big game hunters, seniors over 60 years old. Guarantee local tags.
provide information on the insurance policy, that SD GFP has so they farmers can turn in or SD GFP can turn in for the damage to individual farmers. SDGFP says they own/manage the wildlife but do little to help the landowner who has some loss recover that loss. It is the responsibility of SDGFP to provide that liability if they claim to own / manage the wildlife.
I own less than half acre on corner of main highway and gravel road. I have few other houses around me so don't see much wildlife outside of a couple rabbits and an occasional opossum
The "land" I own is all within city limits of Edgemont SD.
Keep up the good work
Ide like to be able to shoot deer and other small critters on my property.
We have more problems with people that enter our lands without permission than the deer damage. They are hard on fences and come in our yard and ruin evergreen trees. We do not have crops that geese or pheasants pick out seed of newly planted crops. The coyotes have thinned out our cats and I am sure they go into nests for baby pheasants or the eggs.
It would be a nice program if they supplied repellants, or other means of deterring critters from an area
I have less than 3 acres
I like the free trap program offered. I hope it encourages young adults and children to help control predators.
The deer and turkeys get stuck in Dakota Dunes on The Pointe because they have nowhere else to flee and some of the stupid homeowners in the Dunes treat these like pets which does not help. We had a water feature/koi pond messed up by deer and the turkeys can take out new grass or sod you have just laid if you are not careful.
About half the acreage is in CRP to benefit wildlife, primarily pheasants.
The predator control program this year has been beneficial. An increase in the amount of allowed deer hunting licenses would be beneficial.
Give landowners more freedom to control nuisance and destructive animals.
Cleaner lakes and better water runoff
A cattle feed lot is about to setup shop at my back door in Lake Andes. I think the damage this will cause to the ground water and air pollution will be devastating to us and our town. With that and the fact that it will be indirectly poisoning the Missouri river I believe it would be in our best interest and the Wildlife damage management program's best interest to try to stop it. We have a small window of time. Have someone show up on September 16th at the Charles Mix county courthouse if you care. How do you think this feedlot is going to impact wildlife here? Please Help
I have only personally had 2 lions that I am aware of on land that I own, but overall there are far too many lions in the Black Hills and river drainages in western SD.

Table 16. Additional comments provided for Q24 of the Landowner Survey
Busy highways through Minnehaha close to town need additional hunting of deer allowed for safe travel conditions. Esp. in the Dell Rapids area along Highway 115 and behind the quarry east of town.
Providing the landowners with better management information for habit and seeking out tax breaks for the habit for the landowner. Helping them with occasional seminars to attend on habit and wildlife control would be helpful.
Population of wildlife on my land has increased greatly. Being in Roberts county the population seems to be growing a bit. Getting rid of the domestic canine on the property. The coyotes have been higher than desired, but a couple foxes are a great sight to see even though it's still low. Deer population is healthy as well as turkey. Overall many populations are doing well
I have never heard of the Wildlife Damage Management Program.
I am disturbed by the rodent kill plan that Gov. Noem has championed. I think it disturbs the natural order of the ecology of the area. (Perhaps this is why you are surveying...?)
We had a great response on the Beaver but an extremely poor response and essential denial from GF and Parks personnel about 10 years ago when we had a male Mountain lion causing havoc and chasing our cattle all over and taking 7 calves from the next-door neighbor's herd. No recognition and no help and we were forced to sell our cattle early and at a sig loss!!!
You need a bounty out on a lot of predator. More officers so there stretched so thin.

Appendix C: General Public Survey Responses

General Public Assessment

- Web-linked survey provided to any interested South Dakota resident (Convenience Sample)
- Resulting in 454 total responses (cannot calculate response rate)

Q1: Do you currently own or lease land in the state of South Dakota?

- 454 responses.
- 89.9% (408) of respondents indicated “Yes”
- 10.1% (46) of respondents indicated “No”

Q2: Are you currently an agricultural producer in the state of South Dakota?

- 406 respondents answered this question, and 48 skipped it.
- 74.1% (301) of respondents indicated “Yes”
- 25.9% (105) of respondents indicated “No”

Table 1. How would you describe your agricultural operation? (Q3)		
Type of Operation	Percent	N
Exclusively farming	22.2%	67
Mostly farming with some ranching	16.2%	49
Farming and ranching are equal	22.2%	67
Mostly ranching with some farming	24.5%	74
Exclusively ranching	7.6%	23
Other (please specify)	7.3%	22
Total responding*	100%	302
* 152 respondents skipped this question.		

Table 2. How many acres do you own or lease in South Dakota? (Q4)		
Acres	Percent	N
Less than 20 acres	9.0%	36
21-159 acres	8.8%	35
160-320 acres	18.6%	74
321-640 acres	15.0%	60
641-1280 acres	15.0%	60
1281-3840 acres	19.6%	78
3841 or more acres	14.0%	56
Total responding*	100%	399
* 55 respondents skipped this question.		

Table 3. In what county do you primarily own or lease land in the state of South Dakota? (Q5)		
Location of Land	Percent	N
Region 1	22.3%	88
Region 2	22.1%	87
Region 3	31.7%	125
Region 4	23.9%	94
Total*	100%	394
* 60 respondents skipped this question.		

Table 4. In what other counties do you own or lease land in the state of South Dakota? (Q6)

Location of Land	Percent	N
Region 1	23.7%	52
Region 2	25.6%	56
Region 3	31.5%	69
Region 4	19.2%	42
Total*	100%	219
* 177 respondents answered this question and 277 skipped it.		

Table 5. In general, how familiar are you with the information and services of the Wildlife Damage Program offered by South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks? (Q7)

Response	Percent	N
Extremely familiar	10.6%	41
Very familiar	16.1%	62
Somewhat familiar	36.0%	139
Not very familiar	23.6%	91
Not at all familiar	13.7%	53
Total responding*	100%	386
* 68 respondents skipped this question.		

Q8: Have you suffered any wildlife-associated damage to your lands, crops, livestock or property in the past 2 years (2017-2018)?

- 380 respondents answered this questions, and 74 respondents skipped it.
- 61.6% (234) of respondents indicated “Yes”
- 38.4% (146) of respondents indicated “No”

Table 6. Was this wildlife-associated damage a new or recurring problem? (Q9)		
Response	Percent	N
New problem	7.8%	18
Recurring problem this year	9.9%	23
Recurring problem over last 2-4 years	22.4%	52
Recurring problem for 5 years or more	59.9%	139
Total responding*	100%	232
* 222 respondents skipped this question.		

Q10: Did you contact or attempt to contact the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks regarding your wildlife-associated damage?

- 230 respondents answered this questions, and 224 respondents skipped it.
- 38.7% (89) of respondents indicated “Yes”
- 61.3% (141) of respondents indicated “No”

Q11: Did you have any difficulty contacting a South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks employee concerning this problem?

- 89 respondents answered this questions, and 365 respondents skipped it.
- 15.7% (14) of respondents indicated “Yes”
- 84.3% (75) of respondents indicated “No”

Table 7. In general, how would you describe your interaction with the South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks employee concerning this wildlife problem? (Please provide a rating for all attributes) (Q12)

Response	Poor		Fair		Average		Good		Excellent	
	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N
Fairness	17.4%	15	7.0%	6	19.8%	17	24.4%	21	31.4%	27
Professional	10.5%	9	4.7%	4	15.1%	13	31.4%	27	38.4%	33
Responsive	22.1%	19	11.6%	10	12.8%	11	22.1%	19	31.4%	27
Courteous	7.0%	6	7.0%	6	12.8%	11	33.7%	29	39.5%	34
Positive attitude	8.1%	7	12.8%	11	19.8%	17	22.1%	19	37.2%	32

* 86 respondents answered this question, and 368 respondents skipped it.

Table 8. How would you rate the effectiveness of the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks in addressing your wildlife damage complaint? (Q13)

Response	Percent	N
Extremely effective	12.9%	11
Very effective	16.5%	14
Somewhat effective	25.9%	22
Not so effective	20.0%	17
Not at all effective	24.7%	21
Total responding*	100%	85

* 369 respondents skipped this question.

Table 9. Which species were responsible for wildlife damage that caused you to request the services of the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks Wildlife Damage Management Program? (Q14)

Wildlife species	Number of producers that listed each species	Percent
White-tailed deer	149	66.5%
Coyotes	85	38.0%
Raccoons	57	25.5%
Geese	41	18.3%
Skunks/mink/other small mammals	40	17.9%
Pheasants	30	13.4%
Mule deer	30	13.4%
Beavers	29	13.0%
Elk	20	8.9%
Turkeys	19	8.5%
Blackbirds/starlings	18	8.0%
Pronghorns	11	4.9%
Mountain lions	10	4.5%
Foxes (red, gray, swift)	8	3.6%
Ducks	4	1.8%
Grouse	1	0.5%
Sandhill cranes	1	0.5%

Wolves	1	0.5%
Black bears	1	0.5%
Total cases reported by 224 respondents*	556	
* 230 respondents skipped this question.		

Table 10. What was the estimated economic impact to the wildlife-associated damage that you experienced during the past two years (2017-2018)? (Q15)

Species	\$1,000 or less		\$1,001 to \$4,999		\$5,000 to \$9,999		\$10,000 or greater		Total
	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	
White-tailed deer	44.8%	65	42.8%	62	4.1%	6	8.3%	12	145
Coyotes	56.0%	47	33.3%	28	6.0%	5	4.8%	4	84
Raccoons	76.4%	42	20.0%	11	1.8%	1	1.8%	1	55
Geese	41.5%	17	46.3%	19	7.3%	3	4.9%	2	41
Skunks/mink/other small mammals	77.5%	31	20.0%	8	0.0%	0	2.5%	1	40
Pheasants	62.1%	18	34.5%	10	0.0%	0	3.5%	1	29
Mule deer	44.8%	13	41.4%	12	6.9%	2	6.9%	2	29
Beavers	62.1%	18	31.0%	9	3.5%	1	3.5%	1	29
Elk	20.0%	4	30.0%	6	5.0%	1	45.0%	9	20
Turkeys	73.7%	14	21.1%	4	0.0%	0	5.3%	1	19
Blackbirds/starlings	55.6%	10	27.8%	5	5.6%	1	11.1%	2	18

Pronghorns	63.6%	7	27.3%	3	0.0%	0	9.1%	1	11
Mountain lions	40.0%	4	40.0%	4	0.0%	0	20.0%	2	10
Foxes (red, gray, swift)	87.5%	7	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	12.5%	1	8
Ducks	50.0%	2	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	4
Grouse	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	1
Sandhill cranes	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	1
Wolves	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	1
Black bears	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	1
Bobcats	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	1
Total Responses*	54.7%	299	33.3%	182	3.7%	20	8.4%	46	547
* 218 respondents answered this question, and 236 skipped it.									

Q16: Have you received information from the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks in the past two years (2017 & 2018)?

- 361 respondents answered this questions, and 93 respondents skipped it.
- 30.2% (109) of respondents indicated “Yes”
- 69.8% (252) of respondents indicated “No”

Table 11. How would you rate the information provided by the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks? (Q17)		
Response	Percent	N
More than adequate	19.3%	21
Adequate	53.2%	58
Less than adequate	16.5%	18
No opinion	11.0%	12
Total responding*	100%	109
* 345 respondents skipped this question.		

Q18: Have you received services from the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks in the past two years (2017 & 2018)?

- 358 respondents answered this questions, and 96 respondents skipped it.
- 14.3% (51) of respondents indicated “Yes”
- 85.7% (307) of respondents indicated “No”

Table 12. How would you rate the services provided by the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks? (Q19)

Response	Percent	N
More than adequate	17.3%	9
Adequate	55.8%	29
Less than adequate	25.0%	13
No opinion	1.9%	1
Total responding*	100%	52
* 402 respondents skipped this question.		

Table 13. What type of services were provided to you by the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks? (Q20)

Types of services provided	Percent	N
Lethal removal of nuisance animal(s)	39.3%	24
Alteration of the habitat to discourage nuisance animal(s)	4.9%	3
Exclusion of nuisance animal(s) with fencing or other methods	29.5%	18
Deterring nuisance animal(s) with noise, visual, or chemical methods	3.3%	2
Other (please specify)	22.9%	14
Total responding*		61
* 403 respondents skipped this question.		

Table 14. In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the information and/or services of the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks? (Q21)

Response	Percent	N
Very satisfied	12.4%	31
Satisfied	23.9%	60
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	46.2%	116
Dissatisfied	10.8%	27
Very dissatisfied	6.8%	17
Total responding*	100%	251
* 351 respondents answered this question, and 103 skipped it. Of the 351 respondents, 28.5% (100) answered "did not request or receive information or services." Percentages shown above are of those that responded as receiving services or information.		

Table 15. For the following species, please indicate your assessment of their abundance on your land. (Q22)											
Species	Much lower than desired (+2)		Slightly lower than desired (+1)		About the right amount (0)		Slightly higher than desired (-1)		Much higher than desired (-2)		Favorability*
	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Coyotes	1.2%	4	2.4%	8	26.2%	87	30.4%	101	38.3%	127	-20.4%
Raccoons	2.1%	7	2.7%	9	23.6%	78	29.9%	99	38.7%	128	-20.1%
Skunks/mink/other small mammals	3.1%	10	3.1%	10	25.2%	82	35.1%	114	30.5%	99	-17.4%
Blackbirds/starlings	1.2%	4	2.5%	8	41.5%	134	26.01%	84	21.4%	69	-12.8%
Beavers	3.7%	12	2.5%	8	14.6%	47	15.0%	48	10.3%	33	-5.1%
Mountain lions	1.2%	4	1.2%	4	10.6%	34	4.7%	15	10.6%	34	-4.4%
Wolves	1.3%	4	0.3%	1	0.6%	2	0.3%	1	1.6%	5	-0.1%
Black bears	0.9%	3	0.3%	1	1.6%	5	0.0%	0	0.9%	3	0.1%
Elk	4.7%	15	2.8%	9	3.7%	12	1.3%	4	3.1%	10	0.9%
White-tailed deer	13.7%	47	22.2%	76	36.3%	124	11.4%	39	14.9%	51	1.7%
Geese	13.9%	45	6.2%	20	37.0%	120	11.7%	38	4.9%	16	2.5%
Bobcats	7.9%	25	3.5%	11	13.9%	44	0.6%	2	1.9%	6	3.0%
Sandhill cranes	8.2%	26	1.6%	5	12.9%	41	0.6%	2	0.6%	2	3.2%

Pronghorns	9.3%	30	6.2%	20	7.4%	24	3.1%	10	2.8%	9	3.2%
Ducks	14.9%	49	8.5%	28	49.4%	163	4.2%	14	2.7%	9	5.7%
Turkeys	16.5%	54	13.8%	45	18.0%	59	7.0%	23	3.4%	11	6.6%
Foxes (red, gray, swift)	18.5%	60	13.6%	44	32.4%	105	8.0%	26	3.4%	11	7.2%
Mule deer	15.0%	49	12.0%	39	12.3%	40	1.2%	4	2.5%	8	7.2%
Grouse	31.7%	102	10.6%	34	13.0%	42	0.3%	1	0.6%	2	14.5%
Pheasants	48.8%	163	18.3%	61	16.5%	55	1.5%	5	1.5%	5	22.3%
<p>* Favorability was calculated by averaging the weighted categorical percentages (+2, +1, 0, -1, -2). Negative favorability generally indicates the species is not desired by agricultural producers, while positive favorability generally indicates that the species is desired by agricultural producers. 346 respondents answered this question, and 108 respondents skipped it.</p>											

Table 16. In the previous question (Q22), you indicated that there are more of these species than desired on your property. What do you think is the best way to address these over-abundant species? (Q23)

Species*	Control by recreational hunters or trappers		Control by WDM personnel		Control by private landowners		Control by predator control district		Don't know/No opinion		Total
	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	N
Coyotes	35.09%	80	19.30%	44	30.70%	70	6.58%	15	8.33%	19	228
Raccoons	41.15%	93	12.39%	28	37.17%	84	2.65%	6	6.64%	15	226
Skunks/mink/other small mammals	34.91%	74	11.32%	24	41.98%	89	2.83%	6	8.96%	19	212
Blackbirds/starlings	18.42%	28	18.42%	28	32.89%	50	2.63%	4	27.63%	42	152
Beavers	32.50%	26	40.00%	32	18.75%	15	1.25%	1	7.50%	6	80
Mountain lions	32.65%	16	10.20%	5	46.94%	23	2.04%	1	8.16%	4	49
Wolves	0.00%	0	33.33%	2	33.33%	2	33.33%	2	0.00%	0	6
Black bears	33.33%	1	0.00%	0	33.33%	1	33.33%	1	0.00%	0	3
Elk	28.57%	4	7.14%	1	50.00%	7	7.14%	1	7.14%	1	14
White-tailed deer	52.81%	47	6.74%	6	33.71%	30	1.12%	1	5.62%	5	89
Geese	44.44%	24	9.26%	5	31.48%	17	1.85%	1	12.96%	7	54
Bobcats	25.00%	2	0.00%	0	25.00%	2	25.00%	2	25.00%	2	8

Sandhill cranes	25.00%	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	25.00%	1	50.00%	2	4
Pronghorns	52.63%	10	10.53%	2	31.58%	6	5.26%	1	0.00%	0	19
Ducks	39.13%	9	0.00%	0	17.39%	4	4.35%	1	39.13%	9	23
Turkeys	50.00%	17	11.76%	4	17.65%	6	5.88%	2	14.71%	5	34
Foxes (red, gray, swift)	40.54%	15	13.51%	5	35.14%	13	8.11%	3	2.70%	1	37
Mule deer	41.67%	5	8.33%	1	33.33%	4	8.33%	1	8.33%	1	12
Grouse	33.33%	1	0.00%	0	33.33%	1	33.33%	1	0.00%	0	3
Pheasants	30.00%	3	0.00%	0	50.00%	5	10.00%	1	10.00%	1	10
* Species are rank ordered based on the Desirability score assigned in Table 15. 309 respondents answered this question, and 145 respondents skipped it.											

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q24 of the General Public Survey

I feed and winter from 200 to 700 whitetail deer annually. I do this for the most part to help keep the deer off my neighbor's property and keep their damage to their hay minimal. I did contact the GFP the first few years, with little to no effect. So, I just started planning better and putting up more feed. I would love to see landowners like me that don't ask for assistance get some rewards. A couple deer tags for example. A couple that we can give a family member or even sell to help with the costs of feeding so many animals for the GFP. Just an idea, but without our efforts, they would have a huge death rate in the winter and a lot fewer tags to sell the next season.

Dam rabbits are eating my trees, and they live under the neighbors shed

I think the bounty program is ridiculous. Habitat controls game populations, not predators. If people want game, they need to manage their land accordingly.

I've heard that it takes a long time and a lot of work for recreational trappers to get permits for trapping beaver out of season. Therefore no one is willing to go through the work of getting a permit for out of season trapping. I've had water ways backed up every summer for the last 10 years and would like to be able to have someone get rid of them during the spring and summer months. Please consider make this less of a hassle.

We sustain over 10,000 elk days annually on our ranch with minimal damage. This is achieved by putting our hay into hay yards in a timely manner and not over grazing with cattle. Scamming your organization without demonstrated losses and taking our tax dollars for exaggerated losses is an injustice that should promptly be stopped. Please consider a requirement for documentation of losses before any financial reimbursement for losses is considered. Thank you.

Let us know about programs and someone needs to better manage the conservation officer (located in Plankinton/ I know of several landowners that have issues with him)

Go back to the way it was when the rest of the country used to try and model their predator control after our way of keeping coyotes under control. Get trappers that JUST TRAP like they used to do and kept the coyotes under control. Allow private landowners to hire licensed pilots to help keep coyotes under control when needed. They don't need supervisors supervising supervisors and trappers with little experience in actually trapping, including the supervisors. If this keeps going like it has for the last 4-5 years, we will run out of wildlife. It's simple math, no pheasant and fawn recruitment and they will disappear. They already have. Pretty tough to keep young hunters interested when they don't see anything. Thanks for doing the review. I know our governor really wants to turn this situation around. As far as habitat goes, we have over 1200 acres of new CRP added in the last 5 years in our 2 townships with zero improvements in wildlife numbers.

I do not know how they could do better. We receive excellent service

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q24 of the General Public Survey

I farm for a living and expect wildlife to be on my land, I enjoy them greatly. I feel very strongly that part of being a good steward is caring for wildlife and providing quality habitat.

Our biggest wildlife damage species is deer. We planted a 400-tree shelter belt with an irrigation system. The deer completely destroyed the spruce trees and damaged all other species except the Russian olive. The deer also come in the yard around the house and eat our spruce trees. At the browse level the deer will completely strip the needles and destroy the general shape of the tree. Coyotes are the other species we struggle with. They will come right into the feeding ground during calving to get the afterbirth. Also, they will take newborns if they are left unattended by the cow.

As far as deer on alfalfa bales... if the producer puts a bale out 100 yards from the stackyard... the deer will eat that first.... may take out to 4 bales for a rough winter

The damage also done by Jackrabbits and Cottontails to Tree Groves when there is a heavy snowy winter should be listed on the survey and be addressed.

I realize these surveys are "form" oriented and that makes it difficult to really tell the story. I have had two recent contacts with SDGFP Wildlife Management. The first involved coyotes killing farm animals, including three of our milk goats. The person they sent to help us was [REDACTED], who is a great guy and I have nothing negative to say about him. He set traps on our place and a few of the neighbors' places. The result was two coyotes, a raccoon, and two cats. After the second cat, it was obvious that trapping was too indiscriminate under the circumstances. The traps were removed, and no further efforts were taken to control coyotes on our property. Not altogether a bad experience but that was so mostly through the personal efforts of Sean not by GFP policy. Where I really parted company with the GFP was when they choose to do nothing, nothing, in response to a mountain lion kill under the deck of our house in a residential area within the city limits. When we discovered the carcass, GFP was contacted and a person, not [REDACTED], was sent over. His sole purpose appeared to be to get the carcass loaded and to get going. My responses in the survey relate to [REDACTED] and to no other employee or staff of the GFP. Maybe we are talking two different issues that involve financial loss as opposed to community safety. My complaints of financial loss resulted in action while my complaints of compromised community safety did not. I mean they did not so much as look for tracks in the snow. There was no effort to investigate or to inform others living in the area that heightened awareness was warranted.

I feel the G, F&P should provide resources to the landowners for wildlife deprivation without requiring the landowner to sign off on allowing "free and reasonable access to hunters".

The deer proof fencing really helps, we also need more predators that control deer numbers

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q24 of the General Public Survey

More opportunity for nonresidents to obtain tags, more opportunity for residents to obtain dbl tags use to be able to harvest 35 to 40 deer off our property now thru license system only 10 to 15. Need to control coyotes better, has to be main reproductive deterrent for mule deer. Add coyote tails to tail incentive program

Please do not renew the tail bounty program. It's expensive, it's not targeted to any specific habitat, and its stated goal, apart from predator control, "to introduce young people to the outdoors" is grotesque. I was introduced to the outdoors in many ways, including not shooting pheasants on the ground or ducks in the water. NOT BY TRAPPING SMALL ANIMALS, KILLING THEM IN THE TRAP AND CUTTING THEIR TAILS OFF FOR A MONEY.

Elk populations are out of control and are not properly managed. Appear to be managed strictly for hunters and revenues for SDGFP. Landowners are providing habitat for the large populations at their own expense and damages caused by increased herds. Solution: Fencing provided by SDGFP or drastic reduction in numbers of elk!

Put the information on a website with what assistance is available and what the requirements are

How do you get rid of pocket gophers in alfalfa

Trapping skunks and racoons seems the only option for these creatures. Don't believe SDDGFP can really affect their populations.

for example. we have a large elk/white tail deer population. that spend every night on our crop lands. By not being controlled they have forced us to quit producing cash crops thus cutting into our bottom line. the last time we planted a wheat crop the south side of the quarter made 10 bpa and the north made 45 bpa. the difference is 35 bushels times today's market rate \$4 per bushel equals \$22400 for the quarter. at the time that land was enrolled in the walking in hunting program at a \$ 1 or \$2per acre. which works out to be \$320. during deer season that field produced the harvest of roughly 20 deer at \$50 per tag. the Issue I have is the state wants us to feed their animals year round at a cost of Thousands and Thousands of dollars but when we ask for assistance in keeping these animals from inhibiting our ability to make a living you offer us peanuts in the form of WIH payments. yes, we have received a couple of stackyards to keep the deer and elk from getting into our hay lots. but what does that do for the standing crops in the fields. A herd of elk are no different than a cow or horse. and you wouldn't begin to turn 30 hd of those into your corn or soybean field every night from may till November.

We shouldn't receive money from the GFP budget because wildlife is part of farming. Farming should work with wildlife. Please stop using GFP money to private landowners. Please stop the bounty program as well as it doesn't work and waste of money. Put that money towards purchasing public lands. We need more habit. Thank you.

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q24 of the General Public Survey

With all of the card/deer accidents I see in Yankton County and the damage they cause in farm fields I think it's ridiculous that it is so difficult to get a rifle deer tag in Yankton County. I know many people have just given up on trying to rifle hunt deer in the county. Let's forget the idea that everybody should have a chance to shoot a mature buck and get things under control.

I am under stress to return to my residence to deal with high mold spores due to flood water that was around my house. I have never heard of this program and neither have others I know. This staff person\s needs training on how to reach out to the greater public and become a public servant.

I think the Department does too much for landowners. So many landowners expect a panacea of the wildlife species they can make money off of and none of the species that they can't make money off of. Landowners who want services should foot the bill or at least a large portion of it. I have never requested services and don't expect the government to solve my problems. Landowners who claim to be independent and proud need to start acting like it. I admire the GFP and other landowners who take the good with the bad.

wildlife has to be managed and not left to overrun the farm and rancher. They need to have some input into the numbers and control.

Need to react to conditions faster

Lack of anyone that cares. Just hold a position that no one is held accountable for their jobs

Deer have damaged or destroyed new shelter belts planted. I have been told there is nothing GFP can do. Please offer tree guards to protect these new trees. Thanks!

Recommendations for improvement would be to issue landowner tags. We are a non-resident landowner and did not draw a white tail or mule deer tag. Being a non-resident landowner, we have no opportunity for landowner tags. Additionally, we pay over \$20,000 dollars in taxes annually as a non-resident. We feel as if we should be eligible for landowner tags just like the residents.

More landowner and GFP interaction?

Grant county needs to once again have whitetail antlerless tags available to control doe populations. A lot of habitat is being removed which concentrates the remaining whitetail population which affects the farmers/ranchers who happen to have maintained habitat. They are in effect being asked to bear the brunt of the population of whitetail deer for the county. When Grant county did have antlerless tags available, we had less crop damage due to doe harvest. The mentality of the present-day hunter is to only shoot a buck which does not help control the localized populations of whitetail deer. We as a farm have always told hunters that they can hunt on our land if they shoot an antlerless deer but when they hear that we generally do not see them again.

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q24 of the General Public Survey
Need to increase trapping
The Moody county GFP officer needs to use the proper procedures when it comes to dead and injured birds of prey; such as owls.
Allow private helicopters, planes, and snowmobiles to hunt coyotes and fox. Landowners have better knowledge to where these animals hide out. This would also allow a faster response time to address the problem. 3-5 days for a response is way too long to wait for action.
Mule deer are our biggest problem we can't even get a landowner's tag to hunt also the individuals who hunt here can't get a mule deer tag many local hunters didn't get a tag this year
Need more deer and antelope licensee
We need more predator control. When the habitat recovers from the floods, we should consider stocking pheasants to help the population.
There are too many geese and ducks. We should be allowed to poison Canadian geese
This department needs to change the staff at the top. The trappers do an excellent job after a kill, but it seems like if there was more being done all year in predator control than the pressure would be less during calving and lambing. As a rancher I would be curious to see the number of kills from 1980-to current date, and dollars lost due these kills.
Stop barbaric trapping.
we have elk on our property, and we live in elk county.... 1% of the landowners are totally controlling the population of big game in the southern unit for elk. our population was at a good and healthy population until the 1% of landowners complained about the elk and then they shot 50% of the elk population down due to the 1% of complaining landowners. SD damage management program goes way out of their way (\$\$\$) to help the 1% of complaining landowners. STOP killing all the big game for the 1%. it is a slap in our face (the 99% of ranchers) that deal with the elk and don't receive anything from the GFP. 99% of the ranchers do enjoy the wildlife on their property. GFP damage management program shouldn't be to kill all the wildlife because of the 1% of complainers
There is an animal rights page on Facebook that is telling people to lie on this survey to sway you to ban trapping. Hunting and fishing are Midwest and American traditions. Maintaining healthy populations of wildlife is essential, to include controlling excess populations. I wish we had more ability to control excessive populations on our own property without being charged with poaching

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q24 of the General Public Survey

Noem and the GFP's Predator program has done nothing for those of us living in the Country but kill off innocent animals that benefited the eco-system. We have not seen 1 pheasant all year! Nothing but a waste of taxpayer money to the tune of \$1.5+ million dollars. Money could have been better used for pheasant habitat if that was her purpose!
The SDGF&P cannot manage themselves out of a wet paper bag. Some of the officers cannot even manage a wet dream.
The bounty tail program does not work and is a wasted cost to the people buying licenses.
The live trap and tail program very much needed.... It was about time to see something done.... would very much like to see the tail program continue....
I was asked to take this survey, but no explanation was given as to what the WDMP does.
As a landowner, I am allowed only one deer tag, as are family members. None of which were for Mule deer. The family has legally shot up to 15 deer from our home section one. The pheasants eat the corn right down the row, the neighbor has a hunting business. I am not able to grow any row crop on that 65 acres. The deer also ruin trees, either by eating the small trees or the bucks rubbing. We have oak trees that are maybe 3 ft. tall but there is one that was planted at the same time is 20+ft tall. The mule deer that are in a different area of the county break up hay bales as well as eat the crops in that area.
Landowners should be given more tags during deer season and should be able to trap year around on smaller game.
There are so many raccoons around; I need to continue to trap. Game Fish and Parks are doing a good job.
Go back to the structure of the ADC program in the early 80's. Go back to ADC section and NOT under regional supervision. Higher professional trappers with only 1 or 2 supervisors who know what they are doing and actually have ADC and aerial hunting experience. Have WDM and ADC 2 separate programs. Adequately fund ADC program long term
I feel like the predator population is really high and I think that the trapping program was great last year, but I feel it needs some more work to make it an even better program. maybe lower the amount of money given for each tail so they will trap more possibly. I also think that giving the traps out is a great idea but think they should direct it more to giving them to kids so the kids will participate possibly more.
GFP. inept, self-serving, snobs.

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q24 of the General Public Survey

I have been involved in WDMP my entire adult life, true and easy reporting is paramount in management, your program hasn't had on for many years. Your management has built a program to do away from good control measures from your guys on the ground. Upper management has too many meetings, and the folks they hire have no experience in control methods. It shows, management doesn't care for the program or just doesn't know how to manage the program. I hope the review is not just an exercise in just appeasing the public or rural population. I would love to be involved in finding solutions to the problems of the program, with being in management for nearly 20 years I believe I could help build a good program, but it has to start at the top.

Allow control of coyotes by any means.

Trapping bounty a brilliant way to get young people out and increase nesting of ground bird success

There are too many deer being killed per acre in my area. you have guides leasing 2000 acres killing 8-10 bucks off it a year. this as well as EHD has dramatically affected my deer population. I have very few deer and 99 percent of my bucks are young. I rarely see any old deer anymore and the chances of killing an old big buck are almost zero. The fish and game have to consider limiting the number of bucks that can be killed per acre. I have been very vocal about this, but it seems to fall on deaf ears

My experience is landowners in general "own" all the wildlife on their land, unless it is causing a problem. Then it is owned by the state, and the state must pay them and/or fix the problem. Another option is to simply keep increasing the animal damage control budget and taking sportsman's dollars to do it. A recent example is the predator trapping program, and for that matter, money wasted on coyote/cougar control. I think the state should employ wildlife biologists who understand killing a few animals here and there is not necessarily a solution, unless the idea of more dead animals (with no decrease in depredation or predation) is what keeps landowners happy. The Government thinks it knows all the answers to complex biological problems and is more than happy to spend someone else's money to prove it. The day I need a state or federal trapper to kill the problem animals I have is the day I need to sell my land. Millions and millions of dollars are spent needlessly, or worse, to increase the problem because wildlife does not listen to politicians. Please, please, please put someone in charge who is not afraid to speak truth to power, who knows they need experts to work on specific problems, wildlife-related or otherwise, who understands that not everyone has the money to pay more to accomplish less, and who truly cares about the average sportsman in this state, be he or her a landowner or not. Please. And for heaven's sake, NO NEW TAXES. A habitat stamp, money to be spent on feel good projects? Sorry, not for me.

Hire people with actually wildlife management experience, not people who have a degree and spend very little time in nature

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q24 of the General Public Survey

The focus of the Game fish and Parks should be to grow the species diversity and population of animals. They should not worry about what ranchers who only care about how much money per head they are getting, or farmers who only worry about how many acres they can farm. The mule deer population in the black hills shows how much more the GFP needs to focus on growth of wild species. Adding proper habitat for animals (bedding areas etc.) and preventing farmers from getting rid of sloughs and CRP on their land would immensely help the deer and pheasant populations in the state.

Noem- you are a joke, so are my answers in this stupid survey.

I think the trapping program the State did this year was a great way to get younger generation to learn how to trap and still get a reward for it. We have been trapping on our farm for 10 years or so just to keep the predators down to let the pheasant population grow and to keep the coyotes away from our calves in the spring. More people around the area trapped because of the program so I feel it was a good response.

The turkey population has exploded the past several years and in turn reduced pheasant population as well as corn plant population because they walk down the rows and dig up every kernel. The whitetail population was decimated a few years ago. But they are coming back with a vengeance and whining out mature corn plants. The whitetail are young but plentiful

Get more than one plane to kill coyotes.

More mainstream communication

Buffalo near Deerfield running in BH Forest is a serious concern & that it has been ongoing for months 2019. Not sure if WDM has been part of this issue but should be.

Wind turbines are driving the wildlife away!

Need to address the damage blackbirds do to fall crops. Mainly on the milo & sunflower acres

Make more funds available to help feed wildlife in bad winter years

Weather/climate conditions are having the biggest impact on wildlife numbers and concentrations, both large and small. Current weather and row crop farming are not conducive to pheasants (that aren't native anyway), more water is boosting raccoon and opossum numbers, and hard winters are concentrating existing deer populations. My Canada goose populations have become manageable when I eliminated soybeans and planted more small grains.

Give money to help compensate for forage loss that occurred by deer, elk and other animals. Make these programs easier for landowners to enroll and know about. Like the GFP website where it says landowners' matter, prove it because we don't feel like we do.

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q24 of the General Public Survey
Need more effort on predators to increase pheasant numbers. Overall, satisfied with help provided to control Canada goose population in soybean fields near public water.
Make the program known to landowners and operators
Buy feed directly from the farmers having depredation issues if they are willing to sell it. Allow for some compensation for loss.
Something needs to be done about the overabundance of pocket gophers.
I own and or lease grass for my livestock and when the game fish and parks oversee the wildlife on public and private land however they do not have to pay the private land owner for grazing or feed that is provided by the landowner they seem to have adequate funding for recreational programs and improvements but not enough to adequately compensate the private landowners.
The free traps given out last winter show the governor's commitment to game management
SDGFP needs to represent the sportsman of SD to preserve our wild game & fish. They should not represent nonresidents & not represent the hotel & restaurant alliances in the state. Our states wildlife should be managed based on their populations not based on economic demand.
As far as I'm concerned, they do damned good. Just need to control skunks, coons etc. and we had the coyotes all killed off right after WW2
Need to kill more coyotes
Seems to me that the elk population in the county is growing faster than the licenses available. There are more landowners that ask for depredation than there are licenses and the herd just keep growing. We decimated the deer herds with double tags as did the pronghorns in previous years, so that is not an answer, but the amount of elk licenses is inadequate in my opinion.
Neighbors have all called about the sever impact of deer on our hay and corn fields with no effort to help
Too many out of state hunters with pheasant s available. Deer also being harvested by out of state bow hunters.
Allow landowners using fencing to keep deer out of haystacks to hunt. Currently I MUST LET OTHERS hunt but I must apply for a license and if not issued I can't hunt for control. That is not right in my opinion, so I provide my own fencing and do not allow hunting at present.

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q24 of the General Public Survey

The solution the state has to my severe overpopulation of deer is the open it to public hunting or a depredation hunt where the state brings in volunteers. I run a pheasant hunting operation and can't have anyone running around the property let alone open it up to public hunting when I need it for pheasant hunting. In Nebraska where I am originally from they offer depredation tags to the landowner for them to control the population and here I have to pay in my opinion is an overpriced doe tag and I could never purchase enough to control the amount of deer on my property and each year they continue to just get worse

Fish ducks...way too many...40-60 any given time... eat a lot fish over a year's time.

GFP spends too much on damage management. Most of the complaints seem to come from people who do not allow hunting

Noem's programs are ridiculous and costly.

Gave out more doe tags before you can get a buck tag

Bounties on raccoons, skunks and coyotes might be something to consider. I know it is working on the live trap giveaway and raccoons.

The coyote population is out of control. Something must be done to reduce their population.

Employ people who are willing to work and solve the problem rather than socializing and doing personal business on state time would likely improve the actual results of the program.

Only damage I've incurred was the result of beavers damming up large culverts, preventing water from flowing through property properly, resulting in road flooding/damage. State Trapper resolved issue after my attempts failed. Thanks for providing this service. I don't support feeding deer in winter months to prevent damage to hay, etc., when landowners don't allow hunting.

Ariel hunting for coyotes in east river, buck whitetail hunting should be banned for 2 years to lower the dose population across the whole state

Keep WDS's doing all damage control. Not just trapping. Keep them involved with surveys and wildlife management and season recommendations.

If farmers and ranchers want these animals controlled, then they need to allow hunter permission to hunt their land.

not enough "critters" anymore to do damage.

Take the hunting season off mountain lions and make them open season.

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q24 of the General Public Survey

We have an abundance of pronghorn and people looking to hunt them but the draw statistics for out of state hunters is way too low to help us make an impact. Prairie dogs are the other nuisance eating crops we are dealing with. I would like to see assistance from wildlife management in helping control the prairie dog population.

What about a water survey? We have too much.

Elk are a big problem and are heavily damaging our crops like alfalfa and millet and our fences. They've tried to control them by public hunting but unsuccessful. Our biggest problem is that the hunters want more elk and the few landowners having problems are terribly outnumbered.

at any given time during the winter of '19 we had over 200 deer in or around the farmyard.... they tried feeding them 1/2 mile away to keep them out of livestock feed with no success. bagged silage was torn open because of deer standing on top of bags, bags were impossible to seal back up.

If the agent in charge of a damage complaint says he will show up, then make sure he makes an effort to help fix the problem. everyone is busy if they are unable to do the job get someone else. Gov's bounty program sounds good give it a chance to work, has to help. Don't hinder the trapping community from trapping in this state, they are important to keeping wildlife in check.

There are compensated programs out there, but the compensation is so low it's not worth taking the Land out of production, it's better to take my chance and try to get a crop in those infected areas rather than take a knowingly reduction in cash flow.

Keep encouraging trapping to young kids. It can only help conservation and the kids will benefit from the experiences. Also, if anyone needs help taking out coyotes around western Minnehaha, I'd be happy to try and help (trapping).

I don't believe that on my land whitetail deer do much damage to the crops in the field. We actually have seen the numbers grow and have the proof on camera. Each year I receive my landowner's deer tag as a means of controlling the population by tagging a buck. As of last week, on my camera I have found 5-6 bucks on my property. Years ago, we used to have a high population of pheasants, now if I see one it is amazing. I will be trapping for raccoons this fall to see if I can thin them out, but my mother who lives on the farm says that the coyote numbers in the area have shot up. I think some depredation hunts in Yankton county would be a start.

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q24 of the General Public Survey

Take responsibility for the elk population. The creatures are devastating to ranchers who are attempting to make a living off of their land. Treat all ranchers the same. We talk. Don't give more assistance to who has the best whine story. The financial assistance is a joke. Go try to buy replacement feed for \$400. Offer licenses to people who can actually shoot, not the wives who have never seen a gun. The folks who have never seen a gun before don't help reduce the population. Build stack yards for ranchers. Not offer minimal assistance for them. Once again, consistency is key. The amount of money costing the ranchers is overwhelming. The cost of barbed wire replacement, the feed that is consumed by the elk is unbelievable. Have a South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks follow the footsteps of a rancher to see the man hours it takes to clean up after elk. Should not be a burden. Change the selection process for giving out landowner tags. It is a complete joke as well!!!

Taking coyotes by plane seems to be very effective. Landowners Giving permission for GFP or another agency to do occasional fly overs is a great way to manage them. Need to give plenty of public notice it is an available program.

I farm for the wildlife so I can hunt them. The coyotes, skunks, and predators like that are getting out of control. I think the traps I received helped and I think the bounty helped. There has to be enough money in it for the trappers to break even on so they will keep coming around to trap the predators.

Would like to get more information as a landowner/operator to improve wildlife habitat

Give out too many deer tags and go back to the old draw system

I would to see a resource for landowners who want to have big game animals' winter on their property, instead where they are not welcome. Wildlife would be very welcome on my property as a wintering ground.

We have virtually no wildlife management staff presence in our area. Hunting is out of control and unsafe, so farmers hesitate to allow hunters. Most farmers encourage hunters and trappers to help control wildlife if it is done safely and legally

Let hunters take care of the problem, they will pay to fix the problem

need to give landowners depredation tags when numbers get too high. Control the numbers of deer and coyotes in the Adams nature area.

The bounty program helps

I believe it was ill advised to take away the use of rifles for turkey hunting in Charles Mix County. These birds are over abundant, and shotguns make little impact on their numbers.

I liked the State program that paid \$10 per tail. Need more money for next year,

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q24 of the General Public Survey

Need to open Turkey hunting in Walworth and Corson. In Walworth on my land I have about one hundred. In Corson where I run cows there has to be thousands

I love SD and all its various wildlife.

Leave our wildlife alone for a healthy ecosystem.

I believe there is too much depredation hunts on big game animals. As a hunter and farmer, I will gladly take damage on my crops to feed the animals for a better population.

Elk have been a huge issue in my area for several years, they tear up bales and take out a lot of fence in very hard to get to areas. There isn't a season in my area for them. I have requested and have been told not enough damage has been reported. The person that told me that I suggested to let's go look at some fence I was told fence damage doesn't count.

Whitetail deer licenses in McPherson County should be shall issue to whoever wants to help reduce the population. Same with geese. The predator trapping and bounty program is ridiculous, a waste of money, against species diversity, and should be ended immediately.

I lost about 7 alfalfa bails last year to deer. I was fine with it not seeing them starve, but kind of expensive.

One thing is that I think that we need transferable landowner tags as some species I don't care to harvest however I have nonresident friends that would love to harvest an antelope, but they can't draw a tag in my unit. Even though I have plenty of antelope on my property. I am not going to let anyone that is not a personal friend or family hunt them anyways, but my friends and Family have to put in for several years to get a tag, I can get a tag every year but would like to be able to allow my friends and Family to harvest the animal, as we don't have any need for Antelope meat when we can eat beef. So, I would suggest that the landowners get the allotted tags for their land only and they are transferable to a different name that would need to be specified, when applying for the tag so the actual hunter appears on the license.

The GFP does a good job with landowners and I appreciate their efforts.

Bounty program great process to educate and stimulate the reduction of nest predators, I have done this for 20+ years and always have great pheasant hatches, and best hunting possible. Would love to see it continue

I think the predator control district of Perkins county should be abolished. One solution would be to only have the people who request help from a plane pay the bill or go off of the numbers people report to the FSA office when there is a disaster payment. I only run cattle and don't need help from someone else to control coyotes. Or protect my cattle from coyotes. Therefore, I should not be subjected to pay a tax so that others can get their sheep protected from coyotes. I would love this message to reach Kristi Noem's

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q24 of the General Public Survey

desk.
I loved the \$10 for tails. Hope you do next year
As a rancher I see in my area that 4 ranchers control the outcome of habitat. They want them all gone but also use the funding. They want the funding and also controlling the elk habitat.
We lost poultry two years in a row. The 2nd year we contacted GFP depredation out of Spearfish. They said they would come put up game cameras, but no one ever showed up. We hung our own cameras but have only caught eyes and ears so no way to tell what animal it was. We suspect a fox or coyote. It's hard to trap when you don't know what you are trying to catch which is why we reached out.
The trapping division needs an overhaul....
I think GFP should get more landowners to open their lands without fees to Hunters and Trappers as they are the ones that already pay the majority of the depredation fees and will help remove a lot of these nuisance animals. Hunters have helped me by bringing down the populations of nuisance whitetails, coyotes and turkeys in the past.
I enjoy having wildlife on my property.
I had the state trapper come in to take care of the coyote problem, he set traps and never came back to check them or pick them up, poor management
The traps for controlling predators was a good program but it should go for a few years and I think it would make a huge impact on the pheasant population. Also gave my grandchildren an opportunity to trap and make some money. They loved it.

Appendix D: 2017 & 2018 WDM Service Recipient Responses

Service Recipient Assessment

- We cross-referenced 3050 names and addresses of service recipients provided by SDGFP with Exact Data commercial email addresses and matched 766. Of these, 32 were returned as invalid.
- We surveyed these 734 South Dakota service recipients with an email solicitation resulting in 100 total responses (13.6%).
- We surveyed all 3,050 physical addresses provided by SDGFP of South Dakota service recipients with a postcard mailer, with 150 returned as undeliverable, resulting in 126 total responses (4.3%)

Q1: Do you currently own or lease land in the state of South Dakota? (Same Q on other surveys)

- 226 responses.
- 93.4% (211) of respondents indicated “Yes”
- 6.6% (15) of respondents indicated “No”

Q2: Are you currently an agricultural producer in the state of South Dakota? (Same Q on other surveys)

- 212 respondents answered this question, and 14 skipped it.
- 84.4% (179) of respondents indicated “Yes”
- 15.6% (33) of respondents indicated “No”

Table 1. How would you describe your agricultural operation? (Q3) (Same Q on other surveys)

Type of Operation	Percent	N
Exclusively farming	29.8%	53
Mostly farming with some ranching	15.2%	27
Farming and ranching are equal	23.0%	41
Mostly ranching with some farming	20.8%	37
Exclusively ranching	9.6%	17
Other (please specify)	1.7%	3
Total responding*	100%	178
* 48 respondents skipped this question.		

Table 2. How many acres do you own or lease in South Dakota? (Q4) (Same Q on other surveys)

Acres	Percent	N
Less than 20 acres	6.7%	14
21-159 acres	6.2%	13
160-320 acres	9.6%	20
321-640 acres	10.5%	22
641-1280 acres	18.7%	39
1281-3840 acres	25.8%	54
3841 or more acres	22.5%	47
Total responding*	100%	209
* 17 respondents skipped this question.		

Table 3. In what county do you primarily own or lease land in the state of South Dakota? (Q5) (Same Q on other surveys)

Location of Land	Percent	N
Region 1	18.7%	39
Region 2	16.7%	35
Region 3	27.3%	57
Region 4	37.3%	78
Total*	100.0%	209
* 17 respondents skipped this question.		

Table 4. In what other counties do you own or lease land in the state of South Dakota? (Q6) (Same Q on other surveys)

Location of Land	Percent	N
Region 1	21.5%	23
Region 2	16.8%	18
Region 3	25.2%	27
Region 4	36.4%	39
Total*	100%	107

* 84 respondents answered this question and 142 skipped it.

Table 6. Was this wildlife-associated damage a new or recurring problem? (Q7) – (Cross reference to Q9 on other surveys)

Response	Percent	N
New problem	18.8%	37
Recurring problem this year	9.1%	18
Recurring problem over last 2-4 years	15.2%	30
Recurring problem for 5 years or more	56.9%	112
Total responding*	100%	197

* 29 respondents skipped this question.

Q8: Did you have any difficulty contacting a South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks employee concerning this problem? (Cross reference to Q11 on other surveys).

- 195 respondents answered this questions, and 31 respondents skipped it.

- 6.1% (12) of respondents indicated “Yes”
- 93.9% (183) of respondents indicated “No”

**Table 7. In general, how would you describe your interaction with the South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks employee concerning this wildlife problem? (Please provide a rating for all attributes) (Q9)
(Cross reference to Q12 on other surveys)**

Response	Poor		Fair		Average		Good		Excellent	
	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N
Fairness	3.1%	6	2.1%	4	11.8%	23	32.8%	64	50.3%	98
Professional	1.0%	2	4.1%	8	7.2%	14	29.2%	57	58.5%	114
Responsive	5.1%	10	4.1%	8	9.7%	19	26.7%	52	54.4%	106
Courteous	1.5%	3	2.1%	4	7.2%	14	26.2%	51	63.1%	123
Positive attitude	1.5%	3	4.6%	9	7.2%	14	26.2%	51	60.5%	118
* 195 respondents answered this question, and 31 respondents skipped it.										

Table 8. How would you rate the effectiveness of the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks in addressing your wildlife damage complaint? (Q10) (Cross reference with Q13 on other surveys)

Response	Percent	N
Extremely effective	22.7%	44
Very effective	29.9%	58
Somewhat effective	34.0%	66
Not so effective	6.7%	13
Not at all effective	6.7%	13
Total responding*	100%	194

* 32 respondents skipped this question.

Table 9. Which species were responsible for wildlife damage that caused you to request the services of the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks Wildlife Damage Management Program? (Q11) (Cross reference with Q14 in other surveys)

Wildlife species	Number of producers that listed each species	Percent
White-tailed deer	64	33.2%
Coyotes	61	31.6%
Beavers	47	24.4%
Geese	46	23.8%
Raccoons	22	11.4%
Skunks/mink/other small mammals	15	7.8%
Mule deer	8	4.2%
Turkeys	7	3.6%
Pheasants	4	2.1%
Elk	4	2.1%
Foxes (red, gray, swift)	3	1.6%
Blackbirds/starlings	3	1.6%
Pronghorns	2	1.0%
Wolves	2	1.0%
Ducks	1	0.5%
Mountain lions	1	0.5%
Grouse	0	0.0%

Sandhill cranes	0	0.0%
Black bears	0	0.0%
Total cases reported by 193 respondents*	290	
* 33 respondents skipped this question.		

Table 10. What was the estimated economic impact to the wildlife-associated damage that you experienced during the past two years (2017-2018)? (Q12) (Cross reference with Q15 in other surveys)

Species	\$1,000 or less		\$1,001 to \$4,999		\$5,000 to \$9,999		\$10,000 or greater		Total
	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	
Pheasants	50.0%	2	0.0%	0	50.0%	2	0.0%	0	4
Grouse	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Ducks	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1
Geese	37.0%	17	43.5%	20	13.0%	6	6.5%	3	46
Sandhill cranes	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Turkeys	57.1%	4	42.9%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	7
Elk	50.0%	2	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	4
Mule deer	12.5%	1	37.5%	3	37.5%	3	12.5%	1	8
White-tailed deer	25.0%	16	42.2%	27	18.8%	12	14.1%	9	64
Pronghorns	0.0%	0	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2
Coyotes	57.4%	35	29.5%	18	13.1%	8	0.0%	0	61
Wolves	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2
Mountain lions	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1

Black bears	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Bobcats	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Foxes (red, gray, swift)	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	0.0%	0	3
Raccoons	54.6%	12	40.9%	9	4.6%	1	0.0%	0	22
Beavers	66.0%	31	27.7%	13	6.4%	3	0.0%	0	47
Skunks/mink/other small mammals	66.7%	10	26.7%	4	0.0%	0	6.7%	1	15
Blackbirds/starlings	33.3%	1	0.0%	0	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	3
Total responses*	46.9%	136	34.8%	101	12.8%	37	5.5%	16	290
* 193 respondents answered this question, and 33 skipped it.									

Table 11. How would you rate the information provided by the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks? (Q14) (Cross reference with Q17 on other surveys)

Response	Percent	N
More than adequate	24.5%	47
Adequate	56.8%	109
Less than adequate	10.9%	21
No opinion	7.8%	15
Total responding*	100%	192
* 34 respondents skipped this question.		

Table 12. How would you rate the services provided by the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks? (Q15) (Cross reference with Q19 on other surveys)

Response	Percent	N
More than adequate	27.1%	52
Adequate	51.6%	99
Less than adequate	15.6%	30
No opinion	5.7%	11
Total responding*	100%	192
* 34 respondents skipped this question.		

Table 13. What type of services were provided to you by the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks? (Q13) (Cross reference with Q20 on other surveys)

Types of services provided	Percent	N
Lethal removal of nuisance animal(s)	57.8%	111
Alteration of the habitat to discourage nuisance animal(s)	2.6%	5
Exclusion of nuisance animal(s) with fencing or other methods	27.6%	53
Deterring nuisance animal(s) with noise, visual, or chemical methods	9.9%	19
Other (please specify)	21.4%	41
Total responding*	100%	192
* 34 respondents skipped this question.		

Table 14. In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the information and/or services of the Wildlife Damage Management Program offered by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks? (Q16) (Cross reference with Q21 on the other surveys)

Response	Percent	N
Very satisfied	32.8%	63
Satisfied	37.0%	71
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	14.1%	27
Dissatisfied	9.9%	19
Very dissatisfied	6.3%	12
Total responding*	100%	192
* 34 respondents skipped this question.		

Table 15. For the following species, please indicate your assessment of their abundance on your land. (Q17) (Cross reference with Q22 on other surveys)

Species	Much lower than desired (+2)		Slightly lower than desired (+1)		About the right amount (0)		Slightly higher than desired (-1)		Much higher than desired (-2)		Favorability*
	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Raccoons	0.56%	1	0.56%	1	12.99%	23	36.72%	65	45.76%	81	-25.3%
Coyotes	1.10%	2	0.55%	1	12.15%	22	33.15%	60	48.07%	87	-25.3%
Skunks/mink/other small mammals	0.00%	0	0.57%	1	31.03%	54	32.18%	56	33.91%	59	-19.9%
Blackbirds/starlings	1.18%	2	0.59%	1	33.73%	57	28.99%	49	24.26%	41	-14.9%
Beavers	1.18%	2	1.76%	3	15.29%	26	19.41%	33	28.24%	48	-14.4%
White-tailed deer	2.75%	5	9.89%	18	35.16%	64	23.08%	42	26.92%	49	-12.3%
Geese	6.82%	12	3.41%	6	35.23%	62	17.05%	30	23.30%	41	-9.3%
Mountain lions	1.79%	3	0.00%	0	8.93%	15	5.95%	10	4.17%	7	-2.1%
Turkeys	5.85%	10	5.26%	9	23.98%	41	9.36%	16	8.19%	14	-1.8%
Wolves	0.61%	1	0.61%	1	1.22%	2	1.83%	3	2.44%	4	-1.0%
Pronghorns	1.80%	3	1.80%	3	12.57%	21	2.40%	4	2.40%	4	-0.4%
Elk	1.81%	3	0.00%	0	4.22%	7	0.60%	1	1.81%	3	-0.1%

Black bears	0.60%	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.2%
Sandhill cranes	1.20%	2	1.81%	3	15.66%	26	1.20%	2	0.60%	1	0.4%
Bobcats	3.64%	6	2.42%	4	15.15%	25	0.00%	0	0.61%	1	1.7%
Mule deer	7.32%	12	5.49%	9	15.24%	25	2.44%	4	3.05%	5	2.3%
Ducks	11.43%	20	5.71%	10	58.86%	103	9.14%	16	2.29%	4	3.0%
Foxes (red, gray, swift)	14.12%	24	12.94%	22	37.65%	64	11.18%	19	2.94%	5	4.8%
Grouse	16.07%	27	10.12%	17	16.67%	28	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	8.5%
Pheasants	37.99%	68	23.46%	42	25.70%	46	3.35%	6	0.56%	1	19.0%
<p>* Favorability was calculated by averaging the weighted categorical percentages (+2, +1, 0, -1, -2). Negative favorability generally indicates the species is not desired by agricultural producers, while positive favorability generally indicates that the species is desired by agricultural producers. 191 respondents answered this question, and 35 respondents skipped it.</p>											

Table 16. In the previous question (Q17), you indicated that there are more of these species than desired on your property. What do you think is the best way to address these over-abundant species? (Q18) (Cross reference with Q23 on other surveys)

Species*	Control by recreational hunters or trappers		Control by WDM personnel		Control by private landowners		Control by predator control district		Don't know/No opinion		Total
	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	N
Raccoons	38.36%	56	10.27%	15	40.41%	59	4.11%	6	6.85%	10	146
Coyotes	29.93%	44	29.93%	44	21.77%	32	10.88%	16	7.48%	11	147
Skunks/mink/other small mammals	34.78%	40	10.43%	12	42.61%	49	1.74%	2	10.43%	12	115
Blackbirds/starlings	14.44%	13	15.56%	14	33.33%	30	1.11%	1	35.56%	32	90
Beavers	17.28%	14	59.26%	48	14.81%	12	2.47%	2	6.17%	5	81
White-tailed deer	47.25%	43	9.89%	9	36.26%	33	0.00%	0	6.59%	6	91
Geese	40.85%	29	12.68%	9	29.58%	21	0.00%	0	16.90%	12	71
Mountain lions	29.41%	5	29.41%	5	23.53%	4	5.88%	1	11.76%	2	17
Turkeys	36.67%	11	20.00%	6	33.33%	10	0.00%	0	10.00%	3	30
Wolves	14.29%	1	57.14%	4	14.29%	1	14.29%	1	0.00%	0	7
Pronghorns	37.50%	3	0.00%	0	50.00%	4	0.00%	0	12.50%	1	8
Elk	25.00%	1	0.00%	0	75.00%	3	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	4

Black bears	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
Sandhill cranes	33.33%	1	0.00%	0	33.33%	1	0.00%	0	33.33%	1	3
Bobcats	100.00%	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	1
Mule deer	33.33%	3	11.11%	1	55.56%	5	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	9
Ducks	45.00%	9	0.00%	0	25.00%	5	0.00%	0	30.00%	6	20
Foxes (red, gray, swift)	37.50%	9	25.00%	6	20.83%	5	16.67%	4	0.00%	0	24
Grouse	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0
Pheasants	14.29%	1	28.57%	2	42.86%	3	0.00%	0	14.29%	1	7
* Species are rank ordered based on the Desirability score assigned in Table 15. 185 respondents answered this question, and 41 respondents skipped it.											

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q19 of the Service Recipient Survey
<p>Truly am happy with our outcome. We were outnumbered, and the yotes were getting very bold. Would feel better if we had a local GFP Trapper stationed here again. We would have on the spot attention when needed, as these animals are in our back yard. Truly, would like to see more ADC Trapper positions added to the GFP program again. This administration seems to talk as though it is a possibility to spend money more effectively in places it is needed. GFP wildlife division has the funds, from self-funding sales of licenses and other fund-raising opportunities available to their uniquely operated agency--spend the money where it is needed please...and add employees outside of Pierre. Thank you for the opportunity to share my opinion. Very satisfied with the coyote control issue here.</p>
<p>the fence they wanted me to put up didn't cover all the hay yards. So, I refused it. They come in during winter months and not during hunting season.</p>
<p>GFP in my opinion is controlled by sportsman groups. they are not landowner friendly. reluctant to address trespass and wildlife damage. Have made goose damage a news talking point to get federal money. they have lost sight of their mission statement. Public waters perfect example call legislature back in summer to open lakes so they can boat and fish. looks to me recreation has more priority than important issues in sd. would be sad to think this survey would be used to get SD tax dollars to fund gf and p. If they should focus on wildlife management and controlling weeds on public land and law enforcement not sportsman's welfare.</p>
<p>so far have only had one really bad experience with a lion, but it raised hell with calves and a horse several years ago, then apparently moved on.</p>
<p>Butte county along the river has long had issues with wildlife overpopulation. While we have received enough fencing to protect about half our crops the best answer I can ever get out of my local contacts is a depredation hunt. In our experience they are not nearly as effective as raising the number of tags available instead of cutting them as we have seen. By far the best control we have had on the deer is a bout with blue tongue every 5 years</p>

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q19 of the Service Recipient Survey
I really appreciated the help in getting rid of the skunks from under my grain bin. Not only did we get rid of them, but I learned how to do the control myself if it happens again.
Very impressed by responsiveness and professionalism when I know they are super busy. Really nice guys.
The state trapper has to cover too much area and therefore is not efficient!
We are so fortunate to have a great wildlife agents to work with. They go above and beyond and we are so grateful.
Would like to see less coyotes. They removed a lot last year through a trapper in neighboring area and that helped
Need info on hay lot fences, nobody followed through with getting info to me about cost, how to sign up
It is a good program as far as predator control and has improved in recent years. There needs to be more done to compensate landowners for deer depredation on hay yards during harsh winters. In 2019 there will be more hay and feed stored than any other year and if we receive another harsh winter this hay will be at risk of some loss to wildlife. Also, I'm quite sure that there is not enough fencing available to adequately address the issue.
Pay for crop damage.
The GFP people try their best and do a good job with the resources they are given but it is still way too little help. The other problem is the management for these species so as to have so many to hunt that it is easy to hunt them but then there is too big of a population that causes troubles. It is also a very costly thing for individual farmers that end up bearing the cost in the end and it is not distributed evenly in all areas. The populations need to be lowered and the state needs to provide more help for not just bean crops but also corn and other crops and feed.
We know that they are doing what they can, and we appreciate all the work they do. Thank you.

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q19 of the Service Recipient Survey
<p>Overall, I think the SDGFP does a good job addressing animal damage issues. If there is one place I believe they need to be more pro-active in it would like to see an even more aggressive pursuit of controlling the coyote issue. The sheep men as well as cattlemen are tired of feeding the coyotes. The financial impact is very big.</p>
<p>The predator control district in our area is a joke in my opinion. When I had sheep, I was and officer...we purchased equipment for the state trapper in the area, [REDACTED] to use...not sure IF it ever did, it didn't on my problems! And our main problem was in our cow herd. We calve later and there are numerous problem coyotes around here that the state trapper doesn't seem to want to do anything about, sheep problems seem to be first too. Baby calves are way more valuable than sheep! Yes, I have sold my sheep, and one of the reasons was the coyote thing, but the cows stay, and I guess we are going to have to do our own coyote control more than depending on the state trapper! Maybe I need more information on the damage control program, because the route I have taken with the state trapper is no good.</p>
<p>coyotes are our main problem and it is getting worse. fox and mountain lions not as much, fox early in the spring when the lambs are small. the coyotes are forcing sheep owners out of business. I am pleased with our trapper and very happy with the plane, both respond as quickly as they can. If they could come once a week, we might keep them under control (spring and summer) but they have a large area to cover and can't get here that often. It is our lively hood and of course a lot of other factors cause us death loss. I am afraid if it isn't kept under control, we will lose calves also. Some of our neighbors already have that problem.</p>
<p>Program offered by SDGF&P is adequate along with the federal plane, which is a life saver. Working together they are very effective.</p>
<p>Program assistance is certainly appreciated, but control is far from adequate and monetary damage continues to be significant, especially from Canada geese.</p>

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q19 of the Service Recipient Survey
Instead of wasting time and money and resources to poison the prairie dogs, there needs to be follow up poisoning to make sure that there is a good kill on them. Just coming out once to poison still leaves over 50% of them around. Then they breed and move, and we have a bigger problem. Coyotes are the same way. To many out in our area that are killing baby calves, so in the early spring before calving season would be the best time to kill them.
Coyotes can affect both cattle, goat and sheep operators. Perhaps the State knows who produces what. If not, contact could still be made with livestock landowners as a type of Public Relations tell of their services. In my case, where I had made contact with SD G&F Wildlife Damage; perhaps a follow-up would be appropriate as you they have my information.
Include coyotes in the pelt reward system to get the traps It's a win-win. The pelts are not worth enough otherwise to give anyone incentive. Coyotes kill our baby calves frequently
What happened to all the songbirds? It seems like a lot of them nest here and when the young grow up, they are gone. We used to have birds here all summer long and now for the latter part of summer we hardly have any.
Keep WDS's involved in all management and season recommendations.
Please strongly encourage Forest Service/BLM to work with state to control the prairie dog population explosion.
Make furs worth more money for an incentive for them to trap.
please reference what prompted survey. had to contact GFP to see what precipitated survey.
I believe Gov. Noem's pheasant predator control program implemented in 2019 was a waste of our state taxpayer money and the GF&P's already scarce resources.
There is no response for pheasants either through the state or Pheasants Forever. As a non-native species, the damage is not something I should have to put up with. No one came out to look at the corn nor my yield maps. On a side note, I've been very satisfied with the response on geese and beavers. Great to work with on those animals.

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q19 of the Service Recipient Survey
Increase flying for coyotes by experienced fliers and gunners. Fly in winter when snow is deep, and chance of coyotes is greater. Add bounty program for coyotes. Continue bounty program on small mammals. Coyotes need to be controlled. They kill calves, sheep, goats, and pheasant hens when they are nesting. Trappers are spread too thin and spend too much time doing non-trapping activities. Need to hire experienced trappers and more of them.
Offer a great deal more white-tail deer licenses for Meade / Pennington county. Landowner licenses should be free up to five and processing fees waived if meat donated to food banks.
Whitetail deer are not a problem during most of the year. But during late winter they group up in certain areas and this is when they cause damage to private land. GF and P should take a more proactive approach to this problem.
We appreciate the help when dealing with destructive animals like beavers
It seems that when I hear coyotes on my farm that there is never an urgency to remove them until there is a calf kill. That is too late to act in my opinion. WDMP should work hard to remove coyotes before there is a kill. The aerial predator control plane is never available for me when the snow is on the ground and when hunting coyotes is much easier without the cover
I am not sure why our township was included in this survey, I/we believe it had something to do with the Governors initiative for removing predators that affect pheasant nesting. The letter did not state what our animal complaint was or how they helped us. Further info would be helpful.
I don't hunt but enjoy seeing pheasant but to many deer and geese for sure
Wildlife personnel are very helpful but to limited when there is a real problem. Pheasants are being decimated by the plague of raccoons. Our largest problem are whitetail they are a huge problem we are having to change farming practices based on the devastation they are causing with hay and especially corn. This problem needs more leniency on controls or more freedom for wildlife personnel to address it when it occurs. Farming is a great life with obviously many challenges, but this is an unnecessary problem that needs to be addressed. We love having the wildlife but not the unmanageable population we have now

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q19 of the Service Recipient Survey
Coyotes are the biggest problem. They can be heard frequently and will definitely come around with a carcass handy. Rendering services are very slow, so have resorted to covering the carcass with dirt. When it is calving time, it is a concern with young calves and cow cleanings available.
new program where they gave out traps and paid per tail was I think a good idea. would like to see the bounty per tail again next year.
I appreciate GF&P's coming out and putting up a fence to try to keep the damage to a minimum, but my biggest gripe is the fact that when the fence needs to come down or when GF&P needs to access the field. These interns don't have enough common sense to stay off of the crop. Every year they pull in with these 4 wheelers or side by sides and drive down the outside two rows of beans when all that they would have to do is cross the fence and drive on the inside of the beans where the water has receded. But no, they don't seem to be intelligent enough to do that, so they drive on the beans. Makes no sense!
South Dakota GF&P does a good job of developing good hunter and landowner relationships.
[REDACTED] trapped the beavers off our property. This is great service provided by the state and I hope it is continued.
Fast service and great guys. All good.
Coyotes are far too prolific for landowners to adequately control. For that reason, I very much appreciate the help from the wildlife Damage Management Program. The aerial hunting is far more productive and needed coupled with landowner-based controls.
The nest predator bounty program was exactly what we needed. Hope it continues but add cat tails
Have lived and hunted my land and rented land for over 50 years and I have as good or better habitat but between coyotes and hawks which visually take pheasants while I'm cutting alfalfa and hay and we were wonder why the numbers are down. At times there are 6 to 10 hawks circling my fields at on time. Not habitat its predators

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q19 of the Service Recipient Survey
I think her should be more whitetail licenses in Potter County. We need to figure out a way to harvest more does. We have a lot of damage in the summer on our corn and flower fields and during bad winters they move in on the hay yards
When trees are destroyed by beaver on state land, normal lake drainage outlets are dammed, lake levels are causing major shore damage on private and abutting state lands, it seems that the DGFP personnel should open their eyes a bit and address the problem. In my opinion DGFP need to actually manage by action rather than by printed hype. For example, if DGFP can't see problems, perhaps they should request volunteer assistance from local residents to report problems. A short email of action taken is all a volunteer usually desires. Volunteers are usually willing to assist in curing problems if requested.
<div data-bbox="152 747 217 785" style="background-color: black; width: 40px; height: 18px; display: inline-block;"></div> tried to be very helpful with a problem of a young buck that had a very persistent attraction to your dog and the dog to him. The buck got our dog to run with him, but our dog would herd the buck back to the farm at night and they would sleep together in the machine shed or the cattle shed. (This is not a made-up story! Our dog's name is Barkley and the buck our neighbors called Buckley when they would see them together.)
The geese are the main problem encountered on this land
The coyote population is really high. We are spending a lot money hunting them from a plane in our area. Maybe thinning the numbers down during the winter with snowmobile hunts would be more aggressive to control numbers and they wouldn't even need to be paid other than keeping the pelt and the satisfaction of better control.
Very responsive on coyote control. Very helpful! Very much appreciated. Overpopulation of deer if an ongoing problem. Our out-of-state deer hunters have been unable to draw licenses the past 2 years.
You're doing a fine Job!!!!
In this part of world grain farming have clear the land of trees and winter protection. If you want the resources, then you have to feed the resources from fall to spring. Then harvest it down to a right number. Listen to the landowners they have bankers to answer to on the cost of lost hay,

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q19 of the Service Recipient Survey
corn silage.
I think the bounty program is a good thing. Raccoons are a big nuisance!
need to list what the people say, not just surveys, get out to the farmers, not just set at the desk, make contact, see it all the time, way less administration personal.
A very good program. I would like to be more involved if possible.
Continue with the spring season of Canada geese. It helps! Some years are worse than others but allow the landowners some ability to control not eradicate. We don't want them wiped out. They are a part of our ecosystem and help our communities in the fall with the people they bring into them. Thank you for asking our opinion.
The overabundance of these animals by the game, fish and parks is violating personal property rights of the landowner. The landowner's hands are tied in dealing with the overabundance of these animals and the damage they cause. Also, depredation programs are too little too late. The game and fish response to these problems is very inadequate. There is very little appreciation shown by the game, fish and parks to the landowners for taking care of the state's livestock. Also, no accountability to the private landowner is demonstrated by the game, fish and parks of South Dakota.
Encourage hunters by keeping license fees affordable, encourage landowners to open land to non-fee usage to courteous hunters. Keep special goose license available to landowners. Program seems to work if owner takes time to get after geese early on. Sounds like trap program worked well although I haven't received mine yet. Keep big game herds in check.
When I had a bad coyote problem last time, I was very happy with [REDACTED] eradication of them. It's my understanding that currently he lost traps to a neighbor mowing the ditch and I'm waiting yet for these dirty coyotes that even show up I the daytime to be eradicated. They come when the wife is home and she doesn't shoot.

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q19 of the Service Recipient Survey
Deer are the most serious problem. Have seen 11 at once in our yard and they come near the house and eat shrubs and fruit trees and garden. Love to have hunters take them. Need licenses.
█ was excellent. Satisfied until the college kids ran over beans to remove the fence. Still better with the fence though. Best cure is I planted buff strip grass
Less deer tags. Populations are still too low. Go back to old draw system. New one is a joke
Doing a great job for us always answers calls and is very helpful
Please give out more deer licenses. We are seeing does with twins and even triplets! We have hundreds of them in the winter. Some starve to death or make messes in hay fences.
Let hunters from other states come in and kill the damn birds and deer.
We have excessive amounts of wildlife on our properties. Generally, we welcome them, but it is difficult to get trees to grow and they damage huge amounts of our crops.
Allow me more than one deer license. And why do I have to pay for license, when I pay for all damage. I count 60 to 100 deer on my 80 acres. Way too many. If nature preserve causes the problem, time to take control of problem.

Table 17. Additional comments provided for Q19 of the Service Recipient Survey

I am a third-generation sheep producer of Harding County, South Dakota having seen the animal damage program in this state vary from good to terrible. The livestock sector was forever changed in 1972 when President Nixon signed an executive order banning the use of toxicides for predator control. Within months predator control districts were organized in order to fund a method to control livestock losses from predators. The predator districts worked in cooperation with US Dept of Interior wildlife services until the mid to late 1970's when animal damage was transferred from US Dept. of Interior to US Dept. of Agriculture APHIS. My recollection was a good deal of conversation among sheep producers to stay with the Federal administered program or work with a State operated program. The State administered program was favored being more likely to respond to issues than a Federal program. Sheep producers seen a well operated program for decade and a half then the political winds shifted, and state agency administrators seemed to focus on preservation of predators instead of controlling them. The predator's districts were relied on heavily to diminish livestock losses. The last decade has seen a reversal in attitude from South Dakota Game Fish and Parks with an Animal Damage Program has been the best seen in years. The administrative staff is cooperative with livestock producers expanding resources and funding allowing more trappers in the field. I have heard the comment coyote losses are the largest reason the sheep industry has been declining. That certainly is one factor but not the only reason. The 1940's seen the record number of sheep at 56 million head and today a bit above 6 million. South Dakota numbers at 255,000 head. This decline is a result of attitude of producers switching operations from sheep to cattle, the repeal of the National Wool Act in 1995 that provided assistance to sheep producers also the loss of Mandatory Price Reporting in October of 2004. In January of 2012 the price for feeder lambs being two dollars per pound by September that market dropped to eighty-five cents per pound. Markets changes that fast drove a lot of producers out of the business. To finalize this, I think the South Dakota Game Fish and Parks have a very good Animal Damage Program with professional people at the administrative level to the trappers in the field that provide the resources livestock producers can utilize. Respectfully yours, a Harding County Sheep Producer.

Appendix E: South Dakota RFP 1640

**State of South Dakota
Office of Procurement Management
523 East Capitol Avenue
Pierre, South Dakota 57501**

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

**Independent Review and Evaluation
South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks
Division of Wildlife's - Wildlife Damage Management Program**

RFP #1640 Buyer: Jason Simmons Email: Jason.Simmons@state.sd.us

Deadline for Submission of Proposals: March 31, 2019 – 11:59 PM CST

Read Carefully

Firm Name: _____ Authorized Signature: _____

Address: _____ Type or Print Name: _____

City/State: _____ Telephone #: _____

Zip: _____ Fax #: _____

Federal Tax ID#: _____ E-mail: _____

Primary Contact Information

Contact Name: _____ Telephone #: _____

E-mail: _____

Table of Contents

1.0	<u>Proposal Terms and Conditions</u>	1
2.0	<u>Standard Contract Terms and Conditions</u>	1
3.0	<u>Project Description</u>	1
3.1	<u>Background</u>	2
3.2	<u>Goals/Objectives</u>	2
3.3	<u>Scope of Components and Deliverables</u>	3
3.4	<u>Descriptions of Components and Phases</u>	4
3.4.1	<u>Demonstration and Oral Presentation</u>	4
3.4.2	<u>General</u>	5
3.4.3	<u>Multi-Vendor Proposals</u>	5
3.4.4	<u>Subcontract Services</u>	5
3.4.5	<u>Tasks</u>	5
3.4.5.1	<u>Implementation Plan and Schedule</u>	6
3.5	<u>Cost Submittal</u>	6
3.6	<u>Term of Contract</u>	6
4.0	<u>RFP Calendar of Events</u>	6
4.1	<u>Consultant Questions and Agency Replies</u>	7
5.0	<u>Resources</u>	7
5.1	<u>Project Staffing Roles</u>	7
6.0	<u>Format of Submission</u>	7
6.1	<u>Statement of Understanding of Project</u>	7
6.2	<u>Corporate Qualifications</u>	8
6.3	<u>Schedule</u>	8
6.4	<u>Proposal Amount</u>	8
6.5	<u>Team Organization</u>	9
6.6	<u>Delivery of Proposals</u>	9
7.0	<u>Proposal Evaluation Criteria</u>	9
8.0	<u>Appendix</u>	10
	<u>Appendix A – Included Proposal Terms and Conditions</u>	11
	<u>Appendix B – Included Contract Terms and Conditions</u>	14

1.0 Proposal Terms and Conditions

A consultant that submits a proposal implicitly agrees to established terms and conditions. These terms and conditions can be found in [Appendix "A"](#).

2.0 Standard Contract Terms and Conditions

Any contract or agreement resulting from this RFP will include the State's standard terms and conditions as listed in [Appendix "B"](#), along with any additional terms and conditions as negotiated by the parties.

3.0 Project Description

The State of South Dakota (hereafter referred to as the "State") seeks a Consultant/Contractor/Vendor to evaluate all components and services associated with the Department of Game, Fish and Parks (hereafter referred to as "GFP") – Division of Wildlife's - Wildlife Damage Management Program (hereafter referred to as "WDM program"). Such evaluation shall include any and all program services and program components related to predator damage control and management, prairie dog and other nuisance animal damage control and management (hereafter referred to as "ADC" program services and operations) and big game and waterfowl damage management (hereafter referred to as "Game Damage Management" program services and operations). The "WDM program" as used in this RFP is used to describe all of the services and associated program components that relate to the process of GFP delivering services and/or managing any form of wildlife damage caused to private property, including damage to livestock, crops, stored-feed supplies and hay

The evaluation conducted by the Consultant shall include an assessment of the effectiveness of all components of the WDM program, including WDM program services delivered to agricultural producers and other publics, an assessment of the effectiveness of the current administration and management of WDM program operations and delivery of services, an assessment of the organizational structure of the existing WDM program, including the effectiveness of program administration, supervision, budget management and program staffing. Further, the evaluation shall include an assessment of the effectiveness of the organizational structure of the WDM program, an assessment of the effectiveness of stakeholder communication associated with the WDM program and services, an assessment of program accountability and transparency, an assessment of agency policies and procedures and program guidelines with regard to their effectiveness in the management and administration of the WDM program and an assessment of the revenue and budget resources necessary to successfully sustain WDM program services as presently configured. In addition, the State seeks recommendations from the Consultant as to the need for any additional revenue and budget resources that may be necessary to sustain the current level of services or such revenue that may be necessary to support and provide additional or enhanced WDM program services into the future. As part of this evaluation, the Consultant shall identify the strengths and weaknesses of the current WDM program and services, including the strengths and weaknesses of existing policies, procedures, statutes and regulations, and program guidelines, the strengths and weaknesses of the current organizational structure and the strengths and weaknesses of current supervision and management and provide recommendations that may serve to improve the spectrum of current WDM program components and services and sustain their effectiveness into the future.

The State is also seeking recommendations from the Consultant that will help determine whether or not current WDM program staffing levels and the allocation of current budget resources is being done in the most effective and efficient manner possible and if not, determine options as to how these staff and budget resources could be better allocated or aligned for the purpose of delivering more effective WDM program services to the citizens of the State in the future.

3.1 Background, including Administrative and Management Authorities

Responsibility for management of predators and other animals that are injurious to livestock, poultry, game, land and the public health rests with the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks (GFP) and the Game, Fish and Parks Commission (GFP Commission) under SDCL 40-36-1, 40-36-9, 40-36-14, 41-2-18, 41-2-30 and other associated state statutes and authorities. While GFP has primary management responsibility for the delivery of WDM program services, the South Dakota Legislature, via SDCL 40-36-11, and the GFP Commission, via SDCL 41-2-34.2 and 41-6-66.1, are responsible for the assessment and collection of revenue for WDM program operations. GFP, working with the GFP Commission is responsible for the allocation of staff, budget allocation and delivery and oversight of WDM program services and operations. In accordance with SDCL 1-39-5, GFP and the GFP Commission are also responsible for regulating the harvest and management of the state's wildlife resources with the GFP Commission making final decisions with regard to the allocation of budgets for the Division of Wildlife and the management of various wildlife species, including those that at times cause damage to private property. In addition, the South Dakota Department of Agriculture (DOA), under SDCL 40-36-3, is also authorized to enter into agreements with other governmental agencies, counties, associations, corporations or individuals if such cooperation is necessary to promote the control and disposition of animals pursuant to SDCL 40-36-1. DOA has provided some funding for the management and control of prairie dogs that may encroach onto private lands from adjacent public lands via the authorities under SDCL 40-36-39.1 and the provisions of Chapter 38-22.

Responsibilities, authorities and requirements for both the GFP and the GFP Commission are described in SDCL Chapters 1-39 and 41-2. The GFP secretary is afforded responsibility to oversee the GFP Commission, via SDCL 1-39-5 and 41-2-1.2 and the GFP Commission is vested with quasi-judicial, quasi-legislative, advisory, other non-administrative and special budgetary functions as defined in SDCL 1-32-1. The GFP Commission utilizes the statutory process of rule promulgation established in SDCL Chapter 1-26 after receiving recommendations on the content of those rules from the GFP. The GFP Commission has latitude to adopt Department recommendations in part or in full and also has full latitude to develop and adopt such regulations without recommendation of the GFP. Following adoption by the GFP Commission and approval by the South Dakota Legislature's Interim Rules Review Committee, agency regulations are filed with the South Dakota Secretary of State and published in the Administrative Rules of South Dakota (ARSD) Article 41:06.

3.2 Goals/Objectives

Anticipated work to be performed by the Contractor includes a 10-year historical review of the comprehensive WDM program, including any program components related to the ADC program and operations and the Game Damage Management program and operations in South Dakota and should include:

- Examination of the history and evolution of the entire WDM program and associated services, including an historical perspective on the evolution of changes to the services provided by both programs that includes a review of annual or other program reports over the past 10 years
- Examination of the current organizational structure for the comprehensive WDM program, including a look back at the evolution of the various organizational structures of both the ADC and Game Damage Management programs, identifying the underlying purposes for the changes made to the organizational structures and the identification of both positive and negative outcomes of these changes with regard to the delivery of the spectrum of program services, the effectiveness of program management and the effective use of staffing and budget resources.
- Examination of budgets related to the comprehensive WDM Program, including both revenue sources and annual budgetary expenditures of various program services/components over the past 10 years

- Examination of public opinion surveys or similar-type surveys conducted to ascertain customer satisfaction with the services provided by the WDM program and any associated reports that may have been compiled from these surveys
- Examination of state statutes, regulations, policies and procedures that identify authorities and that outline responsibilities, requirements and which help direct and guide the delivery program services provided through the comprehensive WDM program
- Examination of program communication efforts, both internally and externally, including media reports, informational publications, formal or informal communication efforts with ag producers and sportsman's organizations, annual program reports, etc. that help promote awareness of WDM program services and which serve to demonstrate transparency and accountability on program outcomes and the effectiveness of program services
- Examination of the effectiveness of efforts made by GFP to establish and/or enhance communication, develop partnerships and otherwise engage and foster working relationships with groups or organizations to evaluate and subsequently enhance WDM program services (both ADC and Game Damage Management), including outreach made to local predator control districts, ag producer groups (including such groups as the SD Sheepgrowers Association, SD Farm Bureau, SD Stockgrowers Association, SD Farmer's Union, the SD Cattlemens Association, SD Ag Unity and others) or sportsman's groups, including the SD Wildlife Federation and the examination of other outreach or stakeholder engagement efforts undertaken to facilitate communication and foster effective working relationships with these groups in efforts to share information or review and improve WDM program services
- Examination of communication documents, meeting notes, recommendations, decisions or other communications resulting from the ADC Policy Advisory Committee Meetings over the past 10 years (SDCL 40-36-46)
- Interviews with GFP employees, supervisors, administrators, ag producers who received program services, GFP Commissioners, ADC Policy Advisory Committee members, and other stakeholders that may include: members of ag producer groups, members of sportsmen/women groups, legislators, members of county commissions, members of predator control districts, landowners, and other members of the public regarding their perceptions of the quality and availability of WDM program services in South Dakota
- Examination of WDM programs and services to determine if programs/services are meeting the needs of various customers

3.3 Scope of Components and Deliverables

The Consultant shall answer each of the following questions from the perspective of a general overview of the WDM program and how each question individually applies to the various components of the WDM program, including any program components related to the ADC program and operations and the Game Damage Management program and operations in South Dakota.

1. Does the current organizational, administrative and program management structure of the WDM program in South Dakota lend itself to the delivery of effective WDM program services that meet the needs of agricultural producers, other state citizens, and sportsmen/women?
2. Do field supervisors have sufficient experience, education, training and knowledge to effectively supervise all field operations and associated staff? If not, please identify several recommendations that would enhance field supervisors' ability to be more effective.

3. Are current budget revenue sources used to deliver WDM program services sufficient and are the sources of these revenues appropriate given the diversity of program management needs across GFP?
4. Do current staffing levels and budget allocations within the WDM program provide effective use of budget resources and man-power and efficient and effective delivery of WDM program services, considering the needs for the entire spectrum of WDM program services across the State?
5. Is GFP the appropriate agency to deliver WDM program services or are there other more effective and capable alternatives for delivering these services, given the constraints of current and projected future budget revenues.
6. Does GFP appropriately consider the potential for wildlife damage to private property in establishing wildlife harvest objectives, employing wildlife harvest strategies and employing other management regulations, tools and techniques to ensure various wildlife populations are effectively managed for all SD citizens? If not, what additional mechanisms, techniques or strategies could be employed to ensure wildlife populations are more effectively managed within landowner tolerance while at the same time meeting sportsmen's expectations for the availability of these resources for hunting or the public's expectations for wildlife viewing opportunities?
7. Is there sufficient opportunity for appropriate staff input at all levels of GFP to help ensure effective delivery of WDM program services? Do WDM program supervisors and administrators provide an appropriate level of supervision, oversight and review in making decisions regarding the allocation of staff and budget resources and the establishment of guidelines for the delivery of WDM program services?
8. Does GFP conduct effective communication, outreach and engagement with regard to the various constituents or recipients of WDM program services and other important stakeholders? If not, what changes could GFP make to more effectively engage stakeholders and improve the delivery of WDM program services?
9. Does GFP provide a sufficient level of transparency and accountability regarding WDM programs and services to constituents and stakeholders?

The Consultant shall provide the State a written report that details the results of their assessment, provides answers to the questions posed in this RFP and those that may arise through the course of the evaluation, and which identifies recommendations and/or conclusions of the Consultant. All recommendations formulated by the Consultant must conform to state constitutional and statutory authorities and directives and shall consider current budget resources and shall pose recommendations that are confined by reasonable project future budget revenues and bounded by responsible fiscal expenditures and staffing resources into the future. The report shall include documentation assembled by the Consultant through the various examinations conducted through this evaluation effort that will help justify and/or support the recommendations and conclusions reached by the Consultant.

3.4 Description of Components or Phases

To be evaluated, all proposals shall include the following clearly identified sections in the following sequence; include the tabbed inserts as indicated below:

3.4.1 Demonstration & Oral Presentation

The State intends to require the top scoring vendor or any portion of the top scoring vendors to participate in the oral presentations, before the evaluation committee and other authorized attendees as determined by the State. Vendors are expected to travel to Pierre, South Dakota, to conduct the live demonstration and oral presentation. Estimated dates for these presentations are listed in section 4.0 accompanying this RFP.

Any commitments made by the vendors during the oral presentation, if any, will be considered binding if accepted by State and shall be presented to the State in writing within seven (7) business days after their demonstration and oral presentation. Handouts of the presentation that are provided to the committee will be considered part of the RFP and treated as such.

3.4.2 General

For this section of your proposal, vendors are to provide a general overview of their approach. (Details will be requested throughout the various RFP sections.) The State will be looking for evidence of how your solution will help the State of South Dakota and the GFP to more effectively manage and deliver WDM program services.

Consultants are to describe and explain their capability to meet the requirements that are described in this RFP. If you are unable to perform any of the requirements or have additional suggestions or enhancements for meeting the State's goals, those should be included. These modifications are to be categorized and noted as not meeting the State's needs, or advantages of their recommendations to enhance the State's objectives and desires. If there are items for which your solution will not initially meet the requirements of this RFP, provide a time-line of when these items may be incorporated into the overall solution. (**NOTE:** Should there be an additional cost for these modifications, this is to be stated within the Cost portion of your proposal.)

Generally speaking, list the major areas of process customization you will require to meet the RFP specifications. Please outline the State's role in these matters.

Describe project start-up activities and roles of the State. Provide a high-level project schedule, with BRIEF descriptions of each step, keeping in mind that the details for these tasks will be requested later in this document.

3.4.3 Multi-Vendor Proposals

If the work product being proposed is comprised of products and services from more than one vendor/developer/contractor, indicate which piece of the solution each will be responsible for, who is the Proposer (eventual contractor), and how control will be delegated. Describe the activities and responsibilities of any and all subcontractors deemed necessary to accomplish the intended business objectives.

3.4.4 Subcontract Services

Please list all services that you will be subcontracting for as part of the proposed solution. Use the following format:

PRODUCT/ SERVICE		COMPANY	FUNCTION

1. Describe the methods, policies, and procedures that you have in place to handle quality control of any services listed above.

3.4.5 Tasks

Vendors are to supply a complete, detailed Project Plan identifying the Tasks identified in this section. Tasks are to reference all Requirements defined above. Clearly specify the anticipated dates in which the following Tasks would be implemented:

3.4.5.1 Implementation Plan and Schedule

A Calendar of Events should be provided that reflects the contractor's plan design, process, and implementation period after award and contract negotiation leading up to the estimated live implementation date. The RFP Calendar of Events has been arbitrarily organized regarding State activities with consideration given to workforce requirements throughout the review timeline. Requests for scheduling of reviews with Game, Fish and Parks personnel within the contract dates should be facilitated through the Division Director for GFP's Division of Wildlife. Project schedules will be evaluated with consideration for scheduling challenges. The vendor's schedule should reflect all the time needed for satisfactory design, development, reviews, and implementation.

The Proposer shall provide a project plan and implementation schedule incorporating all elements of the project and demonstrating how the project will be managed to completion while meeting the fundamental requirements. The schedule should be in the form of a chart, which clearly and simply reflects the responsibilities of the vendor and any and all subcontractors. The schedule should also reflect any dependencies or expectations that the vendor has of the GFP or others that may affect the project time line.

3.5 Cost Submittal

The cost submittal shall be placed in a separate sealed envelope within the sealed proposal and kept separate from the technical submittal. Failure to meet this requirement will result in automatic disqualification of the proposal. Section 6.5, Proposal Amount, Pricing Worksheet, Option A must be completed even if the vendor provides an alternative pricing methodology.

3.6 Term of Contract

The term of the contract will commence on the Effective Date (as defined below) and will end 180 days after the effective date of the contract. The Issuing Office shall fix the Effective Date after the contract has been fully executed by the contractor and by the State including all approvals required by the SD Office of Procurement.

4.0 RFP Calendar of Events

Listed below are the estimated dates and times of actions related to this RFP:

All times referenced in the calendar of events below are Central Standard Time / Central Day Light Time.

<u>Event</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>
Request for Proposals Announcement Date	March 1, 2019
Deadline for Consultant's Questions (5:00PM)	March 20, 2019
Questions Answered and Replies Sent (5:00PM)	March 27, 2019
Deadline for Submission of Proposals (5:00PM)	March 31, 2019
Evaluation of Proposals to Determine Short List	April 15, 2019
Consultant Presentations	May 1, 2019
Consultant Selection	May 13, 2019
Contract Negotiations / Potential Contract Start Date	June 1, 2019
Potential Contract End Date	120 days after contract start date

4.1 Consultant Questions and Agency Replies

All written questions should be emailed to Keith Fisk, at Keith.Fisk@state.sd.us.

Vendors may submit written or email questions concerning this RFP to obtain clarification of requirements. No questions will be accepted after the date and time indicated in the above calendar of events. Email questions to the email address listed above with the subject line "RFP SDGFP Wildlife Damage Management Program Evaluation". The questions and their answers will be sent to all vendors that received notice of the RFP and will be sent by the date and time indicated in the above calendar of events. Vendors shall not rely on any other statements, either of a written or oral nature, that alter any specifications or term and condition of this RFP. Vendors will be notified in the same manner as indicated above regarding any modifications to this RFP.

5.0 Resources

The South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks (GFP) is the state organization that provides wildlife damage program services for the state.

5.1 Project Staffing Roles

Agency Project Sponsor

Who: State of South Dakota, Jason Simmons - Policy Advisor, Governor's Office.

Role: Some of the duties performed by the Agency Project Sponsor are:

- Solicit, collect, compile, and summarize public and GFP employee comments associated with the Independent Review of GFP's WDM program and services.
- Review all Vendor Proposals
- Selection of Vendor
- Contract negotiations and signing

6.0 Format of Submission

All proposals should be prepared simply and economically and provide a direct, concise explanation of the vendor's proposal and qualifications. Elaborate brochures, sales literature, and other presentations unnecessary to a complete and effective proposal are not desired.

Consultants are required to provide an electronic copy of their response. The electronic copy should be provided in MS WORD or in PDF format and delivered in adherence to Section 6.6 of the RFP.

Proposals should be prepared using the following headings and, in the order, that they are presented below. Please reference the section for details on what should be included in your proposal.

- 6.1 Statement of Understanding of Project
- 6.2 Corporate Qualifications
- 6.3 Schedule
- 6.4 Proposal Amount
- 6.5 Team Organization

6.1 Statement of Understanding of Project

To demonstrate your comprehension of the project, please summarize your understanding of what the work is and what the work will entail. This should include, but not be limited to your understanding of the purpose and scope of the project, critical success factors and potential problems related to the project and your understanding of the deliverables. This should be limited to no more than two pages.

6.2 Corporate Qualifications

Please provide responses to the each of the following questions in your proposal.

- a) What year was your parent company (if applicable) established?
- b) What is the business of your parent company?
- c) What is the total number of employees in the parent company?
- d) What are the total revenues of your parent company?
- e) How many employees of your parent company have the skill set to support this effort?
- f) How many of those employees are accessible to your organization for active support?
- g) What year was your firm established?
- h) Has your firm ever done business under a different name and if so what was the name?
- i) How many employees does your firm have?
- j) How many employees in your firm are involved in this type of project?
- k) How many of those employees are involved in on-site project work?
- l) What percent of your parent company's revenue (if applicable), is produced by your firm?
- m) Has your firm ever done business with other governmental agencies? If so, please provide references.
- n) Has your firm ever done business with the State of South Dakota? If so, please provide references.
- o) Has your firm ever done projects that are like or similar to this project? If so, please provide references.
- p) What is your Company's website?

When providing references, the reference must include the following information:

- Name, address, and telephone number of client/contracting agency and a representative of that agency who may be contacted for verification of all information submitted
- Dates of the service/contract
- A brief, written description of the specific prior services performed and requirements thereof

6.3 Schedule

Provide a project plan that indicates how you will complete the required deliverables and services and addresses the following:

- Number of consultant staff needed
- Tasks to be performed (within phase as applicable)
- Number of hours each task will require
- Deliverables created by each task
- Dates by which each task will be completed (dates should be indicated in terms of elapsed time from project inception)
- Resources assigned to each task
- Required state agency support
- Show task dependencies
- Training (if applicable)

6.4 Proposal Amount

Pricing Worksheet

All vendors are required to complete a Pricing Worksheet. Vendors are welcome to show the cost associated with each planned activity.

NOTE: If the cost for one of the line items is included in the price of other line items, then mark it as such.

Activity	Hours #	Rate \$	Total \$
TOTAL PRICE (RFP COMPARISON)			

6.5 Team Organization

Consultant should provide an organization chart for the proposed project team. The organization chart should indicate both name and title of each person who will be involved with this project and it should identify the development team project manager. The chart should also include state resources as defined in section 5.1 Project Staffing Roles.

6.6 Delivery of Proposals

Copies (four paper copies and one electronic copy) of your proposal **must** be mailed to:

RFP # 1640
DEADLINE DATE: MARCH 31, 2019
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
ATTN: JASON SIMMONS
500 EAST CAPITOL AVE
PIERRE, SD 57501

Proposals **must** be submitted no later than the time and date set forth in the "RFP Calendar of Events" located in section 4.0. Bids received after this date and time will not be accepted for consideration.

7.0 Proposal Evaluation Criteria

A committee composed of State personnel will evaluate these responses and select the best-qualified proposal. The criteria for the proposal is divided into eight categories (in no particular order):

- 1) Understanding of the scope and requirements of the project
- 2) Technical skills and experience
- 3) Resources available to staff the project
- 4) Company References
- 5) Company financial stability
- 6) Proposed solution and work plan
- 7) Cost proposal
- 8) Previous project experience with the State of South Dakota

After determining that a proposal satisfies the mandatory requirements stated in the Request for Proposal, the evaluator(s) shall use subjective judgment in conducting a comparative assessment of the proposal by considering each of the following criteria:

- 1.1.1 Specialized expertise, capabilities, and technical competence as demonstrated by the proposed approach and methodology to meet the project requirements;
- 1.1.2 Resources available to perform the work, including any specialized services, within the specified time limits for the project;

- 1.1.3 Record of past performance, including price and cost data from previous projects, quality of work, ability to meet schedules, cost control, and contract administration;
- 1.1.4 Availability to the project locale;
- 1.1.5 Familiarity with the project locale;
- 1.1.6 Proposed project management techniques; and
- 1.1.7 Ability and proven history in handling special project constraints.

8.0 Appendix

APPENDIX A – Included Proposal Terms and Conditions

APPENDIX A

**Included
Proposal Terms
and Conditions**

APPENDIX A – Included Proposal Terms and Conditions

1. PRIOR OBLIGATIONS

No proposal shall be accepted from, or no contract or purchase order shall be awarded to any person, firm or corporation that is in arrears upon any obligations to the State of South Dakota, or that otherwise may be deemed irresponsible or unreliable by the Director of Procurement Management.

2. CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, INELIGIBILITY, AND VOLUNTARY EXCLUSION – LOWER TIER COVERED TRANSACTIONS

By submitting a proposal to this RFP, the consultant certifies that neither it nor its principals is presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation, by any Federal department or agency, from transactions involving the use of Federal funds. Where the consultant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, the bidder shall attach an explanation to their offer.

3. NON-DISCRIMINATION STATEMENT

The State of South Dakota requires that all consultants, vendors, and suppliers doing business with any State agency, department, or institution, provide a statement of non-discrimination. By submitting their proposal, the consultant certifies they do not discriminate in their employment practices with regard to race, color, creed, religion, age, sex, ancestry, national origin or disability.

4. MODIFICATION OR WITHDRAWAL OF PROPOSALS

Proposals may be modified or withdrawn by the consultant prior to the established due date and time.

No oral, telephonic, telegraphic, or facsimile responses or modifications to informal, formal bids, or Request for Proposals will be considered.

5. PROPRIETARY INFORMATION

The proposal of the successful consultant(s) becomes public information. Proprietary information can be protected under limited circumstances such as client lists and non-public financial statements. Pricing and service elements are not considered proprietary. An entire proposal may not be marked as proprietary. Consultants must clearly identify in the proposal any specific proprietary information they are requesting to be protected and must provide specific justification explaining why the information is to be protected. Proposals may be reviewed and evaluated by any person at the discretion of the State. All materials submitted become the property of the State of South Dakota and may be returned only at the State's option.

6. DISCUSSIONS WITH VENDORS (ORAL PRESENTATION/NEGOTIATIONS)

An oral presentation by a consultant to clarify a proposal may be required at the sole discretion of the State. However, the State may award a contract based on the initial proposals received without discussion with the Consultant. If oral presentations are required, they will be scheduled after the submission of proposals. Oral presentations will be made at the Consultant's expense.

This process is a Request for Proposal/Competitive Negotiation process. Each Proposal shall be evaluated, and each respondent shall be available for negotiation meetings at the State's request. The State reserves the right to negotiate on any and/or all components of every proposal submitted. From the time the proposals are submitted and until the formal award of a contract,

each proposal is considered a working document and as such, will be kept confidential. The negotiation discussions will also be held as confidential until such time as the award is completed.

7. VENDOR'S CONTRACTS

Consultants and their agents (including subcontractors, employees, consultants, or anyone else acting on their behalf) must direct all of their questions or comments regarding the RFP, the evaluation, etc. to the buyer of record indicated in section 4.1 of this RFP. Consultants and their agents may not contact any state employee other than the buyer of record regarding any of these matters during the solicitation and evaluation process. Inappropriate contacts are grounds for suspension and/or exclusion from specific procurements. Consultants and their agents who have questions regarding this matter should contact the buyer of record.

8. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

A consultant may be required to submit a copy of their most recent audited financial statement if deemed necessary by the Office of Procurement Management.

9. BEST INTEREST OF SOUTH DAKOTA

The State reserves the right to reject any or all proposals, waive technicalities, and make award(s) as deemed to be in the best interest of the State of South Dakota.

10. SECURITY DISCUSSIONS

Communication and discussion of the State's security controls with outside Vendors and Consultants will take place on a "need to know" basis. The decision on what constitutes a need to know rests with the State.

APPENDIX B – Included Contract Terms and Conditions

APPENDIX B

Included
Contract Terms
and Conditions

APPENDIX B – Included Contract Terms and Conditions

1. THE CONSULTANT

The Consultant will perform those services described in the Work Plan, which will be attached to the contract as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference. The Contractor's response to this RFP shall be considered part of the Work Plan.

2. CONTRACT COMMENCEMENT AND TERMINATION

The services to be provided under the contract shall commence and terminate on mutually agreed upon dates. Terms for early termination shall be included in the agreement as negotiated by the parties.

3. STATE EQUIPMENT, SUPPLIES, OR FACILITIES

The terms of the agreement shall state whether or not the Contractor will use State equipment, supplies, or facilities. If the Contractor will use State equipment, supplies, or facilities, the scope and conditions of such use will be clearly indicated in the agreement.

4. INDEMNITY PROVISION:

The Consultant agrees to indemnify and hold the State of South Dakota, its officers, agents and employees, harmless from and against any and all actions, suits, damages, liability or other proceedings that may arise as the result of performing services hereunder. This section does not require the Consultant to be responsible for or defend against claims or damages arising solely from errors or omissions of the State, its officers, agents or employees.

5. INSURANCE PROVISION:

The Consultant, at all times during the term of this Agreement, shall obtain and maintain in force insurance coverage of the types and with the limits as follows:

A. Commercial General Liability Insurance:

The Consultant shall maintain occurrence based commercial general liability insurance or equivalent form with a limit of not less than \$1,000,000 for each occurrence. If such insurance contains a general aggregate limit it shall apply separately to this Agreement or be no less than two times the occurrence limit.

B. Business Automobile Liability Insurance:

The Consultant shall maintain business automobile liability insurance or equivalent form with a limit of not less than \$1,000,000 for each accident. Such insurance shall include coverage for owned, hired, and non-owned vehicles.

C. Worker's Compensation Insurance:

The Consultant shall procure and maintain workers' compensation and employers' liability insurance as required by South Dakota law.

Before beginning work under this Agreement, the Consultant shall furnish the State with properly executed Certificates of Insurance which shall clearly evidence all insurance required in this Agreement and which provide that such insurance may not be canceled, except on 30 days prior

written notice to the State. The Consultant shall furnish copies of insurance policies if requested by the State.

6. INDEPENDENT CONSULTANT:

While performing services hereunder, the Consultant is an independent contractor and not an officer, agent, or employee of the State of South Dakota. As such, Consultant agrees not to use State equipment, supplies, and facilities unless otherwise agreed to.

7. REPORTING OF INJURY:

Consultant agrees to report to the State any event encountered in the course of performance of this Agreement which results in injury to the person or property of third parties, or which may otherwise subject Consultant or the State to liability. Consultant shall report any such event to the State immediately upon discovery.

Consultant's obligation under this section shall only be to report the occurrence of any event to the State and to make any other report provided for by their duties or applicable law.

Consultant's obligation to report shall not require disclosure of any information subject to privilege or confidentiality under law (e.g., attorney-client communications). Reporting to the State under this section shall not excuse or satisfy any obligation of Consultant to report any event to law enforcement or other entities under the requirements of any applicable law.

8. TERMINATION PROVISION:

This Agreement may be terminated by either party hereto upon thirty (30) days written notice. In the event the Consultant breaches any of the terms or conditions hereof, this Agreement may be terminated by the State at any time with or without notice. If termination for such a default is affected by the State, any payments due to Consultant at the time of termination may be adjusted to cover any additional costs to the State because of Consultant's default. Upon termination the State may take over the work and may award another party an agreement to complete the work under this Agreement. In the event of termination, the Consultant shall deliver to the State all reports, plans, specifications, technical data, and all other information completed prior to the date of termination. If after the State terminates for a default by Consultant it is determined that Consultant was not at fault, then the Consultant shall be paid for eligible services rendered and expenses incurred up to the date of termination.

9. DEFAULT PROVISION:

This Agreement depends upon the continued availability of appropriated funds and expenditure authority from the Legislature for this purpose. If for any reason the Legislature fails to appropriate funds or grant expenditure authority, or funds become unavailable by operation of law or federal funds reductions, this Agreement will be terminated by the State. Termination for any of these reasons is not a default by the State nor does it give rise to a claim against the State.

10. AMENDMENT PROVISION:

This Agreement may not be assigned without the express prior written consent of the State. This Agreement may not be amended except in writing, which writing shall be expressly identified as a part hereof, and be signed by an authorized representative of each of the parties hereto.

11. CONTROLLING LAW PROVISION:

This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of South Dakota. Any lawsuit pertaining to or affecting this Agreement shall be venued in Circuit Court, Sixth Judicial Circuit, Hughes County, South Dakota.

12. COMPLIANCE WITH REGULATIONS:

The Consultant will comply with all federal, state, and local laws, regulations, ordinances, guidelines, permits, and requirements applicable to providing services pursuant to this Agreement, and will be solely responsible for obtaining current information on such requirements.

13. CONSULTANT HIRING PROVISION AND ELIGIBILITY OF EMPLOYEES:

The Consultant may not use subcontractors to perform the services described herein without the express prior written consent of the State. The State reserves the right to reject any person from the contract presenting insufficient skills or inappropriate behavior.

The Consultant will include provisions in its subcontracts requiring its subcontractors to comply with the applicable provisions of this Agreement, to indemnify the State, and to provide insurance coverage for the benefit of the State in a manner consistent with this Agreement. The Consultant will cause its subcontractors, agents, and employees to comply, with applicable federal, state, and local laws, regulations, ordinances, guidelines, permits, and requirements and will adopt such review and inspection procedures as are necessary to assure such compliance.

14. COMMUNICATION NOTICE REQUIREMENTS:

Any notice or other communication required under this Agreement shall be in writing and sent to the address set forth above. Notices shall be given by and to _____ on behalf of the State, and by _____, on behalf of the Consultant, or such authorized designees as either party may from time to time designate in writing. Notices or communications to or between the parties shall be deemed to have been delivered when mailed by first class mail, provided that notice of default or termination shall be sent by registered or certified mail, or, if personally delivered, when received by such party.

15. SEVERABILITY PROVISION:

In the event that any court of competent jurisdiction shall hold any provision of this Agreement unenforceable or invalid, such holding shall not invalidate or render unenforceable any other provision hereof.

16. SUPERCESSION PROVISION:

All other prior discussions, communications, and representations concerning the subject matter of this Agreement are superseded by the terms of this Agreement, and except as specifically provided herein, this Agreement constitutes the entire agreement with respect to the subject matter hereof.

17. WORK PRODUCTS:

Consultant hereby acknowledges and agrees that all reports, plans, specifications, technical data, miscellaneous drawings, agreements, and all information contained therein provided to the State by the Consultant in connection with its performance under this Agreement shall belong to and is the property of the State and will not be used in any way by the Consultant without the written consent of the State.

Papers, reports, forms, or other material, which are a part of the work under this Agreement, will not be copyrighted without written approval of the State. The State reserves a royalty-free, non-exclusive, and irrevocable license to reproduce, publish, and otherwise use, and to authorize others to use, the work for government purposes.

Consultant hereby agrees to provide BIT, for safekeeping, a copy of source code for each executive branch state agency computer system that is developed or maintained by the Consultant. The source code provided will be the latest version that currently runs in a production environment. The Consultant will also provide BIT, any computer system source code for non-executive branch state agencies if requested by the agency owning the system.

18. CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION:

For purposes of the sub-paragraph, "State Propriety Information" shall include all information disclosed to Consultant by the State. Consultant acknowledges that it shall have a duty to not disclose any State Propriety Information to any third person for any reason without the express written permission of a State officer or employee with authority to authorize the disclosure. Consultant shall not: (i) disclose any State Proprietary Information to any third person unless otherwise specifically allowed under this contract; (ii) make any use of State Proprietary Information except to exercise rights and perform obligations under this contract; (iii) make State Proprietary Information available to any of its employees, officers, agents, or consultants except those who have agreed to obligations of confidentiality at least as strict as those set out in this contract and who have a need to know such information. Consultant is held to the same standard of care in guarding State Proprietary Information as it applies to its own confidential or proprietary information and materials of a similar nature, and no less than holding State Proprietary Information in the strictest confidence. Consultant shall protect confidentiality of the State's information from the time of receipt to the time that such information is either returned to the State or destroyed to the extent that it cannot be recalled or reproduced. Consultant agrees to return all information received from the State to State's custody upon the end of the term of this contract, unless otherwise agreed in a writing signed by both parties. State Proprietary Information shall not include information that (i) was in the public domain at the time it was disclosed to Consultant; (ii) was known to Consultant without restriction at the time of disclosure from the State; (iii) is disclosed with the prior written approval of State's officers or employees having authority to disclose such information; (iv) was independently developed by Consultant without the benefit or influence of the State's information; (v) becomes known to Consultant without restriction from a source not connected to the State of South Dakota. State's Propriety Information shall include names, social security numbers, employer numbers, addresses, and all other data about applicants, employers, or other clients to whom the State provides services of any kind. Consultant understands that this information is confidential and protected under State law at SDCL 1-27-1.5 and federal regulation at 20CFR 603 and agrees to immediately notify the State if the information is disclosed, either intentionally, or inadvertently. The parties mutually agree that neither of them shall disclose the contents of the contract except as required by applicable law or as necessary to carry out the terms of the contract or to enforce that party's rights under this contract. Permission is hereby granted to disclose State proprietary information, other than information about applicants, employers of clients, if reasonably necessary to carry out the purposes of this agreement. Consultant acknowledges that the State and its agencies are public entities and thus are bound by South Dakota open meetings and open records laws. It is therefore not a breach of this agreement for the State to take any action that the State reasonably believes is necessary to comply with South Dakota open records or open meetings laws. If work assignments performed in the course of this Agreement require additional security requirements or clearance, the Consultant will be required to undergo investigation.

20. CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS:

From time to time it may be necessary or desirable for either the State or the Contractor to propose changes in the Services provided. Such changes shall be effective only if they are in writing and contain the dated signatures of authorized representatives of both parties. Unless otherwise indicated, a change or amendment shall be effective on the date it is signed by both parties. Automatic upgrades to any software used by the Contractor to provide any services that simply improve the speed, efficiency, reliability, or availability of existing services and do not alter or add functionality, are not considered "changes to the Services" and such upgrades will be

implemented by the Contractor on a schedule no less favorable than that provided by the Contractor to any other customer receiving comparable levels of services.

21. **FORCE MAJEURE:**

Notwithstanding anything in this Agreement to the contrary, Contractor shall not be liable for any delay or failure to provide the Services hereunder, if the delay or failure is caused by war, terrorist attacks, riots, civil commotion, fire, flood, earthquake, or any act of God, or other causes beyond Contractor's reasonable control. Provided, however, that in order to be excused from delay or failure to perform, the Contractor must act diligently to remedy the cause of such delay or failure.

22. **ENTIRE AGREEMENT:**

The RFP response including its appendixes and this Agreement, and the exhibits annexed hereto, together with the Statements of Work issued from time to time hereunder, constitute the entire agreement between the parties. If this contract and the RFP response are in conflict in any part, the contract will be held to be the preeminent document for the part in disagreement. No change, waiver, or discharge hereof shall be valid unless it is in writing and is executed by the party against whom such change, waiver, or discharge is sought to be enforced.

30. **LEGAL REQUESTS FOR DATA:**

Except as otherwise expressly prohibited by law, the Contractor will:

- A. Immediately notify the State of any subpoenas, warrants, or other legal orders, demands, or requests received by the Contractor seeking State and/or End User Data maintained by the Contractor;
- B. Consult with the State regarding its response;
- C. Cooperate with the State's requests in connection with efforts by the State to intervene and quash or modify the legal order, demand, or request; and
- D. Upon the State's request, provide the State with a copy of its response.

Appendix F: Contract

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA SERVICES CONTRACT/AGREEMENT
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

CONSULTANT CONTRACT/AGREEMENT

Wildlife Management Institute-WMI
Steven A. Williams, President
1440 Upper Bermudian Road
Gardners, PA 17324
(CONTRACTOR)

State of South Dakota
Office of the Governor
500 East Capitol Avenue
Pierre, SD 57501
(STATE)

The **STATE** hereby enters into this Agreement for services with **CONTRACTOR** in consideration of and pursuant to the terms and conditions set forth herein.

1. **CONTRACTOR'S** service under this Agreement shall commence on May 15, 2019 and end on December 31, 2019.

Services to be performed: **CONTRACTOR'S** services under this Agreement resulting from RFP #1640 shall evaluate the processes, programs and services associated with Game, Fish and Parks' comprehensive Wildlife Damage Management program in South Dakota. Evaluations will include a review of the following areas: policies and procedures, administration and organizational structure, budget and revenue sources, communication and outreach (internally and externally), transparency and accountability, strengths and weaknesses, public surveys of specific audiences and hosted interviews with GFP staff, ADC Policy Advisory Committee members, GFP commissioners and other stakeholders. The **CONTRACTOR** shall fully investigate and answer the nine questions identified within Section 3.3 and address the 10 goals identified in Section 3.2 of the RFP #1640.

The **CONTRACTOR** shall adhere to the "Goals/Objectives" outline within Section 3.2 of RFP #1640 including the services conveyed within the "STATEMENT OF UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROJECT", and the "SCHEDULE" sections of the submitted **CONTRACTOR'S** bid proposal.

CONTRACTOR shall adhere to the "Scope of Components and Deliverables" outlined within Section 3.3 of RFP #1640 including the services conveyed within the "STATEMENT OF UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROJECT", and the "SCHEDULE" sections of the **CONTRACTOR'S** bid proposal.

CONTRACTOR shall present their findings and final report at the December 12-13, 2019, GFP Commission Meeting in Madison, South Dakota.

CONTRACTOR, at all times during the term of this Agreement, shall obtain and maintain in force insurance coverage of the types and with the limits as follows.

2. **Commercial General Liability Insurance:** **CONTRACTOR** shall maintain occurrence based commercial general liability insurance or equivalent form with a

limit of not less than \$1,000,000 for each occurrence. If such insurance contains a general aggregate limit, it shall apply separately to this Agreement or be no less than two times the occurrence limit.

Business Automobile Liability Insurance: **CONTRACTOR** shall maintain business automobile liability insurance or equivalent form with a limit of not less than \$1,000,000 for each accident. Such insurance shall include coverage for owned, hired, and non-owned Vehicles.

Workers' Compensation Insurance: **CONTRACTOR** shall procure and maintain Workers' Compensation and employer's liability insurance as required by South Dakota law.

Certificates of Insurance: Before beginning work under this Agreement, **CONTRACTOR** shall furnish the **STATE** with properly executed Certificates of Insurance which shall clearly evidence all insurance required in this Agreement and which provide that such insurance shall not be canceled, except on 30 days' prior written notice to the **STATE**. **CONTRACTOR** shall furnish copies of insurance policies if requested by the **STATE**.

CONTRACTOR agrees to report to the **STATE** any event encountered in the course of performance of this Agreement which results in injury to the person or property of third parties, or which may otherwise subject consultant or the **STATE** to liability. **CONTRACTOR** shall report any such event to the **STATE** immediately upon discovery. **CONTRACTOR'S** obligation under this section shall only be to report the occurrence of any event to the **STATE** and make any other report provided for by their duties or applicable law. **CONTRACTOR'S** obligation to report shall not require disclosure of any information subject to privilege or confidentiality under law (e.g. attorney/client communications). Reporting to the **STATE** under this section shall not excuse or satisfy any obligation of **CONTRACTOR** to report any event to law enforcement or other entities under the requirements of any applicable law.

3. **CONTRACTOR** agrees to indemnify and hold the State of South Dakota, its officers, agents, and employees, harmless from and against any and all actions, suits, damages, liability or other proceedings that may arise as the result of performing services hereunder. This section does not require **CONTRACTOR** to be responsible for or defend against claims or damages arising solely from errors or omissions of the **STATE**, its officers, agents or employees.
4. **CONTRACTOR** may not use subcontractors to perform the services described herein without the express prior written consent of the **STATE**. **CONTRACTOR** will include provisions in its subcontracts requiring its subcontractors to comply with the applicable provisions of this Agreement, to indemnify the **STATE**, and to provide insurance coverage for the benefit of the **STATE** in a manner consistent with this Agreement. **CONTRACTOR** will cause its subcontractors, agents, and employees to comply, with applicable federal, state, and local laws, regulations, ordinances, guidelines, permits, and requirements and will adopt such review and inspection procedures as are necessary to assure such compliance.

5. While performing services hereunder, **CONTRACTOR** is an independent contractor and not an officer, agent, or employee of the State of South Dakota.
6. Will **CONTRACTOR** use state supplies or facilities? YES ☐ NO ☒. If yes, specify the conditions under which state supplies or facilities will be used.

7. This Agreement can be terminated upon thirty (30) days written notice by either party. In the event **CONTRACTOR** breaches any of the terms or conditions hereof, this Agreement may be terminated by the **STATE** at any time with or without notice. If termination for such a default is affected by the **STATE**, any payments due to **CONTRACTOR** at the time of termination may be adjusted to cover any additional costs to the **STATE** because of **CONTRACTOR'S** default. Upon termination the **STATE** may take over the work and may award another party an agreement to complete the work under this Agreement. If after the **STATE** terminates for a default by **CONTRACTOR** it is determined that **CONTRACTOR** was not at fault, then **CONTRACTOR** shall be paid for eligible services rendered and expenses incurred up to the date of termination.
8. This Agreement may not be assigned without the express prior written consent of the **STATE**. This Agreement may not be amended except in writing, which writing shall be expressly identified as a part hereof, and be signed by an authorized representative of each of the parties hereto.
9. **CONTRACTOR** will comply with all federal, state, and local laws, regulations, ordinances, guidelines, permits, and requirements applicable to providing services pursuant to this Agreement, and will be solely responsible for obtaining current information on such requirements.
10. **CONTRACTOR** certifies that neither **CONTRACTOR** nor its principals are presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment or suspension, or declared ineligible from participating in transactions by the federal government or any state or local government department or agency. **CONTRACTOR** further agrees that it will immediately notify the State if during the term of this Agreement **CONTRACTOR** or its principals become subject to debarment, suspension, or ineligibility from participating in transactions by the federal government, or by any state or local government department or agency.
11. This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of South Dakota. Any lawsuit pertaining to or affecting this Agreement shall be venued in Circuit Court, Sixth Judicial Circuit, Hughes County, South Dakota.
12. This Agreement depends upon the continued availability of appropriated funds and expenditure authority from the Legislature for this purpose. If for any reason the Legislature fails to appropriate funds or grant expenditure authority, or funds become unavailable by operation of law or federal funds reductions, this Agreement will be terminated by the **STATE**. Termination for any of these reasons is not a default by

the **STATE** nor does it give rise to a claim against the **STATE**.

13. In the event that any court of competent jurisdiction shall hold any provision of this Agreement unenforceable or invalid, such holding shall not invalidate or render unenforceable any other provision hereof.
14. All other prior discussions, communications, and representations concerning the subject matter of this Agreement are superseded by the terms of this Agreement, and except as specifically provided herein, this Agreement constitutes the entire agreement with respect to the subject matter hereof.
15. Any notice or other communication required under this Agreement shall be in writing and sent to the address set forth above. Notices shall be given by and to Jason Simmons on behalf of the **STATE**, and by and to Steven A. Williams, on behalf of **CONTRACTOR**, or such authorized designees as either party may from time to time designate in writing. Notices or communications to or between the parties shall be deemed to have been delivered when mailed by first class mail, provided that notice of default or termination shall be sent by registered or certified mail, or, if personally delivered, when received by such party.
16. The **STATE** will make payment for services upon satisfactory completion of the services, or upon a periodic basis, pursuant to itemized invoices. The TOTAL CONTRACT AMOUNT is an amount not to exceed \$97,800.00.

In witness hereto and with authority to do so, the parties signify their agreement by affixing their respective signatures hereto.

Office of the Governor

Date


Contractor

5/1/19
Date



Substitute **W-9**

DO NOT send to IRS

Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN) Verification

Print or Type

Please see pages 2 and 3 for instructions.

<p>➤ Legal Name (as shown on your income tax return) Wildlife Management Institute, Inc.</p> <p>➤ Business Name, if different from above (use if doing business as DBA, or enter business name of Sole Proprietorship)</p> <p>➤ Order-From Address (where orders should be mailed) PO Box or Number and Street, City, State, ZIP + 4 1440 Upper Bermudian Road Gardners, PA 17324</p> <p>➤ Remit-To Address (where payments should be mailed, if different from Order address) PO Box or number and street, City, State, ZIP + 4 Scot Williamson 4426 VT Route 215 Cabot, VT 05647</p> <p>➤ Exemptions (see instructions, page 3) Exempt payee code (if any) Exemption from FATCA reporting code (if any)</p> <p>➤ Certification (see instructions on page 2) Under penalties of perjury, I certify that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The number shown on this form is my correct taxpayer identification number (or I am waiting for a number to be issued to me), AND2. I am not subject to backup withholding because: (a) I am exempt from backup withholding, or (b) I have not been notified by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) that I am subject to backup withholding as a result of a failure to report all interest or dividends, or (c) the IRS has notified me that I am no longer subject to backup withholding, AND3. I am a U.S. citizen or other U.S. person, AND4. The FATCA code(s) entered on this form (if any) indicating I am exempt from FATCA reporting is correct. <p>The Internal Revenue Service does not require your consent to any provision of this document other than the certifications required to avoid backup withholding.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"><tr><td style="width: 33%;">Printed Name Steve Williams</td><td style="width: 33%;">Printed Title President</td><td style="width: 33%;">Telephone Number (717)677-4480</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">Signature of U.S. Person </td><td>Date (mm/dd/yyyy) 5/7/19</td></tr></table>	Printed Name Steve Williams	Printed Title President	Telephone Number (717) 677-4480	Signature of U.S. Person 		Date (mm/dd/yyyy) 5/7/19	<p>➤ Entity Designation (check only one) <u>Required</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Individual / Sole Proprietor <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C Corporation <input type="checkbox"/> S Corporation <input type="checkbox"/> Limited Liability Company – Individual <input type="checkbox"/> Limited Liability Company – Partnership <input type="checkbox"/> Limited Liability Company – Corporation <input type="checkbox"/> Governmental Entity <input type="checkbox"/> Hospital Exempt from Tax or Government Owned <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term Care Facility Exempt from Tax or Government Owned <input type="checkbox"/> Trust/Estate <input type="checkbox"/> Other Entity (specify, e.g., 501(c)(3), etc):</p> <p>➤ Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN) If you are a sole proprietor and you have an EIN, you may enter either your SSN or EIN. However, using your EIN may result in unnecessary notices to the requester. <u>Required</u></p> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.2em;"><u>5 3 0 1 9 6 6 2 9</u></p> <p>➤ Check Only One <u>Required</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Social Security Number (SSN) <input type="checkbox"/> Employer Identification Number (EIN) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Individual Taxpayer Identification Number for U.S. Resident Aliens (ITIN)</p>
Printed Name Steve Williams	Printed Title President	Telephone Number (717) 677-4480					
Signature of U.S. Person 		Date (mm/dd/yyyy) 5/7/19					
<p>➤ Optional Direct Deposit Information (all fields required to receive electronic payments)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"><tr><td style="width: 30%;">Your Bank Account Number</td><td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/> Checking <input type="checkbox"/> Savings</td><td style="width: 30%;">Name on Bank Account</td><td style="width: 30%;">Bank Routing No. (9-digit ABA #)</td></tr></table> <p>THIS IS A: <input type="checkbox"/> new direct deposit <input type="checkbox"/> change of existing <input type="checkbox"/> additional direct deposit <input type="checkbox"/> email change only</p> <p>E-mail address (Please make this LEGIBLE)</p>		Your Bank Account Number	<input type="checkbox"/> Checking <input type="checkbox"/> Savings	Name on Bank Account	Bank Routing No. (9-digit ABA #)		
Your Bank Account Number	<input type="checkbox"/> Checking <input type="checkbox"/> Savings	Name on Bank Account	Bank Routing No. (9-digit ABA #)				

If you provide bank information and an email address, we will send a message notifying you when an electronic payment is issued. You will also receive a PIN for use when logging into the SD Vendor Self Service website at <http://Bfm.SD.gov/Vendor>. We will **NOT** share your email address with anyone or use it for any other purpose than communicating information about your electronic payments to you.