

Issue APPRENTICE DEER

Position OPPOSE

Name LARRY WILLIAMSON City, State STURGIS SD Create Date 03/15/2023 4:12:03 PM

Comment Attachment:

If I understand the proposal correctly you want to allow apprentice firearm hunting on the Ft. Meade Recreation Area; if that is correct I am opposed for two reasons related to public safety : the area is adjacent to residential areas of Sturgis, and the area is heavily used by hikers, horseback riders, bicyclists, snowshoers, and cross country skiers.

Issue ARCHERY ANTELOPE

Position SUPPORT

Name KYLE PETERS City, State WATERTOWN SD Create Date 03/07/2023 2:53:53 PM

Comment Attachment:

I am writing in support to changing the current Antelope Licenses to have a cap for nonresident archery "buck antelope" tags.

As an avid outdoorsman, I care about the legacy of our hunting industry and want to see this continue for decades to come. I believe we need to be stewards of our resources and focus on the longevity and the quality of the antelope herd which can be directly impacted by issuing fewer tags to nonresident hunters.

Archery equipment is improving and hunters are able to ethically harvest game from double or triple the distances they once could which is resulting in higher success odds. While I am a proponent of opportunity, I do not see South Dakota receiving a 'black eye' from making this change and capping the antelope licenses and requiring non-residents to enter into a preference point system to earn these tags.

I urge the commission to support a cap on a nonresident archery antelope tags.

Respectfully,
Kyle Peters

Name ASHLEY KURTENBACH City, State SPEARFISH SD Create Date 03/07/2023 2:57:35 PM

Comment Attachment:

After seeing the vast number of antelope decreased over several years, I believe the number of licenses should be decreased and the price of the tag for non-residents to be increased.

Name TYLER PICKETT City, State STURGIS SD Create Date 03/07/2023 3:17:45 PM

Comment Attachment:

Protect our herd numbers and resident satisfaction with a non-resident archery tag allocation percentage quite similar to rifle allocation, 8%! This is not an attack on our neighboring hunters. It is fact, the sport of bowhunting has grown immensely, more hunters in the field, more harvest taken, less animals to pursue!
Our wildlife governing agencies push R3 yet when DEMAND sky rockets, we simply give out more and more tags relying on old school archery harvest belief, "low success rates", the advancements in archery technology alone have become a force to recognize. Far more archers are finding success in the present versus the past. So tag allocation should reflect that to protect the hunting heritage for decades to come.

Name PATRICK O'CONNELL City, State BRANDON SD Create Date 03/07/2023 3:49:48 PM

Comment Attachment:

Issue ARCHERY ANTELOPE

Position SUPPORT

Name CONNER MESMAN City, State SIOUX FALLS SD Create Date 03/07/2023 3:53:23 PM

Comment Attachment:

I support the move to put responsible and reasonable caps on NR archery antelope and deer permits. South Dakota is the only western state that gives out unlimited archery antelope and deer permits to nonresidents. We need to protect our resource here and continue to provide a positive experience for everyone that hunts in South Dakota. South Dakota has about 15% of the amount of mule deer that the state of Wyoming and Montana have combined, and yet, in 2021 nonresidents shot more mule deer bucks here in South Dakota than in Wyoming and Montana combined. Limits have to be put on the number of NR tags issued to continue to ensure a strong population of mule deer and antelope as well as a strong age class of each. At this rate, the tags issued for both archery deer and antelope will continue to increase while the satisfaction and experience will decrease. The mule deer and antelope resource that we cherish here in this state can only handle so much. This might mean an increase in the tag price for nonresidents as well as a tag that takes one or two years to draw rather than the otc tag that it is now. Both residents and nonresidents would deal with less crowding while in the field, and I have no doubt that both residents and nonresidents would have improved experiences if these changes would be put into effect. If I were a nonresident, I would rather hunt a state every two or three years and have a great experience than be able to hunt it every year but have to deal with loads of pressure and have a subpar experience.

Name MICHAEL ARNETTE City, State WICHITA SD Create Date 03/07/2023 5:34:02 PM

Comment Attachment:

As a non-resident who plans to hunt South Dakota. I support restriction of non-resident archery antelope and deer permits. However, keeping unlimited Archery antelope tags on private land will only push South Dakota residents out of hunting opportunities due to non-resident dollars spent in leasing property or going through outfitter leased properties. Being from the state of Kansas I can personally attest to the benefits that I have with limited non-resident Archery participation. It also benefits non-residents who enjoy good hunting when they do have a tag. Furthermore, I am proud that Kansas has differentiated Whitetail and mule deer tag allocations for the preservation of the troubled mule deer species in our state. South Dakota would be wise to consider the same

Thank you or your consideration

Name ALEXANDER YOUNG City, State MITCHELL SD Create Date 03/08/2023 4:44:40 AM

Comment Attachment:

I support a cap ok Non-resident archery antelope tags. It's obviously time!

Name ALEX PERMANN City, State CHAMBERLAIN SD Create Date 03/08/2023 2:37:28 PM

Comment Attachment:

Setting a cap on NR antelope is a start. We need to consider a cap that is more in line with our rifle tag allocation.

Position OTHER

Name DAVID FORT City, State BOX ELDER SD Create Date 03/08/2023 3:29:20 AM

Comment Attachment:

With the decrease in antelope numbers across multiple units in the state. It only makes sense to decrease the number of Non resident license and tags allocated. The majority of successful harvest numbers seemingly come from Non resident hunters. And yes the non resident tags draw in more money. But there has to be some sort of cap to the tags. No matter how much money the state brings in, if the number of tags doesn't decrease they're won't be enough money to bring back the heard that once was across the western side of the state.

Position OPPOSE

Name ROBERT VAN DAM JR City, State COLMAN SD Create Date 03/07/2023 2:17:00 PM

Comment Attachment:

Please put a cap and limit on nonresident antelope tags and also mule deer nonresident tags. Since 2013 the state of Wyoming reduced their antelope tags significantly while South Dakota bumped there's up 400% also non-residents shot more mule deer bucks in South Dakota and Wyoming and Montana combined or something needs to be done!

Issue ARCHERY ANTELOPE

Position OPPOSE

Name CHAD VIS City, State SIOUX FALLS SD Create Date 03/07/2023 5:39:50 PM

Comment Attachment:

Please consider a hold on nonresident archery antelope tags for at least two years. We have a renewable resource but it does need time to become a reality. You will see several more nonresident plates than resident plates at all public lands in Butte and Harding Co. as every herd of antelope are harassed nonstop all Sept.

Name DAIN SCHWAN City, State SIOUX FALLS SD Create Date 03/07/2023 7:28:25 PM

Comment Attachment:

I ask the commission to support reasonable caps on non res antelope licenses. thank you

Name HUNTER LAVERACK City, State MARTIN SD Create Date 03/07/2023 11:32:56 PM

Comment Attachment:

The nonresident tags for deer and antelope need to be limited. The hunting quality has gone down in resent years with increase of nonresident hunters

Name DYLAN HERR City, State HURON SD Create Date 03/09/2023 12:57:45 PM

Comment Attachment:

Limit nonresident archery tags

Issue ARCHERY DEER

Position SUPPORT

Name AARON ROGERS City, State HURON SD Create Date 03/07/2023 9:47:20 AM

Comment Attachment:

Dear Commission,

I've grown up hunting in South Dakota and also travel out of state for hunting opportunities. With population growth tag availability is tough, not just at home but across the west. I am in favor of the proposals to reduce the % of Nonresident tags in South Dakota. Following the lead of the majority of western states. I believe this will help the quality of hunts for both resident and non. I can also see with increasing population of hunters in the State that this will be just one of the needed steps and in the future residents will have to make some sacrifices also. Thankyou for your consideration and I hope you realize that these changes are needed.

Aaron C Rogers

Name MATT HEGG City, State WATERTOWN SD Create Date 03/07/2023 10:27:01 AM

Comment Attachment:

I support limiting the "unlimited" number of archery tags for non residents. Probably even more so than the current proposal I think the GFP also needs to study where all the hunters are going (both resident and non resident) and consider implementing further restrictions to control the pressure. The public land near and around where I hunt WR is over pressured, in my opinion. And according to the land owners, some of the public land sees almost daily pressure starting with archery antelope and all the way through the rifle seasons. We're fortunate to have plenty of public hunting opportunities in SD but I worry some areas are getting hunted too hard.

Name ASHLEY KURTENBACH City, State SPEARFISH SD Create Date 03/07/2023 3:05:22 PM

Comment Attachment:

This is a decent start to making adequate changes, but tags should become even more limited for non-residents and also be specific for antlered and antlerless and by species.

Issue ARCHERY DEER

Position SUPPORT

Name TYLER PICKETT City, State STURGIS SD Create Date 03/07/2023 3:22:16 PM

Comment Attachment:

Protect our herd numbers and resident satisfaction with a non-resident archery tag allocation percentage quite similar to rifle allocation, 8%! This is not an attack on our neighboring hunters. It is fact, the sport of bowhunting has grown immensely, more hunters in the field, more harvest taken, less animals to pursue!
 Our wildlife governing agencies push R3 yet when DEMAND sky rockets, we simply give out more and more tags relying on old school archery harvest belief, "low success rates", the advancements in archery technology alone have become a force to recognize. Far more archers are finding success in the present versus the past. So tag allocation should reflect that to protect the hunting heritage for decades to come.
 Unlimited private land archery tags is a punishment to the law abiding citizen, and a bonus to an unethical hunter. A draw for private tags would be better in line with the overall goal here, while it doesn't have to require 5 years of preference for a non resident, it should not be unlimited! Please review and reconsider.

Name CONNER MESMAN City, State SIOUX FALLS SD Create Date 03/07/2023 3:51:39 PM

Comment Attachment:

I support the move to put responsible and reasonable caps on NR archery antelope and deer permits. South Dakota is the only western state that gives out unlimited archery antelope and deer permits to nonresidents. We need to protect our resource here and continue to provide a positive experience for everyone that hunts in South Dakota. South Dakota has about 15% of the amount of mule deer that the state of Wyoming and Montana have combined, and yet, in 2021 nonresidents shot more mule deer bucks here in South Dakota than in Wyoming and Montana combined. Limits have to be put on the number of NR tags issued to continue to ensure a strong population of mule deer and antelope as well as a strong age class of each. At this rate, the tags issued for both archery deer and antelope will continue to increase while the satisfaction and experience will decrease. The mule deer and antelope resource that we cherish here in this state can only handle so much. This might mean an increase in the tag price for nonresidents as well as a tag that takes one or two years to draw rather than the otc tag that it is now. Both residents and nonresidents would deal with less crowding while in the field, and I have no doubt that both residents and nonresidents would have improved experiences if these changes would be put into effect. If I were a nonresident, I would rather hunt a state every two or three years and have a great experience than be able to hunt it every year but have to deal with loads of pressure and have a subpar experience.

Name BRYSON BULTJE City, State SIOUX FALLS SD Create Date 03/07/2023 6:03:01 PM

Comment Attachment:

I support a limit on the number of non resident archery deer tags in South Dakota

Name KEITH PULLINS City, State RAPID CITY SD Create Date 03/07/2023 7:05:53 PM

Comment Attachment:

We need limits on nonresidents hunting. Our hunting will be decimated if something isn't done about unlimited tags

Name ALEX PERMANN City, State CHAMBERLAIN SD Create Date 03/08/2023 2:39:58 PM

Comment Attachment:

Setting a cap on NR archery deer is a start. We need to consider a cap that is more in line with our rifle tag allocation. Also, because NR achers are targeting mule deer, we need to consider denoting a mule deer vs whitetail tag.

Position OTHER

Name BRANDON GIESER City, State CLAIRE CITY SD Create Date 03/07/2023 8:24:02 AM

Comment Attachment:

There needs to be a cap for nonresidents raping and pillaging our resources. There in no captivity should ever be more nonresidents tagging and taking home more deer or antelope than the residents of the state.

Issue ARCHERY DEER

Position OTHER

Name DAVID FORT City, State BOX ELDER SD Create Date 03/08/2023 3:31:28 AM

Comment Attachment:

With the decrease in mule deer numbers across multiple units in the state. It only makes sense to decrease the number of Non resident license and tags allocated. The majority of successful harvest numbers seemingly come from Non resident hunters. And yes the non resident tags draw in more money. But there has to be some sort of cap to the tags. No matter how much money the state brings in, if the number of tags doesn't decrease they're won't be enough money to bring back the heard that once was across the western side of the state. Please come up with a cal to non resident hunters acquiring tags for archery deer hunting in South Dakota.

Name JOE MCDOUGAL City, State BURKE SD Create Date 03/09/2023 12:42:35 AM

Comment Attachment:

There needs to be a significant reduction in nonresident tags not only on public lands but on private as well. Some of the outfitters are absolutely decimating the deer herd especially the mule deer. Us resident also need to be limited to one tag. With the technology available to all hunters and the phone apps, primitive weapons aren't all that primitive anymore. Also, something that isn't talked about "wounding deer" is at an all time high. So many people mistake technology for skill and take 50-100 yard shots regularly and don't spend any time in following up after the shot. I talk to dozens of people who do this multiple times each season and hear about so many more. So instead of filling the tags they have, they are actually killing way more. In the counties I hunt, the public no longer has a huntable population of whitetails and the mule deer are completely gone on most of it. I spend 5-7 days a week scouting starting July 1 and hunt about that many days a week during the season. I was only able to find 1.....just ONE mature buck on public land last year. 4 years ago I could find sometimes 8-10 in one small area. Obviously there are a plethora of reasons the numbers have dropped so quickly but reducing tags is the one thing that can be controlled. Remember, we are supposed to be managing for sustainable harvest, not worrying about whiny people's feelings. It's too late in many places for the mule deer but let's at least try to save what's left and also get the whitetails quantity and quality back to where it was a few years ago. I know we'll never see it like it was 10-15 years ago.

Name DOUG BRAGE City, State WATERTOWN SD Create Date 03/09/2023 6:12:46 PM

Comment Attachment:

We need to limit out of state bow hunters!

Position OPPOSE

Name GUNNAR ENSZ City, State RAPID CITY SD Create Date 03/07/2023 8:25:23 AM

Comment Attachment:

Need to either limit the non-resident tags or increase the price or maybe both.

Name GREG LATHAM City, State EMORY TX Create Date 03/07/2023 9:45:35 AM

Comment Attachment:

I strictly oppose the proposed changes to the nonresident archery tag allocations for deer. The number of resident hunters has increased drastically, whereas the nonresident hunters has nowhere near, increased at the same rate in the past few years. Non-residents are not the ones doing damage to mule deer population numbers. If that is the current concern, there are a couple points to be made. Firstly, build your population numbers are declining across the west. It is much more complex in nuanced than just hunting pressure. Secondly, you can look to states like Kansas and Nebraska to see how easy it would be to limit mule deer harvest, while encouraging Whitetail hunting. A simple solution would be to have a mule deer endorsement that is applied for separately, or just restrict the units that a person is able to harvest a mule deer in. Separately, another huge point is the economic impact of nonresident hunters. Nonresident hunters practically fund conservation in the state. Especially if pheasant hunting is also included here. Stifling the number of nonresident hunters will reduce revenue from license sales, as well as impact local economies, who benefit from food and lodging of these out-of-state hunters. If mule deer conservation is at the forefront of the state's concern, potentially we should limit pheasant hunting because it disturbs mule deer in their highest stress period of the year. Hundreof pheasant hunters stomp through prime deer bedding in the winter months. Please consider these points when making decisions regarding tag allocations. The proposed changes are a slap in the face to loyal SD deer hunters.

Issue ARCHERY DEER

Position OPPOSE

Name	BENJAMIN	LEE	City, State	RAPID	SD	Create Date	03/07/2023 4:09:48 PM
------	----------	-----	-------------	-------	----	-------------	-----------------------

Comment Attachment:

A tag allocation reform is long overdue. While our state is in great demand by ALL bowhunters, we need to start with non-residents. Our limited public land is over ran and being depleted of every spike buck (deer and antelope) alike. Please consider an 8% tag allocation.

CAP AND DRAW for private land to remove the idea set forth of "unlimited private land tags".

Name	CHAD	VIS	City, State	SIOUX FALLS	SD	Create Date	03/07/2023 5:46:57 PM
------	------	-----	-------------	-------------	----	-------------	-----------------------

Comment Attachment:

Please consider limiting the number of nonresident archery tags given out as the residents are being pushed out of even our public lands. Unlimited tags already pushed the average working person off any private land and now we are losing our Sept resident only to include nonresidents. I know you are looking at the dollars but the residents who make up the vast majority of the hunting population cannot afford the proposals coming. Our mule dealer heard is being decimated and soon even the residents won't bother purchasing tags and this natural resource which is renewable with a little common sense will be pushed beyond the brink.

Name	SETH	VIS	City, State	SIOUX FALLS	SD	Create Date	03/07/2023 6:01:22 PM
------	------	-----	-------------	-------------	----	-------------	-----------------------

Comment Attachment:

Need to give out less tags to non resident to give residents a chance at their own deer.

Also should give all of September to residents only. Needs to be a cap on private land non resident tags as well. We don't need rich guys coming in and taking all of our deer.

Name	WILLIAM	ANDREWS	City, State	WATERTOWN	SD	Create Date	03/07/2023 6:34:12 PM
------	---------	---------	-------------	-----------	----	-------------	-----------------------

Comment Attachment:

I know out of staters bring alot of money to the state, but they also bring there \$ to buy /pay good folks to hunt there land ...good for them too! But when residents get kicked out of there hunting ground they have hunted for along time ,I think that is really hurting your local hunters...I know there is alot of public land but the good stuff already has 10+ bowhunters...real fun ...all I want is the outta staters to stay in there state for deer and antelope!! Thanks!!

Name	CRAIG	STADTFELD	City, State	TEA	SD	Create Date	03/07/2023 7:39:28 PM
------	-------	-----------	-------------	-----	----	-------------	-----------------------

Comment Attachment:

There needs to be a quota in county-specific tags issued for archery deer. No different than rifle. There are too many areas getting overrun by traffic, in particular, the Slim Buttes in Harding County, wheee 500+ access permits are being issued as a false narrative in reducing the number of Out of State archery hunters who run the deer out of the Buttes starting in early October, after plenty of residents have already been doing the same. To preserve the quality and number of deer in certain areas of our state, like the Slim Buttes, we must greatly reduce either the number of access permits issued to non-residents, or move to a county by county draw for archery to control the numbers of hunters drawn to public land. We have to find a way to spread out the pressure.

Name	JEREMY	LINDEMANN	City, State	WANNASKA	MN	Create Date	03/10/2023 1:12:38 PM
------	--------	-----------	-------------	----------	----	-------------	-----------------------

Comment Attachment:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment .

First, I am for the protection of the resource . Second, I am opposed to the current proposal.

However, I have a solution . I would like to recommend the commission make East River and West River nonresident deer licenses for public land each be their own separate draw and I would like to see the draw be separate for whitetail and mule deer.

I believe this is the most common-sense approach and would allow the state to better manage each species . Also, the number of permits should depend on the number of deer in each unit. This draw structure would allow better management and provide more opportunities for nonresident hunters and not hurt tourism or the loss of revenue from out of state hunters . I think this would be a good meet in the middle to make everyone happy and have a better handle on deer management and hunter satisfaction.

Thank you ,

Jeremy Lindemann .

Issue FIREARMS CHANGES TO STATE PARKS AND RECREATION AREA

Position SUPPORT

Name ASHLEY KURTENBACH City, State SPEARFISH SD Create Date 03/07/2023 3:09:18 PM
 Comment Attachment:

Issue MOUNTAIN GOAT SEASON

Position SUPPORT

Name ASHLEY KURTENBACH City, State SPEARFISH SD Create Date 03/07/2023 3:06:37 PM
 Comment Attachment:

Issue NONRESIDENT WATERFOWL

Position SUPPORT

Name DOUGLAS BOE City, State MARION, IA IA Create Date 03/28/2023 8:58:36 AM
 Comment Attachment:

I would ask you to support increasing the number of non-resident waterfowl licenses allowed.

Position OPPOSE

Name ERIC PAULSON City, State PIERRE SD Create Date 03/13/2023 3:50:52 PM
 Comment Attachment: NR_Numbers_49b004d13.xlsx

There is no need to increase waterfowl licenses. In my attached file, which is all data from the GFP draw statistics on the website, it shows that for first choice applicants, as a whole state there is only a shortage of 284 licenses. Now granted that includes popular licenses where numerous people were turned down and not popular licenses with an abundance of leftovers.

Why as deer hunters are we told to look for less popular units to apply for to increase our odds for a tag but when it comes to non-resident waterfowl hunting, rather than steer people to the less popular units to apply for we just increase licenses numbers? I'm sure the business owners in the less popular units would love for the GFP to encourage hunters to apply for the leftover licenses in these units and bring them business rather than increase licenses in other units and keeping people away from the less popular units.

In fact, for the 3 day licenses proposed to be changed, after the first choice first draw both units already had leftover licenses. So really all this change would do is increase the leftovers so there is no need to increase either of those 3 day units. It was just leftover and second choice options that sold those out not the first choice option. Encourage the second choice and leftover people to apply in the other units as well.

With the proposed additions, as a whole using the 2022 data, the state would have had an excess of 16 licenses in 2022 (see my attached file again).

I would encourage you to vote no on increasing the licenses. There's already plenty of licenses in the state that go unused. People just need to be encouraged to apply for the less popular units like residents and non-residents are for deer hunting.

Thanks for your time,
 Eric

Name NICHOLAS GILMORE City, State MILBANK SD Create Date 03/13/2023 10:06:23 PM
 Comment Attachment:

The public land areas that I have historically hunted with good success in years past are now overrun by out of state hunters, making access more difficult and driving birds out. Many private landowners that have allowed me to hunt in the past are increasingly annoyed by any hunter due to the ridiculous fall traffic, making permission harder to get for these areas as well. As a year round tax payer in the state of SD, not a three day boost, I beg you to stop increasing the non resident licenses, for all species.

Issue NONRESIDENT WATERFOWL

Position OPPOSE

Name JON LOHR City, State BRANDON SD Create Date 03/15/2023 8:34:30 AM

Comment Attachment:

Please stop increasing out of state waterfowl licenses. It's already so hard to find hunting opportunities in this state the way it is. Out of states are bringing large check books and paying for access to properties. Your typical resident hunter can't afford to take their kids on paid hunts. This is already discouraging young hunters like my teen son. Look what has happened to ND and learn from it. Thank you.

Name JEFFREY CLOW City, State HARRISBURG SD Create Date 03/31/2023 3:29:53 PM

Comment Attachment:

There are more than enough Nonresident Waterfowl licenses issued now

Issue OTHER

Position SUPPORT

Name ALEX PERMANN City, State CHAMBERLAIN SD Create Date 03/08/2023 3:21:25 PM

Comment Attachment:

Moving the elk application and draw earlier in the year is a great idea!

Name BOB BRANDT City, State RAPID CITY SD Create Date 03/08/2023 8:34:28 PM

Comment Attachment: gfp_elk_preference_points_c2e2f109d.docx

proposed change to the elk, sheep preference system

Name JEREMY WELLS City, State STURGIS SD Create Date 03/21/2023 10:27:53 AM

Comment Attachment:

I strongly support a hound season in the fire district of the black hills for the reason the numbers are high and the management process as of late isn't working to the extent it needs to. I know the boot hunters will oppose a hound season because they want the numbers so high they can cut a track on every rd in the black hills and shoot them from the road. The ungulates are suffering especially the bighorn sheep, mt goats, turkeys and elk. I propose the black hills be broken down into smaller units to focus more on certain areas to help the bighorn sheep and mt goats. With each unit having its own harvest limit males/females. Make it a requirement to use tracking units with the shock collars built in to them so theres complete control of the dogs minimizing any trespassing issues. Issue a hound handler permit instead of access permits and keep it residents only. Also work directly with gfp in establishing and maintaining this season and making changes that work for everyone. The system in Wyoming seems to work well and I'm aware there may need to be some slight changes to accommodate South Dakota.

Position OTHER

Name BRANDON GIESER City, State CLAIRE CITY SD Create Date 03/07/2023 8:21:50 AM

Comment Attachment:

Please put a stop to this nonsense of non residents raping our resources and allowing road hunting for pheasants , We as landowners and I renters are REQUIRED to mow the ditches and take care of the land and of course for the landowners pay taxes, this to me seems like it is a gateway for road hunters. It has in many cases been the reason for trespassing. Please look at changing this and not just at the dollars.

Issue OTHER

Position OTHER

Name JEFFREY OLSON City, State RAPID CITY SD Create Date 03/08/2023 2:42:35 PM

Comment Attachment:

Governance Meeting

I was sent to this site when trying to comment on the governance meeting. I am not sure if you will receive this tomorrow morning or not.

One and half hours for this meeting sure seems like a very short time to time cover all the points of discussion. We took 4-8 hours each spring to run these all important meetings. The GFP did NOT run these meetings. We brought in outside consultants that did a very good job. I can not begin to tell you how important I feel governance meetings are. Remember, you work of the stakeholders, not the GFP. There are so many things to learn on how best to represent the stakeholders and protect the resource that does not always come from the department. The process of working with the department is also very important to review.

There are always more than one way to look at an issue. How to gather ALL the information before making a decision should be discussed in these meetings. The role of the commission needs to be reviewed. You control the budget. That is a powerful tool to use if you feel you are not getting all the information or being mislead. I believe the GFP commission is THE most important commission in SD and that is a big job. Just a little history of some thing I went thru when I was on the commission. A tough job and it can be easy just to listen to the department sometimes. The governance meetings are a great place to think outside the box and get the feel on what is the best way to represent the stakeholders. In short, the commission is in place to not rubber stamp the GFP but to oversee them on the behalf of our sportsmen, landowners and our states great resources. Jeff Olson

Name ED HILLER City, State ARLINGTON SD Create Date 03/08/2023 3:58:48 PM

Comment Attachment: Dear_commissioners_c96b5f663.docx

Name TIM SKINNER City, State RAPID CITY SD Create Date 03/13/2023 3:23:58 PM

Comment Attachment:

Remove non resident archery mule deer. I live in the BH National Forest and the quality of mule deer population is greatly diminished with out of state archery hunters shooting younger class mule deer especially does. Specifically in the Jasper burn areas. Preference is to remove all mule deer options.

Secondly, raise licensing fees. We are ridiculously low compared to neighboring states. Double the price would put us in line. Thanks for the consideration.

Tim Skinner

Name RICK SOLBERG City, State BALTIC SD Create Date 03/18/2023 12:20:47 PM

Comment Attachment:

The state needs to address non resident licenses and fees. You let non residents come here and rape our fish and wild life for way less than other states. We should not have unlimited non resident licenses. Should be like other states and triple or more the fee's. If you are just greedy for the money,less tags and higher fees. Thanks

Name NICHOLAS SJOLIN City, State BUFFALO MN Create Date 03/23/2023 7:25:43 PM

Comment Attachment:

Wondering why you call it public land when non residents cant hunt it. You take away the point of it being public. I have hunted in SD for close to 20 years and only taken a few deer. I enjoy being out there in SD but this is going to make extremely hard to do. I lost my best friend out there and enjoy be where i last seen him alive. The times we had out in SD was time well spent.

Issue OTHER

Position OPPOSE

Name JIM KIRK City, State SPRINGFIELD SD Create Date 03/07/2023 9:37:37 AM

Comment Attachment:

Oppose opening date of South Zone waterfowl season. Opening date should go back to 2 weeks following middle zone. Previous decision to open a month later than rest of SD was among most misinformed & worst ever made by Commission. Springfield Bottoms (Niobrara River into Lewis & Clark Lake) is heart of South zone. I'VE HUNTED THERE EACH OF THE PAST 55 YEARS!! By mid December river hunting is done. USACE always restricts water discharge around end of Nov. or earlier causing river elevation in the marsh and all back water hunting areas to freeze in. Marinas are froze in & GFP pulls out the ramp docks around Dec 1. All of which makes boat access & any hunting opportunity on river near impossible. Opening south zone so late has in effect eliminated 2 weeks of our season. The first 2 weeks which are typically mild, marsh full of teal & other puddlers, was good time to take kids. NE season has already opened 1 or 2 weeks before SD. How does that make since? I know of 2 guys who no longer purchase SD hunting licenses because season opens so late, but instead buy NE non-resident so they can hunt river earlier when there are ducks around. Please consider.

Name MARK PEDERSON City, State WATERTOWN SD Create Date 03/13/2023 9:00:51 PM

Comment Attachment:

Please don't sell out our (resident) Archery licenses to out of state individuals. It's hard enough to secure archery hunting privileges without having to compete with big money coming in buying it out from under us. Pheasant hunting comes to mind. I'm not the only life long residence/outdoorsman of South Dakota who feels Governor Nome is deliberately selling our wildlife to out of state people because she feels resident hunters don't contribute enough. I've contacted SDGFP in the past about out of state people coming into our state and one comment made by a employee was "I'm not suppose to say anything, but I will say that Gov. Nome is very, very hands on when it comes to the SDGFP." Bottom line for me is. Severely restrict the unlimited archery permits for any deer to out of state individuals.

Name GREGORY FORSTNER City, State RAPID CITY SD Create Date 03/14/2023 8:57:29 AM

Comment Attachment:

I strongly oppose the the limit on out of state archery tags for non residents. Has the commission ever given an explanation for the changes in policy? I have family that come from MN to archery hunt the Black Hills every year. They do their hunting in Nov. during the firearms season and their success rate is not great but they don't care. They don't travel here specifically to shoot a deer. It's more about spending time together and if they do manage to harvest a deer it's a bonus. I no my comment will not change anything but it is sad that a handful of people can change policy that effects so many and in which they have very little accountability.

Name DAVID LEWIS City, State RAYMOND SD Create Date 03/21/2023 9:03:35 AM

Comment Attachment:

I oppose Unlimited Nonresident Archery Deer: I know this is totally to benefit outfitters based on the proposal. I am a South Dakota resident and landowner and our concerns should outweigh nonresidents that don't live and pay taxes in our great state. This proposal causes an increased burden on land owners in South Dakota because, out of state and out of county hunters will trespass and hunt private property without permission. This will also increase the outfitters to trespass hunt. I already spend too much time patrolling my property to keep people off my property. So if you pass this then you should increase the trespassing fines to \$1000 because the current \$79 fine does not deter trespass hunters. Also if outfitters are caught trespass hunting, they should lose their outfitter license for two years and a \$10,000 fine. Most out of state and out of county hunters I catch on my property have the mentality that I bought a tag and I can hunt anywhere I want and they would risk getting caught and paying \$79 for a fine versus harvesting a nice deer. Please take the landowner into consideration before the out of state money the outfitters will bring in.

Name RODNEY PUTNAM City, State PIEDMONT SD Create Date 04/03/2023 10:45:01 AM

Comment Attachment:

Shooting Range north of Rapid City bid. Please do not approve this bid as it way over engineer estimate and totally out of line. Also only one bid submitted as Rapid City area general contractors didn't even know about bid!!!!

Name MARK SCHARN City, State RAPID CITY SD Create Date 04/07/2023 8:20:15 AM

Comment Attachment:

I have camped at Center Lake in Custer State Park for many years-30 plus. Your decision to move to same day camping reservations has forced me to make other arrangements. Not being able to make reservations ahead of time removes the ability to plan and if not available when we want to go leaves too little time to make reservations elsewhere - so I will just go elsewhere. This is a TERRIBLE decision please reconsider!

Issue PUBLIC LANDS AND WATERS**Position OPPOSE**

Name DOUG HUNHOFF City, State SMITHVILLE MO Create Date 03/10/2023 10:38:43 AM

Comment Attachment:

Wow very disappointed in the commissions decision to limit tags for public lands... I'm sure all the info of over crowding came from resident hunters. My brother and two of our friends are residents of South Dakota and we have hunted out by Edgemont for 30 years and literally have seen very few archers and some days none. Kind of hard to say it's over crowed.... Good luck in the future of ruining the fun in hunting for non residents.

Sincerely
Doug Hunhoff

Issue REFUGE DEER**Position OPPOSE**

Name ERIC PULIS City, State ABERDEEN SD Create Date 03/13/2023 7:08:13 PM

Comment Attachment:

Dear Commissioners,
I am opposed to making refuge deer SL4 Sand Lake, muzzleloader without telescopic sights. This season will often fall over the Thanksgiving holiday weekend when kids have off school proving opportunity for them. I hope to have my girls participate in this season with telescopic sights. People who want to hunt with muzzleloaders without telescopic sights can hunt during any of the firearms seasons under the current regulations when they draw a tag. If the reasoning is to decrease deer killed on the refuge perhaps decreasing the number to tags allotted to this season would have a more predictable result.
Thank you for your time.
Cordially,

Eric Pulis

Issue WATERFOWL SEASONS**Position SUPPORT**

Name TRISTAN GAU City, State LAKE ANDES SD Create Date 03/22/2023 9:11:13 AM

Comment Attachment:

Spring dark goose season along with the snowgeese but with limits.
Or

Change in the white fronted goose season from winter to spring with 1-3 bird increased limit (5,6 bid limit)
Implemented Statewide or either in unit 2
(Can keep winter season but set limit to 1,2 bird limits)

We have the new 3 duck license Implemented for a season in spring as well? Say if some one bought the other tag for 6 ducks they would then have to buy the 3 duck tag as well for spring duck or have 2 different tags for winter and another for spring so if they bought the 3duck tag for winter they would have to buy the second if they wanted to hunt in Feb april march months as well
All extra \$ earned from spring should go back into waterfowl habitats, more public hunting to rivers or lakes or better access ex. Clearing snow from the only road to a spot witin miles,hatching, banding

Issue WATERFOWL SEASONS

Position OPPOSE

Name JUSTIN ALLEN City, State PIERRE SD Create Date 03/28/2023 7:47:02 AM

Comment Attachment:

I'm opposed to any changes that increase the amount of waterfowl licenses to Non Residents in South Dakota. If GFP is concerned about resident hunters number lets address that, not increase NR opportunities. GFP stated in their proposal increasing NR hunters will not effect opportunities of resident hunters. I'm not sure how they can even mention that, fairly laughable. Leasing of land for all hunting in SD is out of control and increasing NR hunters only increases that problem. Resident waterfowl hunter numbers have actually stayed about the same other the last 7 or 8 years. GFP is using 20 year old waterfowl hunter numbers to push their agenda, let's use recent numbers. Increasing NR license by 5% per year over the next 10 years basically doubles the number of NR waterfowl hunters in SD. Manage the resources of the state for the resident not increasing NR licenses sale revenue. Lets protect and promote the resources of SD to the residents of SD before increasing opportunities to NR.

Justin Allen
Pierre, SD

Issue WEST RIVER DEER

Position OPPOSE

Name MICHAEL WILSON City, State BELLEVUE NE Create Date 03/14/2023 11:06:05 AM

Comment Attachment:

The decisions to reduce nonresident archery tags for deer and antelope are not based on science, not based on animal populations, it's based on money. There are powerful lobbyists that do not want to share public land with DIY hunters. They want hunters using outfitters and paying huge fees for leases or trespass hunts on private land. Another group is over reacting to a pulse of new hunters cause by the popularity of hunting on social media and some from a covid surge. These are both temporary phenomenons that will crash. The result of less tags will be an explosion of animal populations ruining crops and damaging cars and then the budget shortfalls from reduced tags sales. Have you told the local gas stations, restaurants, tshirt shops, grocery stores? They're gonna get massively affected by the loss of nonresident hunters too. How will you make up your budget shortfalls? Increased tag fees. You are over reacting to two groups who want public land all to themselves and another group who wants all the money and hates DIY bowhunters. Follow the science not the dollar.

Dear South Dakota Game Fish and Parks Commission

Re: Non-resident Waterfowl Licenses

Another increase of non-resident waterfowl licenses? This issue has been discussed over and over and over again. It has not been easy to keep a fair balance but at one point, we believe compromises had been met and a good number was reached that was fair for both sides of the issue. An increase in non-res license resulted in an improvement in access for residents. Working groups were put together, lots of public input and discussion was provided. Tons of testimony was heard. The Black Hills Sportsmen Club believe the balance was good. That did not happen this time. The department is bringing a 5% increase with no consideration or plans to help the resident sportsman. The commercial industry has continued to push for more and nothing has been offered in return for the resident hunter. It is misleading and unfair for the department to state there is a decline in local waterfowl hunters so might as well give more to the commercial industry.

Three years ago, the GFP worked closely with the SDWF and the SD Waterfowl association to see what could be done to help waterfowlers with better access and to eliminate some of the barriers that are preventing hunters from waterfowl hunting. Instead of just saying no to more non-res tags, the SDWF worked proactively to come up with solutions. In Rebuilding South Dakota's Waterfowl Hunting Heritage, 14 great ideas were proposed. The South Dakota Game Fish and Parks Waterfowl Hunting Access Plan was a draft worked on by all parties. Why has the department not followed through with this? There is little to no activity to help local waterfowl hunters. Those issues need to be addressed before more non-resident tags can be approved. Please find time to review the three documents that have been sent to the commission.

Thanks as always for your time.

Cody Hodson

President Black Hills Sportsman Club

Lewis and Clark Marina Fee Proposal - Comment

Dear Commissioners,

The docks at Lewis & Clark Marina needed to be replaced. The concern that many slip holders, including myself, have is the loosely managed approach being used to accomplish the project and the financial consequences. The cost increases to the slip holders are shocking and out of line with what was originally proposed.

The cost of the 10 x 24 shared slip, which we have had since 2018 has nearly doubled. In just two years, from 2021 the slip cost of \$1550.00 (without fees and taxes) has increased to \$2700 in 2023.

It appears the current approach is put the new docks in at any cost and pass the costs onto the slip holders.

Please consider alternatives to what has occurred to have a properly managed project that is financially feasible. Freeze the previously approved rates until a more complete evaluation of the project is accomplished.

Thank you for your consideration,

Kevin Kuhl

Public Comment Attachment: #10274 Ed Hiller

Dear commissioners,

South Dakota has become a go to state for hunters who do not draw tags in western states and still wish to hunt Mule deer and Pronghorns. Licenses are cheap and unlimited. We need to put a limit on the number of nonresidents like we have with rifle tags. The number of nonresidents coming to hunt them will continue to increase. Now is the time to enact a cap.

If we wish to hunt bears in neighboring states to the east, we have to buy preference points for several years before getting lucky enough to draw a tag. I understand that, since they have a limited number of bears. Being on the eastern edge of the Mule Deer and Pronghorn range we also need to limit tags.

Sincerely,

Ed Hiller

Arlington, SD

Mountaintop Construction Inc.

**Bob Brandt
8705 Sila Pl.
Rapid City, SD 57702
Cell (605) 209-8030**

March 8, 2023

To: SD GF&P Commission

Ref: Proposed change to the elk preference points rules

To Whom It May Concern:

I have been applying for elk tags in SD since the mid 1980's and drew my rifle tag in 1998 with 14 years preference and my archery tag in 2017, also with 14 years preference. I settled for a CSP cow tag in 1985 and have over 25 points for an CSP archery tag and a bighorn sheep tag. I was the co-chair of the BH Chapter of the RMEF for the first couple of years and we fully supported the institution of the \$5 application fee, knowing that the money raised would go to support our incredible, but limited elk population. I have 14 points for my second rifle tag. I will turn 70 years old this summer and while I am in pretty good shape, I realize the chances of me hunting elk again in the Black Hills are getting slim. Like most of us old-timers, we have been faithfully sending our \$15 to \$20 application fees in for a long time, and seen the number of applicants rise every year; and so, our chances of drawing a tag get less and less every year. When you are in your 40's or even 50's it doesn't seem so hopeless, but with the average number of points needed to draw an elk tag exceeding 20, we quickly realize that our chances are getting slim. John Kanta told me that you have received other requests to alter the preference system, and rejected all of them, I sincerely hope you will consider this one worthy of a change, and by the way, John's dad, whom just turned 70, is all for this proposal. While this change certainly will not guarantee us another elk license, it may give some of us another chance to hunt elk in the Black Hills while we can still enjoy it and give it the effort a hunt of this quality deserves. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Bob Brandt

Public Comment Attachment: #10282: Eric Paulson

** Based on first choice numbers and first draw

	Licenses	Turned Down
00A86	250	149
00B86	3725	1087
11A86	25	3
00V86	500	-241
00X86	750	-735
00Y86	500	55
00Z86	250	-34
	<u>6000</u>	<u>284</u>

** Based on first choice numbers and first draw

	Licenses	Turned Down
00A86	250	149
00B86	3925	887
11A86	25	3
00V86	550	-291
00X86	750	-735
00Y86	500	55
00Z86	300	-84
	<u>6300</u>	<u>-16</u>

DEPARTMENT OF GAME, FISH, AND PARKS NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING

This meeting will be held in person, via zoom/conference call, and Livestream. Listen to the meeting beginning at 2:00 p.m. CST via Livestream at <https://www.sd.net/remote1/> or join via zoom by clicking on the link below. Depending on your application, you may be required to enter the meeting ID and password. Remember to **enter your display name and mute your microphone**. To help keep background noise and distractions to a minimum, make sure you **mute your microphone and turn off your video** when you are not speaking.

Thursday, April 13, 2023, at 2 pm CST, and Friday, April 14, 2023, at 8 am CST.

Zoom Meeting Link <https://state-sd.zoom.us/j/93912915359?pwd=K2FVZzdQSXJTY0NwWG5mSWpSazUwdz09>
or join via conference call Dial 1 669 444 9171 Meeting ID: 939 1291 5359 Passcode: 0565645

Public Input: To provide comments, join the meeting in person, via zoom, or via conference call per the info above. To conduct the public hearing and/or open forum as efficiently as possible, we ask those wishing to testify to **register by 1:00 pm CST the day of the meeting by email to Liz.Kierl@state.sd.us**. **Testifiers should provide their full names, whom they represent, their city of residence, and which proposed topic they will address.**

Written comments can be submitted at <https://gfp.sd.gov/forms/positions/>. To be included in the public record, comments must include the complete name and city of residence and meet the **submission deadline of seventy-two hours before the meeting (not including the day of the meeting)**.

Dated this 6th day of April 2023.

s/b Stephanie Rissler

Stephanie Rissler, GFP Commission Chair