

---

**Arlyn Abrams**  
**Beresford SD**  
**AJABRAMS@BMTc.NET**

**Comment:**

support

---

**James Lietz**  
**Brookings SD**  
**jblietz@brookings.net**

**Comment:**

Looks like the old under the table dealings. You are not providing me with more hunting opportunity. giving more out of state hunters to come and make individuals who charge for out of hunters more money. ruining south dakota state residents family traditions. All for the almighty dollar. How many pieces of silver do you need.

---

**Ken Grosch**  
**Sturgis SD**  
**Kenegrosch@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

support

---

**James Stengle**  
**Yankton SD**  
**jbstengle@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

As a Certified Wildlife Biologist (CWB) and long-time hunter, I am concerned that your plan discriminates against a small but important segment of the hunting population. That would be East River Non-Resident (NR) LANDOWNERS. Under the present and proposed system, any NR can apply for East River (rifle) tags only if there are any leftover from the last drawing. There is no other options for NR Landowners. This seems terribly unfair to those NR Landowners that want to hunt on their own property but seldom, if ever, get the opportunity to even APPLY for a tag because there are none available. Those NR Landowners pay considerable taxes on their land. Their lands support wildlife and wildlife habitat. Even though they own the land, pay taxes on their property, and support wildlife/wildlife habitat on those properties, they are discriminated against by the system. That is a terrible system that does not allow a landowner to hunt on their own property. The number of NR landowners is small in comparison with resident landowners. A portion of the overall tags could easily be allocated to NR landowners. If they are not purchased by the landowner to hunt on their own property, the tags could then be included in the leftover draw and opened to anyone. Just saying because discrimination is wrong. A tag allocation for NR Landowners should be developed so that at the least they have an opportunity to apply for a tag to hunt their own property!

---

**Bob Lee**

**Watertown SD**

**Bl@wat.midco.net**

**Comment:**

Two any deer tags is enough people are spoiled in South Dakota they think they should have all they can get for any deer the two is great plenty thank you for doing this.

---

**John Wilson**

**Rapid City SD**

**jkw4002@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I see people that will put in for bh and wr deer and only recieve 1 deer permit any way. so what is the differance in putting for SB/ WR or SB/ HD what is the deal with the SB permit. I never put in for that permit. You are just look out that trophy hunters. Just like when you upped the size limit on trout a few years ago. You were looking out for the fly fisher-man that had a hard time catching big trout. Joke

---

**Thomas Larson**

**Parker SD**

**Comment:**

Nothing wrong with how the draw system is now. Drawings should remain seperate. Most the people that say they never get a tag forget to send in or don't understand the preference system.

---

**Scott Olson**

**Custer SD**

**sdolson092404@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

support

---

**Ron Schuch**

**Rapid City SD**

**rcschuchs4@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Having grown up in east river I hunt both east and west river seasons. I will now have to choose between both seasons. The county that I hunt east river NEVER has left over tags for an any deer license. This would mean having to choose between east or west ricer seasons and never hunting one or the other again. This doesn't work for me.

---

**Wayne Shanks**

**Colton SD**

**Wshanks56@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I support the new deer license proposal with one exception. As a land owner in Minnehaha co I highly suggest going to slug only and eliminate rifle in the entire county. Minnehaha county rural is becoming very populated. Both me and my newborn have had close calls from rifle bullets. Hole in barn and bullet hit close to my feet. To a point I don't want my grandkids outside during season. Please consider request. I'm an avid hunter that is concerned for safety. Don't wait until someone is seriously injured.

---

**Bobby Pudwill**

**Milbank SD**

**Bobby.pudwill@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

This compromise approach and the expected results is a significant improvement over the original proposal. I would recommend however that this proposal is given a two year trial prior to becoming a permanent solution.

---

**Jeff Whillock**

**Ab SD**

**jwhillock@abe.midc**

**Comment:**

This compromise makes very good sense to me. I appreciate the opportunities that this will provide -- for both more hunters to have opportunities and also those who want to hunt more than one area to be able to apply for two on first draw. Well done! Thank you for the collaboration and listening.

---

**Bryan Schnell**

**Rapid City SD**

**pir@rap.midco.net**

**Comment:**

I have tried to - and believe I have- read everything you have distributed about this proposal, both from your website & media stories. I have called the GFP Chairman & Kevin Robling . My question is:What about my existing preference points that me and my active duty military/law enforcement sons (all SD residents) have been accumulating for many years? Mr. Robling assured me they would not be lost, and stated that they needed to get the word out better about that, indicated he was going to do so (2+ months ago) and still no definitive written word. WILL WE LOSE OUR PRE-EXISTING PREFERENCE POINTS OR NOT? Is it yes; no; or maybe? The fact that you have never addressed this outright -that I have seen, maybe I missed it- makes me very concerned about the forthright motivations behind this deal. I am not a conspiracy guy....but I just want a straight answer, in writing, on the record. Can you please answer the question that many hunters and I have discussed, with NO ONE having seen a published answer. Thank you for your answer or directing me to the previously published written public citation clarifying this aspect. Respectfully, BHS

---

**Jeremy Nettifee**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**jerenet1341@live.com**

**Comment:**

Please leave the current system in place. There is nothing wrong with it.

---

**Lee Whitcraft**  
**Webster WI**  
**leew@schooltechbiz.com**

**Comment:**

I have hunted or applied to hunt in South Dakota the past few years. I continue to accumulate preference points for West River rifle and always seem to be fighting a moving target that gives much more opportunity to resident hunters.

I understand you want to retain and increase resident hunter applications but you are discouraging us non-residents.

I hope you reconsider your stance on limiting non resident hunter opportunities.

---

**Justin Smith**  
**De Smet SD**  
**justinsmith\_99@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I like this far better than the original version having said that I still feel you are trying to fix something that isn't broken! I suggest adding the preference point benefits for kids that you've added to your proposal to the current draw system

---

**Randal Turbak**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**randy.turb@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

The Compromise Proposal for deer hunting licenses is much better than the original proposal that mandated an applicant choose only one hunting season. I approve of this.



---

**Ted Judd**  
**Fowlerville MI**  
**mjbldrs@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose this proposal. As a non resident deer hunter of 25 years I have hunted a few different west river units but have spent most years on a ranch in Jackson county. The time I have spent there has been wonderful for me but beneficial for the ranch as well. Every year along with a lease fee I take on projects to help out around the ranch. Making it more difficult for non residents to hunt in SD would likely have many negative affects that may easily overlooked. I hope many of the ranchers that count on the non resident leases are aware of what is going on before it is too late for there voice to be heard.

---

**Matt Stephens**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**Royko68@rushmore.com**

**Comment:**

I thought the prior proposal was a better approach to getting more hunters in the field. With this new proposal, we Hills hunters will still be squeezed out by those hunters applying for both Hills and WR.

---

**Joseph Bowman**  
**Piedmont SD**  
**damnidanyway@protonmail.com**

**Comment:**

I feel and have always felt that the single first choice allocation originally introduced is a fair and balanced method of license allocation. The people that are complaining of it not being fair are the ones that draw multiple tags yearly at the expense of other preference point holders. If this was to be a truly fair allocation, archery would be included in the first choice allocation. It is ridiculous that with the modern advancements in archery weapons that this season continues to have licenses provided on an unlimited basis.

---

**Gaylord Evans**  
**Hot Springs SD**  
**max.evans8@aol.com**

**Comment:**

You guys are doing a Great job keep it up.You are doing what is best for now and the future generations .

---

**Tom Riddle**  
**Mitchell SD**  
**Riddleandsons@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Leave Deer season apps alone,I not sure why this commission is so possessed on changing the season apps. Listen to the hunters they want it left alone

---

**Clint Peterson**  
**Box Elder SD**

**Comment:**

You need to start limiting the non-resident tags before you limit the resident. Non-resident can get East River and West River Archery tag, Black hills tag and West River tag all in one year. They should at the least be limited to one archery tag.

---

**Ernest Getty**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**gettyec1948@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

In the past 5 decades I have had the opportunity to apply for numerous any, or buck, deer tags in the first drawing. Odds being what they were I could usually draw 1 or, sometimes, 2 buck tags in that first draw usually with the help of preference points.

I fear if I am unsuccessful now with only two deer season choices that most, if not all, buck deer tags will be gone for the second draw period.

Thank you.

---

**Ernest Getty**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**gettyec1948@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I do not support limiting the deer application process to 2 choices.

My concern is, what happens to my preference points in the other seasons that I can not apply for in the first drawing ?

If there are no buck-deer tags left in the second draw in the seasons I was not allow to put in for in the first draw because of the 2-season limit do those "other" second season preference points just sit there?

Will I be able to buy a preference point in the second draw if there are no buck tags left ,and, I don't apply for a doe ?

Will I be able to use all of my accumulated deer seasons preference point for the season, or two, I do put in for in the first draw ?

Thank you.

---

**Dennis Winters**

**Pierre SD**

**dwinters22@pie.midco.net**

**Comment:**

I am in favor of the original proposal to allow only one application in the first draw in the hunting season of your choice.

---

**Dan Snyder**

**Pierre SD**

**Shunkaska57501@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Starting this summer my opinion has not changed in leaving the system alone. I help a rancher, over 100's of hours donated labor for the right to hunt on his property, your data showed only a 6% increase in a chance of a draw, I have 1 year of preference. East River West Sully any deer I have 5 yrs of preference were there are only 100 licenses of any deer, and half go to land owners. Land owners feed the deer all yr I have no problem but again in this unit my odds wouldn't increase much. Than with 3 yrs of preference with muzzle loader I am about to draw again. If I can only apply for 2 with no guarantee, why not leave it be, my chances to get west sully and muzzle loader will be good this coming year because I have patiently waited my turn, if not than maybe next year. As a teacher today kids in Pierre are very active, fishing, hunting its Ok for them to also wait their turn, its something taught at home.

---

**Daniel Conrad**

**Rapid Ciry SD**

**d\_boone71@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I would like to keep it the same. 50% wanted change but 50% where happy. Don't change just to change. Change if it is right. Youth shouldn't have an advantage over older hunters. I have paid my dues and deserve tags that I never got when I was young. I am the one paying the money!!!!

---

**Shaun Thomas**

**Tyler MN**

**sthomaselectric@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

As a nonresident, with family that owns land east river I am not able to ever get a rifle buck tag. I pay about 9 times more then a resident and am willing to pay that. It is not right that I can't even have a chance at a tag. The land is in Hughes. County. Or make a land owners tag transferable for a price

---

**Stephen Turner**

**Rapid City SD**

**smturner60@rap.midco.net**

**Comment:**

Look @landowner tags also, are they only too hunt there land for the degradation? Seen there's a group 7 them that dont, also trying to get archery servay too down load. It doesn't work, thanks

---

**Michael Bowman**

**Rapid City SD**

**Comment:**

You started out to spread out the deer licenses and make it easier to get the ONE you prefer. You say you lost support but that is untrue--only the people who were getting multiple tags are upset. Now you are back to square one. Basically GFP caters to archery and east river deer hunters. End of story.

---

**Mitchell Bradley**

**Rapid City SD**

**Comment:**

Resident hunters should be given priority over nonresidents. Each hunter should only be allowed one buck tag per year. There are too many tags given out. Every public area is overcrowded, it is not safe.

---

**Kyle Couchey**

**Mina SD**

**sdcouchey@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Stop changing what is not broken!!! This goes for every other change you guys keep trying to do.

---

**Chad Blodgett**

**Black Hawk SD**

**Jerx0313@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Just leave it the way it is. I haven't talked to any one that supports the new proposal. If you wanna change something, how about you do more for veterans like other states do!

---

**Donald Hinson**  
**Jacksonville FL**  
**dphinson@comcast.net**

**Comment:**

have commented before. own 1400 acres in west river. pay taxes and invest in community farming and ranching same but cannot get landowner tags due to not being resident. would like to see landowner tags allowed for non-residents if they own 1000+ acres or some other way such as increased preference points for non resident landowners.

---

**Steven Frooman**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**sfrooman@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I opposed the rifle deer license allocation proposal the Commission approved in November 2018. While I remain unconvinced of the need for any changes\*, the proposed structure as of the end of the January 2019 meeting does not have the same flaws I objected to. Accordingly, as long as nothing changes from the proposal as presented on the GFP website 1/19/2019, I support its adoption and finalization at the Commission's February 28/March 1st 2019 meeting.

\* As long as any rifle deer tags are available as leftovers following all the drawings, I believe it is misleading at best to say that people are unable to hunt because they "couldn't get a tag". No, they couldn't get as good a tag as they wanted. Big deal. And for what it's worth, I know from personal experience that a satisfying hunt can be had with leftover tags. My 2017 hunt was with a 35C13 tag I bought as a leftover and I had a great time with plenty of opportunities to fill the tag.

---

**Rob Flannery**  
**Yankton SD**

**Comment:**

Looks like a, swims like a, and quacks like a duck, its probably a Deer.  
The "why" has not been addressed for the catalyst and reason for change.

---

**Robert Hettinger**  
**Pierre SD**  
**bobbyhettinger@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

What's going to happen to the already low deer populations when everybody gets their tags? Will tag number still be regulated?

---

**Doug Baltzer**

**Mitchell SD**

**douglinda\_b@centurylink.net**

**Comment:**

The revised format is an improvement over the first drawing change proposed but I still do not want to have to chose a preferred license in the first two drawings. I would rather the system stay as it currently is.

---

**Louis Vaughn**

**Rapid City SD**

**lnvaughn@rap.midco.net**

**Comment:**

There is nothing wrong with the current process. Leave it as it is!

---

**Marty McClure**

**Martin TN**

**martymcclure161@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I have family in South Dakota and its very hard to impossible for me to get a tag.. the 8% is not enough! Non residents bring in a lot more money to your state and should be given a better chance to get tags, not put dead last. If it wasn't for non-residents sending money to hunt your state you would have a hard time founding any of your projects and to give us only 8% and put us dead last in the options is a slap in our face!!!

---

**William Jennings**

**Etta MS**

**wcjsrj@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I myself personally grew up in South Dakota and I want to start by saying I love what you have done to manage and grow quality bucks. However I am a little irritated that there is only 8% of the tags allocated to non-residents. I feel when we (non-residents) come we are helping the local economy. We stay in a cabin at Mountain Meadows resort in the black hills. We eat out in Hill City, Deadwood. I do not see where that non-resident number could not be raised to 15%. We generally draw a tag about every 4 years now. It use to be every other year. I can only assume more hunters are applying is why the time lapse has changed on our successful drawing of a deer tag.

---

**Mike Taylor**

**Comins MI**

**manmtaylor@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

you are making it harder and harder for nonresidents to get tags ? must be you don' want our business

---

**Thad Nafzuger**

**Pierre SD**

**Thadnafziger@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

While I feel no changes were necessary to the drawing system to begin with, I know many felt the same way I did through various forms of communication, social media, etc. The powers that be (commission) surely seemed bent on pushing this proposed change, regardless of the public outcry (that evidently was loud enough to put the brakes on the original proposal) & believe me I spoke to many, & was an attendee at one of the original focus groups—it seemed that nobody wanted this change. Now we have a revised addition to this plan that albeit is slightly more favorable in my & many's eyes, it is still a fix to a non-problem that wasn't broken. For once at least enough harping & clamoring from "the people that pay your salaries"

(if you are truly license dollars funded—doubtful) stopped or at the very least amended yet another unnecessary change, that would appear to be driven by the need to continually change & tinker with things for a couple reasons, & one of them being, in my opinion to justify an entirely over staffed with unnecessary positions—department of game fish & parks, & to follow recommendations from a commission that has entirely too much power, does not represent the everyday sportsman/woman of this state, & needs to be reigned in, either disbanded or at the very least be held accountable by making entrance to this commission solely through a vote of the resident voting population of this state, then & only then would I be in favor of this commission & any recommendations they would make. At the rate of sounding petty, congratulations (and only with a heck of a lot of upset sportsmen/women expressing their concern on this issue) on making a compromise that was at least a little palatable & representative for & of the people you folks are supposed to represent

---

**Branden Abeln**

**Groton SD**

**Comment:**

Focusing on the youth I definitely agree with. As far as the other changes in the draw structure I'm very skeptical. Some of us live for deer season to put meat in the freezer and try to shoot bucks. If the buck part is getting reduced a guy will have to start going out of state to get them.

---

**Kenneth Nigg**

**Watertown SD**

**kjnigg@midco.net**

**Comment:**

I have a lot of family land in Roberts County that I can Deer Hunt. When I was younger I would get a tag for Roberts everytime I applied. Now I am lucky to get one every 2 to 3 years. This adds a lot of expense and travel for my Son and I. When I have to drive a long distance and stay in a Motel. I have to leave a lot earlier. Then before opener I have to go scout just to have an out of state pheasant hunter park next to me, knowing someone is in this spot hunting, and walk with their dog thru my hunt. This happened 3 times last year. It is just frustrating knowing I have a couple 1000 acres of private family land that I am the only one that hunts, when I can get a tag. Something needs to change.

---

**Patrick Rosenbaum**

**Jefferson SD**

**a5x5hunter07@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Do away with the drawing of deer tags for the black hills and go back to buying over the counter and do away with the buying preference points and allow more tags in every unit

---

**Bret Brown**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**bbrown68@me.com**

**Comment:**

Once again I can hardly understand the season proposal. I feel that until the deer population is back to where we want it that people should only have access to one tag per year, and one drawing per person with two choices and a second drawing for leftover tags. This would allow everyone the same chance until the population is back to the point where we could have multiple tags.

Another thing that I would like to see is one tag for all seasons. What I mean by that is, a single tag that could be used for archery, firearm, and muzzleloader seasons. This would help hunters actually have the ability to hunt when they had time. As a seasonal worker I barely had time to hunt during the firearms season due to the nice weather, and subsequently did not have many opportunities to fill a tag that I had finally acquired after many years of applying. I would have liked to be able to take that tag into muzzleloader season as well.

Speaking of muzzleloader season, I don't understand the idea that we cannot use a scope on a weapon that is already inferior to regular firearms. I feel that this rule should be changed to allow hunters the best chance to not leave a wounded deer in the field.

Thank you for your time and the wonderful job everyone does for our state resources.

Sincerely,  
Bret Brown

---

**William Locken**

**Lead SD**

**wjlocken@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I see you gave in to those greedy people who think they have to have more than one buck tag to be happy. Meanwhile we still have hunters who can't get their preferred tag just so someone can have more than one tag.

---

**Scott Peterson**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**north2dakota@sio.midco.net**

**Comment:**

This appears to be a good compromise, time will tell. I work in the sporting goods field and I hear hunters bragging how they received 5 - 9 tags and then filled two with no intentions of filling the other tags. The next hunter I speak with tells me they didn't get a tag or they only got one and are upset. A change is needed and this is a step.



---

**Bob Schneider**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**rjs5555@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

If I'm reading the current proposal correctly, ONLY landowners will have ability to apply for 2 licenses within the 1st draw (i.e.: need authorization for "Special Buck" licenses). Is that correct? FEW hunters are landowners! if that's the case, in my opinion, this "compromise" is a joke!

---

**Gordon Pierson**  
**Columbia SD**  
**e**

**Comment:**

why is one person allowed to get so many licenses , one person does not need over 2 or 4 not 10 plus , why don't you address this problem , there is not many deer to start with then you let the slob hunters run wild

---

**Scott Engle**  
**Independence MN**  
**scott.engle@mchsi.com**

**Comment:**

I have hunted in South Dakota for 20 years and have enjoyed many enjoyable deer and antelope hunts. With this new proposal, I see deer hunting in South Dakota becoming an every 5 year experience (if even that often). Being left to the final draw leaves few options and it has taken a minimum of 2-3 pref points to draw in my area. When in state, I spend over \$1000 per trip in your state, plus license fee (\$280). This is money your state and its businesses will forgo and drive me to other states in the interim years. This proposal is a bad idea for the economic development of South Dakota's tourism industry.

---

**Jerry Travis**  
**Brandon SD**

**Comment:**

I have always hunted east and west with family and would hate to see that tradition end

---

**Christopher Hannah**

**Hill City SD**

**mtcity1878@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

For my family these tags supplement our food for the year. Last year we didn't receive any tags due to people outside of our region getting them. We cannot afford to go anywhere else to hunt. By adding additional seasons to the first draw, my family has a reduced chance to get a tag at home. I believe if you want a tag from where you live, it should be your first choice. there shouldn't be two first choices, it just doesn't make sense. If you want to go into someone else's territory, your territory should be sacrificed. this shouldn't be about money, but be about what's right.

---

**Rick White**

**Summerset SD**

**Whiterick43@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Why must we change anything? I feel residents would be happier if the only change made was to lessen the number of nonresident tags while keeping the draw system the same

---

**Bill Berry**

**Rapid City SD**

**Bill.berry81@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

How come all the changes being made are tailored towards east river hunters. A simple fix would be to have the east/west river rifle seasons to open/close at the same time.

---

**Arlan Smedsrud**

**Chancellor SD**

**smedsrudarlan@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I don't think Custer Park and Refuge should be included in the draw proposal. I believe you should limit landowner preference to one choice. I don't want any nonresident hunters. This seems like an effort to maintain the current GFP budget after the loss of many non-resident pheasant hunters. Why are we always trying to sell everything that the residents of this state love. I live here because of the opportunities that are here, stop trying to squeeze every cent out of this state. Make budget cuts.

---

**David Mines**

**Yankton SD**

**davidmines4831@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Why won't you listen to the sportsman of this state? Your last terrible proposal generated 84 pages of comments. Roughly 262 comments with only 19 in favor. So about 7% of those who care enough to comment like your new plan yet you keep pushing forward with these changes. Our system works fine now. Adopt some of the ideas like the points for youth and let us accumulate points and apply for what ever season we want.

---

**Alex Whitcraft**

**Saint Paul MN**

**Comment:**

As a non-resident who applies yearly in order to have an opportunity to hunt species of deer not available in our state, I find this a decision that can only lead to negative consequences. It's a decision that will haunt SDGFP for years to come. Not only will you drive out non-resident hunters, you are going to be the reason why the number of sportsman continue to decline. These proposed regulations don't promote ethical hunters, they encourage road-side, flashlight, and illegal hunting. For those of you that hunt out of state and go through the preference point process year in and year out, does it make sense to increase restrictions??? By doing so, you're significantly reducing state income that would otherwise be there. If you want to promote hunting and hunter safety, you need to allow everyone an opportunity to share in the experiences.

---

**Cherril Brown**

**Rapid City SD**

**cd.brown@rap.midco.net**

**Comment:**

I think the latest proposal of SD residents being able to apply for 2 of the deer seasons at application time certainly would get my vote and my spouse's vote as well. Thanks.

---

**Dan Kaup**

**Mitchell SD**

**dskaup@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

The new proposal is an improvement over past practices as more individuals have the opportunity to hunt. It was nice to be able to apply for so many permits, but not necessary, especially when so many apply and so many are turned down. Some are complaining that they can't enjoy family activities, but I don't see why not...they can still go but just can't shoot. Not a problem.

---

**Wade Gubrud**

**Gary SD**

**wade.gubrud@pioneer.com**

**Comment:**

More non-landowners need an opportunity to draw a license. It took me 9 years to draw a statewide muzzleloader tag. I can buy a non-resident tag over the counter in MN. My family and I will be doing more deer hunting in MN in the future. Moved to SD 25 years ago looking forward to the hunting experiences and have watched my deer hunting opportunities get worse every year especially east river.

---

**Darrel Knutson**

**Rapid City SD**

**knutsondak@rushmore.com**

**Comment:**

I think your first idea of applying for 1 choice out of 6 was the way to go.

---

**Douglas Kindelspire**

**Leola (Mailing Address Is Forbes,  
Nd) Live In Sd SD**

**dkindelspire@valleytel.net**

**Comment:**

support

---

**Doug Nelson**

**Chamberlain SD**

**dn1stop@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

New system will be a joke. Just have to go out of state to get my hunting in

---

**Michael Fuhrmann**

**Shakopee MN**

**Michael.fuhrmann23@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I get where you want more hunters, but also making it harder for non residents to get a license isn't going to make anything better. You will lose a lot of hunters to Nebraska and Wyoming. We spend a lot of money as a lot of others from out of state do. I think you will have a drop in non resident applications. And a drop in these small towns getting money from non resident hunters staying there.

---

**Brendan Matthew**  
**Sturgis SD**  
**bub0452@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Does this new proposal allow a hunter to apply for two tags in the first draw, and still apply for preference points for other license. For example, if I apply for West River Deer, and Black Hills Deer in the first draw, will I have the opportunity to apply for a preference point for Muzzle loader? If this is not the case, then I probable will never hunt with a muzzleloader again in the state as you will be forcing me to choose between applying for it (to accumulate preference points to eventually draw the tag) and the one of the other hunts I have been doing for 40 years! Sure, the guy who like to hunt with muzzle loader only will love this, as he will get the tag more often, but in the end, you upset one group of hunters to make another group happy. You have even said you do not expect to really see any more tags. Long story to just say please let us continue to accumulate preference points for the hard to get hunts. I am prefectly happy not hunting the hills or west river for a year if it is replaced by the oppurtunity to get the muzzle loader tag.

---

**Robert Lewis**  
**Trent SD**  
**buckangyla@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Not only are whatever these changes are totally confusing to me, but what was wrong with the previous way of applying. I saw nothing wrong with it...

---

**James Buteyn**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**jnbuteyn@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Would you be in favor of increase chances, Of course I'd like to have the Vikings in the superbowl every year as well. It is a poorly written question to elicit a prescribed response. This is flawed from the start.

Black Hills was geared only to one group but expanded to all (again flawed.)

First choice has decreased as Blue tongue went through. Antelope odds decreased as well. I went from multiple tags to one every other.

3. One application means EAST river. the majority live there and don't want to travel. So why change it for the whole state?

14. You have hunters that applied for 9,604 licenses that can no longer submit those. Those hunters are not being treated fairly. There are plenty of tags if you want to shoot a deer, you just have to find a new part of the state.

20. There will not be additional hunters, it will be the same pool. I just can't submit 4 tags across the state. I will be further down the list for East River, and never hunt close to home.

This has been shot down after GFP refused to listen to hunters. It went to the State and got kicked back.

Please leave this alone. Deer numbers cycle and this only serves to export tags for non-resident. they could not apply east river before and now will be eligible. The only increase will be non-resident. Please listen to those who have asked you to leave it alone. You are doing fine, don't change anything.

---

**Brig Knott**

**Hudson WI**

**bknott@mmm.com**

**Comment:**

A portion of your logic is to continue the tradition of families being able to hunt together. You are not factoring in SD families where kids have moved out of state. Your current license proposals makes it almost impossible to plan family deer hunts west river when non-resident licenses are 8% of total and you rely on a point system to eventually get drawn.

---

**Raymond Powers**

**Kimball SD**

**raymondpowers@live.com**

**Comment:**

the old system has worked for years. leave it the way it is.

---

**James Cantalope**

**Eureka SD**

**cantajam@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Your still applying within the unit (season) of your choice, there is no difference!!!!!! Why change it

---

**Brett Andrews**

**Aberdeen SD**

**brett@huffconstructioninc.com**

**Comment:**

There are no issues with the current system. I feel that this subject has been drug out far too long. The new deer draw proposal is almost unanimously opposed by SD hunters yet it continues to be pursued by the commission. If non-resident money is driving this, increase non-resident fees. I apply to many western states and SD has one of if not the cheapest Non-resident fees. Please listen to your resident hunters and voters, do not pass the new deer draw proposal. Focus your time and efforts on matters for conservation, habitat restoration, and programs to get more volunteers and youth into the great outdoors. Do what is best for South Dakota, make it a better state.

---

**Paul Maassen**

**Watertown SD**

**paul.maassen@bpi.build**

**Comment:**

Something should change, I grew up on a farm in SD and am to the point of not even applying anymore. I've shot two deer in the last decade and only because it takes 4 sometimes 5 years to get a license. I think that's deterring a lot of people from choosing to hunt in South Dakota.

---

**Jim Sasse**  
**Aberdeen SD**  
**wisesasse@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

affect this will have on preference points and if I have two buck tags am I still allowed to purchase a doe tag

---

**Chad Vetter**  
**Frederick SD**  
**cwvetter@nvc.net**

**Comment:**

I have been hunting deer in SD for over 30 years now and would have to say that the number one issue at this time is the health of SD deer population. SD continues to oversell its applications for revenue purposes "my opinion" and not so much based on the deer population. I tell my kids stories of all the deer that used to be around and how much fun it was able to go out and stalk deer into a slough and usually on the first day of deer hunting one would be successful. Them days are long past SDGFP. I'm not prepared to support additional changes that limit SD resident hunters and the youth of this state. I saw the first proposal as an attempt to limit resident hunters and allow nonresident hunters an increased number of applications because lets face it as the rural population decreases there are less and less resident hunters applying for those applications. Before I would support addition nonresident hunting I would like to see an effort of SDGFP or this darn State put some effort in getting urban hunters into the fields.

---

**David Carda**  
**Yankton SD**  
**davidcarda@kolbergpioneer.com**

**Comment:**

I like it the way it is with the current system. Please leave it as is.

---

**Joseph Gregory**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**mickey@q.com**

**Comment:**

One person does not deserve more than one license per year for an antlered deer when I can only get a license every three years. Several national hunting magazines have recently published in-depth stories about the decline in the numbers of hunters in the field annually. Only being able to hunt every three years is hardly worth the effort. If a hunter wants more than one license the second license should be only unantlered. I have seen too much wanton waste from people with more than one license.

---

**Todd Rhew**

**Hot Springs SD**

**trhew2@goldenwest.net**

**Comment:**

You are implementing this system against the wishes of almost ALL sportsman, statewide. When are the people whom this effects going to get a say in this? As far as Non-residents are concerned, as long as there is ONE resident hunter that doesn't draw his preferred tag, then there should be NO non-resident hunters even considered. This is where people are convinced that you are considering non-residents over tax paying residents. Many times I have been passed over on Black Hills tags, my home area, and plenty of deer, only to see out of state tags hunting in this area. Frustrating to say the least. Leave the system alone, make all preference points free(as they should be), and put tax paying residents first, not last.

---

**James Whelan**

**Cadillac MI**

**jwhelan@mhc.net**

**Comment:**

Please clarify dates in table. Also, I support the initiative. Aggressive management is the only option to halt CWD. Also please consider making landowner permits transferable.

---

**Michael Keeton**

**Pierre SD**

**michaelkeeton10@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Don't change the way it is. The youth portion of the new proposal is the only thing worth keeping.

---

**Mark Peppel**

**Pierre SD**

**Markpeppel@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I am not in favor to the change to the original proposal. I wish it would have been left alone and everyone only gets one first choice in the first drawing as originally proposed. Very disappointed. Sure some people would have had to change where they hunt but the way the system is now makes it extremely difficult for people who do not have a place to hunt to start a tradition with their friends and family.



---

**Brad Day**

**Maple Grove MN**

**brady@firstclasscorp.com**

**Comment:**

Please provide opportunity for non residents to purchase a buck tag on land they have ownership in. Non Residents currently have very few opportunities to purchase and receive a buck tag East River. This proposal sounds like it will make it even harder for a Non REsident to get a buck tag. I own land in SD and it is hard for me to hunt on my own

---

**Travis Hansen**

**Worthing SD**

**thansen87@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

The system we have is not broken. People need to realize that certain counties will not have enough tags to please everyone. No one I have spoken with supports the changes.

---

**Matt Field**

**Brookings SD**

**matthewjfield78@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Will having a archery tag limit a hunter to 1 tag in the first 2 draws? Or will can you have a archery tag, and 2 additional tags in the first two draws?

---

**Randy Malterud**

**Lead SD**

**Comment:**

I highly support changing the deer drawing to 1 tag in the first drawing vs the current proposal of 2. The current compromise of 2 is not a significant enough change to make a difference. If you want to recruit/retain hunters, they need to be able to draw a preferred tag frequently to keep them interested. Why should a person be able to get 2 preferred tags before another person gets 1? Those people who want the 2 preferred tags because of "tradition" are greedy. They still can have both hunts most years, but may be limited to shooting does on 1 of the hunts. It should not eliminate the hunt for them. Have the courage to make this right for all hunters and limit first drawing tags to 1.

---

**Justin Schwarz**

**Ankeny IA**

**jschwarz@hanifentowing.com**

**Comment:**

What happens to all the preference points nonresidents had before this change? Did we just donate our money/points and kicked to the curb? I've read this proposal a million times over and in the East River county I hunt in with my resident family, I'll never have a shot at getting a buck tag. Very disappointing. North Dakota will be getting my money from now on.

---

**Kurt Schweiss**

**Rapid City SD**

**kschweiss@fmgengineering.com**

**Comment:**

I believe that the vast majority of hunters who apply for more than one deer tag in the first drawing don't apply for more than two. Therefore this decision by the SDGF&P won't change much of anything. It was a political move designed to look like a compromise.

Several years ago I purchased a small piece of land (80 acres) just for hunting. I get my first choice deer tag every other year. I can't do much hunting anyway, because I have to spend all of my time chasing off trespassers. I wonder how many of them have multiple first choice tags in their pockets while I'm hunting on my own land in the middle of rugged-river-break-mule deer country with a leftover whitetail tag in my pocket. Because of this I may never purchase or apply for a hunting license of any kind in the state of South Dakota again. I am seriously considering selling my land, putting the money in an account and using it to do all of my hunting out of state. I won't give the state of South Dakota any more of my money than I absolutely have to. By the way, the only people who think that one person getting two first choice tags while the next person gets zero is fair, are the people getting two (#SELFISH!!!!!!). Subtract one hunter from the field.

---

**James Suedkamp**

**Pierre SD**

**moriverseeds@mncomm.com**

**Comment:**

Its Ridiculous that GFP plays to a few disgruntled high society hunters who will require the rest of us real hunters to abide by their requirements. Its terrible that GFP staff can't even explain this new negative direction!

---

**Torrey Wahl**

**Selby SD**

**twahl@webwater.org**

**Comment:**

Why are you trying so hard to change something that works fine the way it is, my guess is there is an agenda to figure out some way to allow the GFP the ability to sell more deer tags to nonresidents and commercialize big game hunting just like pheasant hunting, just leave the tag situation alone.

---

**Christopher Gruenwald**

**Redfield SD**

**christophergruenwald@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

It's a better idea than the original to only allow 1 application. A buddy and I try every year to go out west river as well as hunt east river. Sometimes we draw tags and sometimes we don't and we pick up some leftovers instead, but at least we had to opportunity to apply for the seasons. One year we even got lucky enough to draw tags for black hills, west river and east river. I don't feel getting a deer tag is all that difficult with the original system we had in place. Elk tags area completely different story, but we have a limited resource of elk.

---

**Steve Moses**

**Rapid City SD**

**Jdslr@rushmore.com**

**Comment:**

I do NOT want a change but I can see you are going to shove this down our throat anyway just like rapid city you can vote it out but if they want it they just do it any way but take muzzle loader and custer state park

---

**Steve Moses**

**Rapid City SD**

**Jdslr@rushmore.com**

**Comment:**

DUPLICATE

I do NOT want a change but I can see you are going to shove this down our throat anyway just like rapid city you can vote it out but if they want it they just do it any way but take muzzle loader and custer state park

---

**Jaret Biel**

**Aberdeen SD**

**jaretbjel@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Still disagree with the attempt in compromise since the majority is not in favor of any changes being made. We should not lose the option to apply for multiple tags. For you to include Black Hills, Muzzleloader, Refuge and Custer State Park is just wrong. You need to listen to the public and leave the system alone. Anyone that is an avid hunter does not want this change as it is not benefiting the hunter.

---

**Keith Geiken**

**Lennox SD**

**Comment:**

The new deer license draw. East river and west river rifle should be one draw. This is all one state, not two states. A lot more people would get a license, if you could only apply for one rifle license. If there are left over tags, then a person

---

**Craig Niemann**

**Volga SD**

**craigniennann2018@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

2013 GFP sold 159,117 total tags on 109,857 licenses

2017 GFP sold 117,030 total tags on 103,388 licenses

This represents a 36% decrease in Tags from 2013-2017.

This represents a 6% decrease in Licenses from 2013-2017.

I compiled the data on the SD 2018 Deer Draw results for both ER and WR. The data set represents the "01" or "any deer" tags for the tag units that require at least 1+ preference point. These tags could also be referred to as the "PREFERRED TAG" Also included is the ER and WR Special Buck Statistics. The percentage represents the percentage of people with those points that were successful in drawing. Not included are limited issue draw units. All other deer tags not on this list you can draw with 0 preference points.

ER 2+ pts

Tag Percentage

05a01 93

12a01 69

16a01 100

17a01 35

59a01 27

61a01 41

63a01 78

ER 1pts

Tag Percentage

01a01 85

06a01 49

07a01 3

13a01 16

19a01 88

22a01 96

23a01 98

29a01 25

33a01 13

36a01 72

38a01 22

43a01 35

44a01 6

46a01 58

55a01 96

62a01 58

WR 2+ pts

Tag Percentage

15a01 90  
20a01 50  
21a01 29  
27a01 38  
30a01 22  
30b01 43  
35c01 56  
45a01 100  
45b01 44  
58a01 37

WR 1pts

Tag Percentage

02c01 4  
21b01 98  
24a01 67  
27b01 24  
35a01 51  
39a01 85  
53a01 35  
60a01 61

WR Special Buck 1pt

Tag Percentage

WR101 93

ER Special Buck 1pt

Tag Percentage

ER101 96

Look at the data. If it takes you 4+ years to draw a tag like I've seen mentioned I ask what tag are you applying for? If it is on my list attached then talk to your commisioners about doing away with the lottery draw and go to a true preference point system so you can atleast draw the tag every 1-2years. If it's not on this list then you are applying for a limited issue area.

THE ONLY WAY YOU ARE UN-SUCCESSFUL IN THE CURRENT SD GFP DRAW SYSTEM IS BY APPLYING FOR ONLY 1 TAG.

For the past 5 years I've received 4-5 any deer tags in SD. 2018 I reveived 5 tags with my muzzleloader tag, which took me 6 years to draw. Guaranteed Archery ER and WR. Lottery draw for rifle ER and WR. I utilize the special buck for both ER and WR every other year. I apply for the county tag every other year. The counties I apply for are 1+pt preference counties. Meaning you will only draw that tag 1x/every other year. I have never applied for a Custer or Black Hills tag. Every year I apply for ER, WR, Refuge, and Muzzleloader. Always get my ER and WR tags.

Special Buck tags up to 2017 were 100% guaranteed with 1pt. Now they are just under 100%. I have my preference points set up so I can draw an ER and WR rifle tag every single year on my first choice tag. This doesn't include my 2nd choice WR tag which I always draw, this is typically an "any whitetail only tag".

One thing I want to make very clear. The new proposal doesn't guarantee you a tag for ER and WR; it doesn't even gaurantee an ER or WR tag. It does guarantee you the opportunity to apply and possible draw an ER and/or WR deer tag.

The state gfp anticipate 1,000 more hunters will have a tag with this 2nd proposal. That represents less than a 2% increase across the state. I personally don't think they will achieve this number. Look at the draw results and how many people applied for tags without a chance of getting them. Every tag I listed above had people applying for it with zero preference points. Guaranteed not to get a tag. They should have applied for a different tag if they wanted to hunt a deer. There are plenty of first choice tags you can draw with 0 preference points. This shows that these people don't understand the current allocation system or they only want to hunt a specific tag.

The reality is this: Many deer hunters want to hunt certain counties/tags only. Which means the amount of applicants will stay the same or increase for those tags. 80% of applicants that are unsuccessful on draw #1 don't even apply for draw #2. Why or how does this new proposal address that problem?

This would be my proposal to make a change if the state is so hard headed and committed to making a change:

- 1: Give every landowner as many tags as he or she wants for herd management on THEIR LAND ONLY. This does not include leased/rented ground. Only owned ground or land in a family trust. The amount of money and time they sacrifice to maintain a deer herd should allow them as many tags as they want.
- 2: That landowner can donate the tag/tags or he can use them himself.
- 3: Do away with "landowner preference tags" and allocate those tags to everyone. This should open up more tags for non landowner applicants. If a landowner wants to hunt public or private land other than their own, they can apply and will be included in the draw just like a non land owner.
- 4: Leave the 6 individual draw applications just as they are.

Last but not least:

- 1: The state needs to do a better job at making land-locked public ground available to the public hunter. Either through land swaps or access easements.
- 2: The state needs to do a better job at allocating financial resources for public land. There is a lot of public "Walk in" land that is extremely small and holds no wildlife, over grazed/hayed and holds no wildlife, or is a bean field that holds no wildlife. Spend the money on better land.
- 3: Game Production areas can be managed much better. Many GPA areas have no food plots and if they do most are not managed properly. ie: not fertilized, not sprayed for weeds, etc
- 4: Stop grazing GPA ground to the dirt. If you want to take the grass off then burn it, hay it, or graze it after nesting is over. Aggressive spring grazing does the wildlife nothing.

I'm all about spreading the wealth and getting more people in the outdoors. People need to experience getting close to wild animals. I just feel that all this time, 3+years, and all this money is a waste if it is only going to result in maybe 1,000 more people or 1.5% more deer hunters.

2013 GFP sold 159,117 total tags on 109,857 licenses

2017 GFP sold 117,030 total tags on 103,388 licenses

This represents a 36% decrease in Tags from 2013-2017.

If you want more people to have an opportunity to experience deer hunting then do a better job at managing the natural resources and increase the deer herd. That is money and time better spent than trying to get a tag in another 1,000 peoples hands while pissing off 90% of the hunting population and deflating the faith they have in our SD GFP.

---

**Wayne Thuen**

**Rapid City SD**

**wayne.thuen@midco.com**

**Comment:**

I liked the first proposal of trying to make it much easier to draw a preferred tag in the area wanted. I strongly support your efforts to make drawing a tag in a preferred unit of choice and increasing our odds of drawing a tag.

---

**James Zeck**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**jzeck2@sio.midco.net**

**Comment:**

I would prefer that you leave the deer application as it is. I feel the changes being proposed will harm resident hunters in favor of non-resident hunters.

---

**Darren Swenson**  
**Madison SD**

**Comment:**

Leave the system as it is now.

---

**Robert Coyle**  
**Summerset SD**  
**clintcoyle50@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

This about tags, your really going to hurt those that live on wild game, why mess with something that's not broke, it just like when you changed the hunting atlas map now I can't even use it. It was perfect before you changed it, if it's not broke

---

**Todd Brown**  
**San Diego CA**  
**TCBROWNIE@GMAIL.COM**

**Comment:**

It's unclear to us how the proposed changes will affect our ability to secure a non-resident bow hunting license moving forward? My friends and I have been hunting deer/pheasant and waterfowl for the last 10 yrs and look forward to that continuing. We spend plenty of money in SD with licenses, even more in the local communities when we get there on lodging, food and other fun supplies! Without that deer tag we won't do the trip. Hope you all understand the implications of not just the monetary side but the ability to showcase your beautiful state to avid hunters across the country. We live in San Diego and look forward to our trip all year. It's understandable to prioritize the opportunities of SD residents, we just hope you all understand the value that non-resident hunters bring in the overall scheme of things. Thank you.

---

**Thomas Whitley**

**Doland SD**

**Twhit0889@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I do support the change in many ways, but some of the things I don't understand is why do the out of state hunter's get 8% over the resident in West River Black Hills and Reservation area's has it always been this way or just this way now? I also believe as residents we should have the ability to half of the seasons so 3 out of the 6 instead of 2 out of the 6! I like how we are capable to get more tags in the later drawings! Many families including my own hunt to feed not only ours but others in the communities!

---

**Tim Weigel**

**Aberdeen SD**

**dexterweigel@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

In an effort to make license more available the landowner preference should be eliminated. Can still use landowner tag (on their own ground). But not reduce odds for non-landowners. Every one in the same bucket. Should also go to a true preference point system. A small portion of license would still be available in random draw. This would allow sportspersons to plan and schedule for the different units they may like to hunt. This drawing odds/ results in this should also be available to view.

---

**Rob Brooks**

**Dakota Dunes SD**

**robb@siouxcityford.com**

**Comment:**

I feel it is stupid to change the current application process for deer hunters. If people don't know how to work the current system in their favor through preference points, that is their fault. Don't ruin it for rest of us.

---

**John Evenson**

**Springfield SD**

**johnevenson3885@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I think it was fine the way it was.

---

**Eric Grenz**

**Rapid City SD**

**egrenz@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I support putting all 6 license types in one draw and allowing 2 apps. I like the free points for youth hunters.



---

**Brian Wherry**

**Herreid SD**

**brian.wherry@k12.sd.us**

**Comment:**

It is absolutely ridiculous to put muzzleloader into the same draw against rifle seasons. They are different weapons and after the rifle seasons. Makes no sense. It is already a disadvantage shooting primitive and after rifle seasons are done. Pull that out of the proposals!! In fact, don't change a thing!! Get youth involved if you want more hunters.

---

**Christian Freeman**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Freemo51@outlook.com**

**Comment:**

Your giving a bonus point to kid which i dont like because your teaching them to only shoot bucks there is nothing wrong with shooting a doe! I do like that its free for them! But to me to pick up extra money you should raise prices on elk and deer if you check other states its alot higher and our out of state tags are way to cheap! Montana is way higher and so are the other boardering states! Also your not soloving the real problem is there are to many hunters in to little public land. I have a hard time off getting off the road (close the designated roads! And add more walk in programs)!

---

**Steve Wiege**

**Rapid City SD**

**stwig1347@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Although I was against any changes to the current draw, I would support this new proposal over all the others that hv been proposed thus far.

---

**Roger Heintzman**

**Aberdeen SD**

**r\_heintzman@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I could loose 2/3 of my hunting opportunities with the proposal.  
Now you are using under 15 youth as pawns just to pass your pathetic proposal.  
How stayed awake at night to come up with such a unwanted change.  
Leave well enough alone.

---

**Ryan Patterson**

**Aberdeen SD**

**ryan3290@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Hello I am writing you tell you I am opposed to the deer allocation. The only benefit to this is to help kids get out into the field. No way does this new proposal help the deer population and it bad for South Dakota sportsman as there will be some sportsman go along with it because we all see the writing on the wall. We see that no matter how many sportsman speak up against the deer allocation are still going to make a change. The current "old" system we have works and there's no need to change it. Leave it as it is and if you want to try and get kids into hunting then go a head and pass the part for the kids but leave the rest as it is now.

---

**Douglas Kingsbury**

**Lawton IA**

**Loesshillsbow@aol.com**

**Comment:**

Need way more non resident west river deer rifle and antelope tags.

---

**John Brockmueller**

**Irene SD**

**Jd.brockmueller@plantpioneer.com**

**Comment:**

I think you should have stayed with your original proposal where they had to apply for 1 license in first drawing. Otherwise I support this current change.

---

**Merris Miller**

**Lennox SD**

**coyotedoc3@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Although it is disappointing that politicians kill an idea that most people are in favor of, at least GFP has continued to improve things with this compromise approach. Hopefully, this will pass. I hope with the passing of this, the GFP will work on the next issue that needs fixed with deer seasons in SD.....Landowner Preference tags. Anyone with a landowner preference tag, should be required to hunt on their own land. At the very least, they should not be able to hunt public land! This is an issue, and should be fixed. Thank you.

---

**Brad Waage**

**Vermillion SD**

**brad.waage@usd.edu**

**Comment:**

Why do non resident hunters only get to apply for West river tags. There is no East river tags on the first draw.

---

**Travis Hendricks**

**Vivian SD**

**sdpheasanthunt@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

support

---

**Dusty Waldron**

**Pierre SD**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Jack Dokken**

**Pierre SD**

**Comment:**

oppose

---

**Ray Konz**

**Brandon SD**

**ray@adrianstatebank.com**

**Comment:**

i see no reason to change to a new program.  
please leave it as it has been.

---

**Craig Ellman**

**Salem SD**

**crellman@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Changes do not address greatest problem with current system. Rich Landowner special advantage set at 160 acres. See article 6 of state constitution. Every year,"out of county and out of state" hunters get licenses that in ( county resident ) hunters are denied.

---

**Jason Van'T Hul**

**Harrisburg SD**

**Jvanthul@outlook.com**

**Comment:**

As a hunter in the state of South Dakota, it takes me 4 years to Draw a rifle tag under current rules. I only hunt public ground, so areas where large amounts of public ground exist get to be many hunters first choice.

I support the new allocation plan. I would even support those that what to buck hunt with additional tags can enter more then twice, but the cost of the additional tag is at non resident rates. Use th excess tag revenue to provide additional walk in areas in the state. I also suggest gfp increase tag costs across the board.

I realize people will complain about the cost of the tag, but no one complains about the \$200 sika pants and \$200 sika shirt and \$150 danner boots they bought to hunt with.

Good luck. GFP does a good job. I appreciate you listening to the public.

---

**Robert Watts**

**Rapid City SD**

**robert.watts@state.sd.us**

**Comment:**

1 Still dumps excess hunters in areas where locals can't get a tag in the unit they live in. 2 Still puts the burden of nonresident hunters in the BH's unit and west river units ,when are the east river hunters going to have to be burdened likewise.3 left over tag sales to people who all ready have multiple tags just crowds more hunters on what little public land there is.4 Whether anyone at the GFP thinks so or not it just makes them look like they don't care about anything but selling tags. 5 Mentor tags to teach kids to hunt without the pressure of competition is good for our kids but why sell these tags for \$10 to nonresidents for their kids, if they can come from Minnesota to hunt expense wise they can pay \$100 for the tag period.

---

**David Jorgensen**

**Wagner SD**

**Comment:**

Since you feel that you have gotten enough input that you feel the need change the current application process. I find the current proposal of applying for two tags in the initial drawing far more acceptable than your original proposal. I know you have gotten input on both sides of this, so if there is a need to change this is a decent compromise.

---

**Bo Moysis**

**Utica SD**

**Bo\_moysis@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Why fix something that's not broken! Leave tag drawings the way they are! Thanks have a good day

---

**Gary Larson**  
**Deadwood SD**  
**glarson@safordlab.org**

**Comment:**

Keeping traditions on Family hunting kind of left along time ago when the draw started

---

**Randell Kenner**  
**Piedmont SD**

**Comment:**

I am submitting my support for the GFP Commission proposal passed on 1/11/19. Allowing hunter to apply for two of the six deer seasons in the first drawing is an excellent compromise. Thank you.

---

**James Benscoter**  
**Parkston SD**  
**dmbenscoter@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I feel there should be no preference points so that everyone every year has a chance for a deer license. a game warden said that it costs more to keep track of preference points then the money you receive so why have it.

---

**Harold Bartsch**  
**Owatonna MN**  
**bartscha@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

My hunting partner and I have applied to hunt deer in West River zones for over twenty years, and seldom get picked on the first draw even with multiple preference points.  
We pay full price for leftover licenses just to see our Ranching friends, but this change almost nullifies our chances of getting drawn.  
Since my hunting partner will be 80 and I will be 79 this year, our chances of getting to use our preference points will be close to zero.

---

**Steve Moses**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**jdsir@rushmore.com**

**Comment:**

Also have non residents archery start October 1 give residents a month to hunt with out getting ran over by non residents

---

---

**Jerome Gau**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**gaujerome1@gmail.comD**

**Comment:**

I was in agreement with the original proposal. Increasing the first draw to two applications will not improve the odds for Black Hills hunters. With the decline in the numbers of hunters, its important to allow as many hunters as possible to obtain a license. For Black Hills hunters I believe the odds will remain at about 3 years to draw a license. Also since the wild game belongs to the state, as many hunters as possible should be allowed to harvest at least one animal.

---

**Jerod Hudelson**  
**Sturgis SD**  
**JEROD@RUSHMORE.COM**

**Comment:**

I am against any changes to the deer allocation process. This process that GFP is doing on this proposal is the biggest mess I have ever seen.

---

**Trent Neu**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**neumoose@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Seems like this is a better option than choosing just 1 season. Multiple reminders(emails) to apply before the deadlines would be appreciated. I like the current system that is in place, however I can understand how this will increase odds for success in some areas. It will be interesting to see how it is viewed in 2022 when it is reviewed. I still believe if you have 3,4,5 plus preference points you should be in a different bracket instead of just cubing the preference points. Each point increase in preference should be a different grouping. Someone with 2 points should not be in the same grouping as someone with 3. 3 shouldn't be with 4's etc. Thx Example the muzzleloader tag this past year.

---

**Mark Clausen**  
**Pierre SD**  
**mark.clausen@dot.gov**

**Comment:**

I would like to be given an explanation of how I will be able to use my existing preference points with the new system. Currently I have 4 preference points for WR deer and 3 preference points for ER deer. Can I only use them for the deer season I acquired them in, or would I be able to use them in different seasons (Ex. - say use 7 preference for ER deer)??

---

**Bradley Beavers**

**Jefferson SD**

**brad@dakotamechanical.com**

**Comment:**

This is more of a question than a comment. I am an East(Union Co.) and West(Gregory Co.) river landowner. I am also a part in a west river hunting lease in Butte county. Will I be able to get a Butte county tag and also get a landowner tag for Union and Gregory County. I do not see anything in the structure to address this. Thank You

---

**Donn De Boer**

**Chamberlain SD**

**Comment:**

The current system has worked well for years. No need to change something that is not broke.

---

**Jim Detoy**

**Rapid City SD**

**jsdetoy@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Have quit deer hunting in SD after not getting a license in 3 years. Put it back to what it was .Paying for a point is not for me.

---

**Louie Genzler**

**Aberdeen SD**

**louiegenzler@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

There are no deer on public hunting ground , and to get farmers and ranchers to give permission is next to impossible! I hunt in Potter county

---

**Scott Nielsen**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**sniel732998@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

to many licenses sold for the number of deer in units as it is