
Gerald Bobzin
Hill City SD
bobzinklan@msn.com

Comment:

I want the tag system to stay the same. But if you are going to change it don't put Custer state park, and muzzleloader in the new system.

Daron Peterson
Humboldt SD

Comment:

I would like to see you leave it the same as it's always been

Phillip Eide
Centerville SD
phillip.eide@iw.net

Comment:

i just don't understand the benefit of changing the current system.

Joel Reil
Rapid City SD
1fuzzie54@gmail.com

Comment:

You are loosening residents because the cost versus the wages paid in South Dakota!!! Maybe all we need is nonresident tages make the game an fish happy! What a bunch of BS on your new proposals on tags for South Dakotans. Bad bad bad

Todd Dathe
Brandon SD
Todddathe99@yahoo.com

Comment:

I believe the fairest way to allocate the licenses is to create a system where everyone has to pick the license they would most like to have as their first choice. The current system results in some people getting several of their first choices and others getting none. Making the first drawing a true first choice drawing ensures that each hunter can target the season that is most important to them. Yes this will result in change for some, however, in order to make the system more fair there will have to be change. I view the changes to the elk draw as positive for the same reasons. Hunting should be something that is open to all not just the few who have the most influence. Please try to consider the average person that has limited financial resources in your decisions

Dalton McNutt
Doland SD

Comment:

Still have no idea why we are trying to fix a system that isn't broken? Okay the lottery like everyone else! I feel habitat is a bigger focus than this yet you do nothing about it. What a joke, I'll be hunting in other states

Kevin Forrester
Sturgis SD
k4ester@yahoo.com

Comment:

The original proposed changes actually provided opportunity for youth hunters to draw a Black Hills buck license because hunters would have to prioritize their first draw preference. The changes now proposed still allow for application for their favorite East/West River Deer and still be in on BH Deer draw. Based on the published draw statistics the only thing this proposal does is make youth preference points free. It will not change the timeline to actually draw a license. I know my kids have soured to hunting because the only license they can get are antlerless.

Brian Frybarger
Rapid City SD
bafman59@gmail.com

Comment:

This proposal offers plenty of opportunities for hunters to obtain tags while preventing certain parties from stock piling tags, either for themselves or to "pass along" (sell) to their friends, guests, etc.

This should ensure tags are actually being used by ethical hunters, not for those seeking to profit from deer licenses.

To determine success of this program, implement a mandatory post-season reporting system on deer taken, day hunted, locations, and so on.

Terry Mixell
Brandon SD
mix007@alliancecom.net

Comment:

I support this proposal however I was in favor of the first proposal limiting a person to their first choice. Since that was shot down I feel this is a good compromise but again reduces a persons chance of getting their first and preferred choice. Thank you for your time.

Bruce Evans

Rapid City SD

BSE36@HOTMAIL.COM

Comment:

It sure looks like more fortunate individuals who have access to private land want to be able to apply for East or West River and Hills Deer are dictating policy. Initially you were going to require a person to choose one deer application in the first drawing, that would be more fair to public land hunters who rely on the Hills as their main deer hunt. Once again those of us who live in the Hills area and had traditional deer camps with friends and family for years will again be forced to take a back seat to hunters who aren't willing to give up their East or West River tag for a chance to hunt the Hills.

Steven Ahrendt

Sioux Falls SD

rosemariea@sio.midco.net

Comment:

I believe your original proposal to limit hunters to one tag on the first draw is the correct approach, if in fact, your goal is to get more hunters an opportunity to deer hunt. The comments (objections) you posted would be the selfish, me first ones one would expect. Hunting tradition is not based on how many tags one draws, but on one's ability to hunt. Your proposal is not complicated and if it can't be understood by an individual, then maybe they are too dumb to have a rifle in their hands. As a Hunt Safe Instructor, we often hear that the opportunity to hunt is not available for a variety of reasons. Preference points are great but they aren't the same as drawing a tag. Don't compromise – there is no reason too.

Doug Sippel

Groton SD

douglas.sippel.68@gmail.com

Comment:

There is nothing wrong with the way it is. Everyone has the same chance for getting a tag. You are penalizing the the hunters who like to hunt different seasons by not letting them at least have chance of getting an any deer tag in each season. I don't mind shooting does but I at least want a chance at a buck tag. If this goes through my kids and I will only send in for two tags instead of four each. We will also quit buying preferences. If people are whining about not getting their favorite tag then maybe they need to expand their ways of hunting deer and enjoy other ways of pursuing.

Adam Golay
Sioux Falls SD
adamgolay@yahoo.com

Comment:

Even though letting people still hunt both east river & west river in the same year for bucks is better than the original proposal it still is not better than what we already have. We have a system that works that never needed to be fixed in the first place. It was never broken. Hunters need to take advantage of the preference point system that South Dakota has to offer if they want to draw their preferred deer license. I still to this day have yet to meet 1 person that is in favor of changing the deer license structure that we already have. I know people that hunt 1 season per year & they don't even want it changed because they might want to hunt 3 or more seasons at some point. My concern at this point is that this new proposal will affect my ability to buy preference points for west river the same year that I draw a west river special buck & vise versa if I draw a special buck WR then I won't be able to buy a preference point for west river deer that same year. I would like to know if I can still do this as I can on the current allocation where you can hunt all 6 seasons. I am all for GFP making money but this might threaten their preference point system & bring in less money for preference points as I buy them a lot & so do all my hunting family & friends.

Randy Campbell
Flandreau SD

Comment:

If this has worked fine for as long as I've been applying. Why is there a need to change. Everybody has the same chance of drawing a license as I do.

Jarrett Perry
Rapid City SD

Comment:

support

David Dolan
Hermosa SD
ddreferee@hotmail.com

Comment:

Now that you are allowing a hunter to apply for 2 deer applications I can support that. I for the first time in many years did not draw any tags. I was disappointed but I enjoy hunting with my son and friends both east and west river. Not drawing this year is part of the process. I encourage you to allow the current compromise.

Tyler Henderson

Marvin SD

tyh1@msn.com

Comment:

I do not support the measure, the majority are not in favor of change, why does this need to be pushed through. No changes are required, the system works.

Nathan Fossell

Sioux Falls SD

fosselln@hotmail.com

Comment:

As I look at this, I like it a lot more. I would like to see muzzleloader excluded from this as it is a different weapon of choice. I'd also like Custer removed as it is a quite unique ecosystem. Other than that, I appreciate you working with us

Michael Hughes

Mound City KS

michael_h_66103@yahoo.com

Comment:

I am a non resident hunter and have hunted west river deer season for over 20 years and i have seen tag draws become more and more limited. I would like to see more tags available and possibly elk tags included.

Doug Alvine

Watertown SD

dougalvine@hotmail.com

Comment:

By changing the proposal to allowing hunters to put down 2 deer seasons as a first choice, you might as well leave the deer allocation process the way it was. West River Deer is the most competitive season with East River Deer, so now hunters will put down both as a first choice, which will not help hunters get one or the other, which is what we have now. I mainly hunt East River and get a license every 2-3 years. I thought by hunters having to choose one season as their first choice, it might help me get a license more often. With the compromise, I don't think it will help much at all and makes it a wasted effort. Stick with picking one as a first choice, not two. Thanks.

Butch Funke

Brandon SD

b.funke51@gmail.com

Comment:

As a landowner and wildlife advocate ,I feel we are being left out and not represented in our State. Our current Governor (Noem) has not given any thought toward land owners and what we give to wild life in our state!also being a one party (republican) State. We have lost all Democratic government in SD!it is a one party rule....

Aric Craven

Winner SD

ariccraven@yahoo.com

Comment:

Original option was a much better option. Make people choose between an east river tag and the west river tag for their primary choice. The new option again East River hunters can have their cake and eat it too. Need to make the East river and west river seasons the same time. Then one does not get to go to West River shoot whatever runs in front of them then go back to East River and trophy hunt. Just like you put it in your own words people want to come out to West River and enjoy then also go back to East River and do it again. I have a 12-year-old daughter that didn't even draw West River tag on her first deer season last year because there wasn't enough tags, this isn't right and if there was a few less east river hunters Double dipping I'm sure she would've drawn one just fine.

Bryan Parks

Rapid City SD

bnparks@rap.midco.net

Comment:

East river deer tags should also be subject to the same amount of out of state licences as west river and black hills.

If the draw dates were the same for all of the mentioned seasons (which they now will be) AND if all of the season dates were the same for all of the mentioned seasons, this entire back and forth about licence allocation would probably be self regulating.

Jared Pearson

Summerset SD

docjcpearson@gmail.com

Comment:

I don't feel the system needs to be changed. There are plenty of opportunities to obtain licenses in SD.

Larry Gadbois
Sioux Falls SD
LGAD361859@AOL.COM

Comment:

My family and I have been hunting deer in South Dakota for the past 60 years. We have enjoyed the application system throughout the years. Please do not change the drawing system. Why change something that is not broken? thank you for listening to us hunters.

Paul Van Bockern
Sioux Falls SD
Pvb@midco.net

Comment:

It's a good compromise. A way to advocate for young hunters, gives more resident hunter an opportunity to draw a tag yet does allow for a reasonable number of nonresident tags.

David Hodina
Rapid City, Sd SD
hodinadc@rap.midco.net

Comment:

I hunt the black hills only. People that hunt only one season still have to share the tags with local prairie hunters. I thought this new system was to help everyone get their first choice. Now it is choices.

Jeff Carlton
Hill City SD
Wildcatroad@yahoo.com

Comment:

Deer tag changes: I don't think you ever explained why changes in the old system was necessary.

Shawn Pliska
Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

The current deer allotment for tags in place is fair, it gives everybody the same opportunity to choose what they want to do. At no time has sportsmen and or women of South Dakota want this proposal in any form it has been shown. 86% opposed this proposal from the last commission meeting in January. Any lost opportunities are detrimental to the people of South Dakota.

There is no compromise as far as I am concerned on this proposal. The majority should always rule how any issues are resolved that concern the public.

Please stop pushing this onto us. Put your focus on something else, like Predator control.

What we all want is to leave something behind, we want to keep South Dakota traditions the same for hunters now and future generations.

Thank you for your time.

Josh Hagemann
Mission Hill SD
jghagemann@hotmail.com

Comment:

Dear Members of the Commission,

I still disagree that a change needs to be made. I also disagree with the way the "research" was conducted and presented.

I also understand that the Commission is dead-set on making a change. You want to cater to the few people that were upset that they couldn't draw their one favorite tag every year.

That being said, I believe the latest iteration of the deer licensing proposal is a fair and true attempt at compromise.

The only change I would make is to let nonresidents apply for additional tags (beyond the 8%) in the 4th draw. I've never had a problem with nonresidents getting a chance to hunt, especially when they are getting a chance at tags that are clearly not in high demand.

Thank you,

Josh Hagemann

Alan Gibson

Dulac LA

Ajgibson@charter.net

Comment:

To my knowledge South Dakota has more private land than public and one factor I see missing in the new proposal for nonresidents would require a nonresident to obtain a signature of a land owner as to apply in draws . I have seen an increase in out of state guides having clients get licenses and landowner's .nonresident family and friends being unable to draw cuasing landowners to end up with no hunters and out of state quides offering landowners less than fair values to hunt deer on the resident landowners lands.

Without the resident landowners participation there would be less deer and thus less opportunity for all hunters resident and nonresident . Any questions please feel free to contact me . Thanks for allowing my comments.
Alan Gibson

John Meyen

Rosholt SD

rosholtinsurance@yahoo.com

Comment:

First leave the deer license drawings as they are. The current system works, and let's see what effect cubing has before you change anything else. Also the youth don't need free preference points and they can wait until they are old enough to apply. We already do too much for them. Do you really think they'll keep hunting after they have to play by the same rules as the adults? I doubt it! I have some friends from Michigan that said their state has done this and all it does is ruin hunting for the adults and once the youth have to play by the adult rules, they quit hunting. Raise your nonresident license fees.

David Miller

Ovid SD

Dlmiller5@yahoo.com

Comment:

I am a mon resident hunter. I believe you are making it harder for me to hunt and vist your state. I have hunted the perkins county srea for yesrs and I'm afraid you are deny me that opportunity with your changes

Christopher Baldwin
Belvidere SD
sdbeeguy@gmail.com

Comment:

I attended the South Dakota Stockgrowers meeting in Rapid City last Fall. I heard the presentation given by GFP reps. I felt that was a fair plan.

I feel now like the Commission has caved to the influence of the most advantaged segment of the deer hunting population. Many hunters with less time and resources, can not take the time and money to travel to other parts of the state to hunt different seasons.

Myself as an example. I hunt West River deer only. I have four different WRD Units within 10 miles of my home. In the past, I have gotten a tag in the first WRD drawing, then applied for a second tag in the third drawing, again WRD. My family will eat two deer a year.

I understand that under the latest plan, I could still do the same in the fourth drawing. My objection is: I thought the idea or goal of changing the draw procedure was to give people who were not drawing tags regularly in their preferred unit/season a better chance to draw. I am all for that. But what I see now, is a more advantaged (rich) person can obtain 3 licenses in 3 different seasons through the third drawing, while a local less advantaged, locally hunting, person can only obtain one. Fair?

The advantaged person is taking license opportunity away from others. How is this fair? Again, I thought the GFP plan I heard last Fall was fair. The subsequent ones, no.
Thanks for the opportunity to express myself.

Steve Greenfield
Watertown SD
s_j_green2002@yahoo.com

Comment:

You had a solid plan that would have helped thousands of hunters get deer tags more often, but for some reason you caved to the vocal minority of hunters. I was hoping to have a chance to get a tag more than every 2nd or 3rd year. By allowing hunters to apply for both east and west river deer in the first draw you destroyed any benefit of the new system. The point was to get more people one tag and less people several tags. I do not approve of the "compromise" and feel it is barely different than the current draw system.

Brooks Gehring
Bozeman MT
bkg132@gmail.com

Comment:

I am most proud to say I grew up in South Dakota, but your opportunities for non resident east river deer rifle hunting are pathetic.

I have been a Montana resident for 35 years and would love to come back to the farm to hunt deer with family members, but the opportunities are ZERO.

How about putting up 1-5% of any given deer license available to nonresidents. Let us buy preference points. Charge a substantial amount for the coveted nonresident license if you must (that's what MT, WY, and CO do). Make some substantial extra revenue for the state with a minimal sacrifice to residents. At least consider making it available to former residents with family still residing in SD (sponsor type set up like AK).

Pheasants may be king in SD (and yes, I do come back to hunt pheasants), but I strongly believe you are losing easy revenue and denying potential awesome family time for those of us with ties to South Dakota.

Daniel Scherer

Rapid City SD

DANIEL.H.SCHERER@GMAIL.COM

Comment:

I preferred the version prior to the most recent amendments, yet still believe this to be better than the allocation method that has been in place.

Brent Reilly

Hartford SD

brent.reilly@yahoo.com

Comment:

I'll start on a positive note; I truly LOVE the recommendation to enhance the odds of our young hunters to draw deer tags sooner. This is fantastic and something all SD deer hunters can rally around. That said, I find it troubling based on the timing that it was clearly added as a sweetener to get this proposal in an attempt to push it through the legislative review process. This enhancement can be added at any point and does not need to be attached to this radical change to the deer draw.

This is yet another example of what has become the key issue in the eyes of many sportsmen and sportswomen which is a lack of trust and confidence in GF&P leadership and the GF&P commission. Here we are again, with the commission forcing through a change to the deer tag process. The fate of this change seems to have been long ago decided by the GF&P leadership and now in the face of immense public opposition you have turned to desperate tactics. Listening to the meetings, the commission talks openly about massaging the name of the proposal to "deer tag process" because it's less authoritarian sounding than "deer tag allocation". Absolutely bizarre, call it whatever you want, it is what it is. These are nothing more than Washington, DC style pork barrel politics, whatever it takes to get it passed.

Unaddressed Items

- The commission members should disclose during the Conflict of Interest discussion what deer seasons they and their family have applied for or hunted in the past two seasons. If the commissioners and those closest to them will benefit from the proposed changes by improving their draw odds it obviously should be disclosed. To my knowledge no such disclosures have taken place.
- It appears from a webpage and video for River View Lodge that Commissioner Phillips has a commercial deer hunting business on what is stated to be a 20,000 acre ranch near New Underwood, SD. The website also states they get \$6,000 for any deer hunts versus \$3,900 for whitetail only hunts. By the GF&P's own data, the proposed changes to the draw process would improve a client's odds of drawing an any deer tag. Has this conflict been disclosed? Do any of the other commissioners own or benefit from commercial deer hunting operations? Has the GF&P studied the impact the proposal will have on growing commercial deer hunting in SD? What safeguards can be put in place to prevent transferable licensing down the road? When you get to the core of these changes and who is pushing so hard for them that is the next logical step. I first saw this rough framework for the tag drawing process in SD about 5 years ago in a 30 minute YouTube video. The presenter was a deer hunting outfitter in SD and WY. Interesting how we got from there to here. Can the commission explain to the state's deer hunters how this is apparently a random coincidence?
- Positions on the GF&P Commission are appointed which cutting to the chase means you need to be a sizable political donor and/or politically well-connected to be asked on the commission by the Governor. I could be wrong but it doesn't appear there is a random working class type person on the commission but rather it is filled with large landowners, CEO's, attorneys and others that tend not to reflect the masses. I'm not naïve; it's the nature of Governor appointed commissions. However, when these types of coincidences with ties to commercial deer hunting come to light, especially given that this topic has faced significant public push-back; add in the fact that the conflict of interest disclosures have been weak or non-existent it doesn't lead SD deer hunters to have a lot of confidence in the process given we have zero recourse.
- Has the commission considered putting the same restrictions on landowners as it does on non-landowners by limiting them to one tag including the own land tags? There is nothing in this proposal to keep a land owner from getting an ER and/or WR own land tag but still being able to apply for 1st draw 1st choice muzzleloader in

the regular draw. Surely this isn't the intent of the commission...is it? If unaddressed that is a large portion of the tags that won't go to new, unique hunters which has been sold as the reason for this change.

- How many of the commissioners and their family members are landowners or benefit annually from the land operator exemption to apply for landowner preference? One curious thing about the entire process is that any changes to the landowner advantages have gone unaddressed. I believe firmly in landowner rights but the current set-up is over the top in favor of landowners in their ability to double dip via the regular draw and having access to own land deer tags. One has to question why and I think it has a lot to do with the make-up of the commission given it's disproportionately made up of folks from areas more likely to be biased toward landowners.

- Why don't you get the unbiased input from all SD deer hunters on the exact proposal by way of a hunter survey now given this topic is front and center. Make the survey questions fair and not leading and see what the hunters have to say. These can be done quickly if you only wanted to listen to the feedback. If the GF&P is so confident in its proposal and that it only negatively impacts about 30% of deer hunters why doesn't it do a survey now addressing the exact issue in its final form? The GF&P claims that a vocal minority is raising a fuss, prove it instead of relying on 2010 and 2014 survey questions that marginally relate to the final proposal.

- Did the commission consider sun setting these changes to end after 3 years? There is a written statement that the commission will continually address any needed changes but the commission will continue to turn over in this period of time. The commission has probably learned how hard it is change something once it is in place.

Predictions Based on Proposal Passing

- Dramatic increase in commercialized deer hunting in SD. There will be more outfitter type hunts but also the exclusive hunting rights on more land will be leased up.

- A strong majority of the muzzleloader tags will go to landowners who will also get an own land rifle tag to hunt the exact same ground. I strongly suspect this is where the vast majority of the muzzleloader tags will go unless addressed as most non-landowner hunters will first try to pull the rifle tag and if unsuccessful switch to muzzleloader for their 2nd choice but the tags will be gone.

- Loss of quality Walk-In Program land that the state leases because individual hunting groups will pay more for exclusive access to it. This will further stress the public hunting opportunities available which will lead to less quality public hunting and more regular folks leaving hunting.

- The GF&P will continue to ignore the increasing numbers of non-resident archery deer hunters that come in and pressure the quality public hunting areas before the rifle seasons. Once the commercialized deer hunting operations get established it will pull even more non-resident archery hunters in. The GF&P can't shut it off or slow it down because they will need the tag money due to lower preference point revenue.

- There will be even more manipulation of sham share cropping arrangements so hunters can gain advantages in the landowner draw processes.

- Humans are smart and they will adapt their license application preferences which will throw off all the GF&P's projections. The new unique hunter projections will prove to be overstated and even the people now supporting the change will become increasingly frustrated. Then no one is happy.

- The ultimate losers are two-fold. The regular, non-landowning SD deer hunter that has hunted for years with family and friends in multiple SD deer seasons. The second loser is the small SD towns and Black Hills towns that make some decent money from out of town SD deer hunters every November. With these changes, there will be a bias for current multi-season hunters to hunt the season closer to home and not make that cross-state trip and all the spending that goes with it.

I believe the GF&P and the commission should reconsider this issue. I'm not saying the deer draw can't be improved, it probably can and some great ideas have come up in the process. But I believe it's wrong with a change this big to not have all stakeholders have to give something up, it's all coming from multi-season deer hunters. The way the entire process has played out I believe the decision was long ago decided and the public meetings etc. are simply check the box procedural issues. The only check and balance for the voters is the legislative review process and thankfully some of them had the nerve to question why the hunting public is so against this yet the GF&P leadership seems so intent in trying to pound this through.

One commissioner has brought up numerous times a young hunter that came up to them and said it's not fair some guy gets 3 buck tags and I didn't get one. My first thought is that is a very precocious teenager to be focused and studying the deer draw tables like they apparently are, wow! Second, using the GF&P's own data 256 hunters drew 3 buck tags in 2017, this is ~ 0.5% of deer hunters and one would need A LOT of built up preference points to draw that many buck tags. Fact - no hunters are drawing 3 buck tags year after year in the first draw as is being insinuated and only folks that hunt less demanded units draw even 2 buck tags with any consistency. Perhaps I'm missing it but I don't see the outrage in this situation. Fact is I'm not aware of any state where residents are guaranteed to draw a high demand firearm buck tag every year in their preferred hunting unit.

If the change is adopted, there will be many children now that are part of deer hunting groups that will fall apart that won't be deer hunting moving forward. There will also be young hunters in split families that will get to pick their "preferred" deer tag which for them means picking between hunting with mom's side or dad's side of the family. Who in this process has been a voice for them?

It would be refreshing if the GF&P leadership would spend its time focusing on important issues that unite deer hunters instead trying to fix something that isn't broken. The biggest threats to hunter participation aren't the current draw system but rather the continuing decline in quality access as farms and ranches continue to get bigger in much of our state. Also, what is being looked at with CWD as that noose continues to tighten around our state from our neighbors and the SW corner of our state which threatens all deer hunting? Point being, we have real issues to address that are going to require the help and unification of all stake holders in the deer hunting equation. The leadership of the GF&P should be focused on how to pull deer hunters together instead of tearing us apart. Instead of doing that, the commission has again repackaged the proposal and my guess is will attempt to lean on new members of the legislative review process now that we have some new legislators in Pierre and attempt to handle it that way.

Mike Dosch

Wolsey SD

mbdosch@hotmail.com

Comment:

Leave the way deer applicants are submitted alone, this has worked for years the way it has been working , why ruin something that has worked for all these years...

Jason Fischer

Cottonwood MN

Jasonfischer@charter.net

Comment:

I think it is absolutely insane to allow a person to draw several tags from one area before allowing a person who wants one to not get it. I have a son that has been applying for a nonresident west river deer drag for two years. He has not been drawn but we hunt with people in our group that are non residents that hold 7 deer tags. One anydeer and 6 whitetail any deer tags. My son cannot even get a any whitetail tag. This is insane. I understand you want to protect your residents but really. I also had 4 other non residents in our group that did not get a tag. I have hunted in 8 states and no one does anything like this.

Richard King

Oak Hill VA

rking@wbbinc.com

Comment:

Your "compromised approach" remains unfair to non-residents, and South Dakota is forgoing a lot of revenue for the department and the local economies.

Did you mean to say "COMPROMISED" ("accept standards that are lower than desirable")) or "COMPROMISE" ("an agreement that is reached by both sided making concessions") APPROACH.? "Compromise" seems most correct"

Marty Muchow

Aberdeen Proving Ground MD

marty.l.muchow.mil@mail.mil

Comment:

As a SD resident on active duty in the Army, I was concerned under the previously proposed draw structure I would only be eligible for 1 tag. I support the current proposal as it will give me the opportunity to continue to be issued tags for both East and West River deer.

Marlys Hanten

Hartford SD

marlyshanten@gmail.com

Comment:

I like the compromise allowing 2 licenses. One of my largest concerns are something that gfp has no control over. It is: there are numerous hunters that apply for any deer tags year & again whom don't shoot a mule deer. So why do they apply for Any Deer? I want the mule deer and can't get any deer tags.

Other

Leslie Larson

Miller SD

annceilia93@hotmail.com

Comment:

So many of these areas have absolutely no true habitat that will attract pheasants. So there should be criteria that the farmer has to produce to qualify before it is accepted!!!! No pheasants no pay!!!

William Podoll

Aberdeen SD

Comment:

There is no need to make changes every year. Personally I can't keep up with them. Just because one group hollowed you people seem to jump.

David Prater
Lexington KY
dprater@email.uky.edu

Comment:

I am 76 years old and have hunted SD since 1969. My son now joins me to hunt pheasants each year. I really appreciate your concern for conservation and efforts to maintain all wildlife populations. In over 40 years of hunting, this was first year to be able to duck hunt. Hope you can improve those chances for out of state hunters annually.

Thanks
DP

Jon Colw
Lake City MN
Jonkathcole@gmail.com

Comment:

Please consider allowing nonresident duck hunters to choose 2-7 day periods to hunt within their zone. It is not practical to have to hunt 10 straight days. Or allow 2-5 day periods similar to your pheasant season. Thank you

Don Tooley
Rapid City SD
ferret54@outlook.com

Comment:

I called GFP to let you know I saw a deer with a broken leg. I was told they would just leave the deer alone. (suffering, and hobbling on 3 legs) If you wanna kill deer so bad.. Please put this miserable animal out of it's suffering.

Bob Koscak
Rapid City SD
bobbyk@rap.midco.net

Comment:

Immediately STOP the tripling of preference points that you initiated last year! You are trying by this latest action to help young hunters into the game by giving them early preference points, thereby acknowledging and trying to correct your past decision. Do what's right; get rid of the tripling of existing preference points! You can still give young hunters these extra points you are proposing, although it does nothing for new hunters who are a bit older. Be fair to them too; STOP THE TRIPLING!

William Reiser
Wagner SD
areiser@hcinet.net

Comment:

on the revenue aspect, why do I have to pay an agent fee when I purchase my license on my home computer.

Justin Murphy
Lyons SD
justintmurphy@outlook.com

Comment:

I strongly support the Super Tag proposal. These tags can generate a good amount of revenue for habitat. Habitat is lacking and continues to disappear from the landscape. Getting out ahead of this issue will make huge impacts for future generations of sportsmen in South Dakota. As a resident of this great state I enjoy the many opportunities available to me. Like it or not those same opportunities should be available to nonresidents as well (obviously in moderation). I enjoy being able to elk hunt the western states and one day hope to hunt Alaska. If nonresident opportunities weren't available I would never get to enjoy those hunts.

My personal thoughts on how to work the Super Tags.

1. Open to both resident and nonresident for all tags available
2. Tags offered: Elk, Bison, Deer, Antelope, Turkey
3. \$10 per entry with unlimited entries. Same price for everyone
4. Do not offer a Super Tag bundle. Raffle the tags separately
5. Closely monitor how the raised revenue is being spent
6. Raffle the tags early in the year so people can properly plan there fall

Justin Murphy
Lyons, SD

Louie Genzler
Aberdeen SD
louiegenzler@gmail.com

Comment:

Why do disabled Vets have to be 100% disabilities to get free camping at State Parks in SD, starting at 10% would be good?

Kevin Forrester

Sturgis SD

k4ester@BlackHillsTrails.org

Comment:

RTP Motorized/Non-motorized monies being spent for Snowmobile Trail Groomers when non-motorized uses are specifically excluded from use. Research through the Federal Highway Administration has shown that the SD GFP who is the administrator of the SD Recreation Trails Program have awarded themselves significant amounts over multiple years to purchase groomers for the Snowmobile Trail System. The funds came from the allocation set aside for Motorized and Non-motorized combined. Since the groomers are for the Snowmobile Trail System and Non-motorized users are excluded from using the system the award of funds for mixed use is questionable at best.

Don Cain

Arlington SD

dc57212@gmail.com

Comment:

Just received the "GFP News: Game, Fish and Parks Fisheries Plans" and was shocked and very disappointed to see where you have taken it upon yourselves without any contact with me, to reclassify my privately owned farm to a "Managed Fishery" with "Public Fishing Access". I'm referring to your new "Highway 81 Northeast" pond as you call it.

This also is known as Brookings County, Bangor Township, Section 30-110-52 based on my tax records.

Your web site lists it as a "Managed Fishery" When did this take place without me knowing about it?

Your web site lists it as "Public Fishing Access".

How is that possible without crossing over private land which is also known as trespassing, in order to gain access.

Is this your new way of working with landowners?

Angela Dixon

Poplarville MS

angelafd61@gmail.com

Comment:

Can you tell me when WLF&G is going to make PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE FOR THERE actions when KILLING ANIMALS THAT THEY SHOULDN'T? Such as the Female greywolf killed on 01/09/2019. There guns SHOULD be taken away, permits revoked/lifetime & a hefty fine. Th Gaming MUST DO something. She was to far out. If he COULDN'T SEE DON'T KILL.

Lee Cooper
Council Bluffs IA
cbcoopers@cox.net

Comment:

I see that you are removing the past restrictions on bass on Roy Lake. I believe this is a very poor decision. My bass club has come to Roy and region every year since 2002. I have also had my sibling and spouses up there 5/6 times for a week. Roy is the only lake my club agrees to come to every year. We drive the 5-6 hours because of the quality of the fish there. We can go else where to fish numbers, but Roy has been a great lake for the quality of the fish we catch. I believe this change will harm the that quality. Bass fishermen believe in catch and release. We are also aware that many of the walleye fishermen there see them as trash fish and will keep many of them. Tourists will keep and eat many also and the size of the average fish will shrink. If that happens, then Roy becomes just another lake, pretty , but 5-6 hours away . I believe the amount of money coming to area will severely decline, as I have talked to several bass men who generally agree. We see it as a chance for a trophy smallmouth, or at least a number of really good fish. I would regret not coming to the Roy Lake area. I enjoy it a lot, but my funds are limited. I'll go where the club goes.

Jim Ivers

Crooks SD

a.herefishyfishies@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please note that I have well over 15 years experience spearfishing in fresh and salt water while freediving and using scuba. Please note that freedive spearfishing is considered one of the worlds most dangerous sports due to something called shallow water blackout. Despite this, it is very rewarding and challenging to confront fish on their own terms without a lot of bulky equipment.

Per current SD regulations, the spear must be rigidly attached to what is known as a 'gun line' on the speargun, not to exceed 20 feet in length. Despite the ease with which someone can reel in a large walleye from the boat, some fish, especially large carp, are far more powerful than a diver underwater. Trust my experience on this, a large fish not 'stoned' by a head or spine shot is fully capable of pulling the diver down at will. A freediver is therefore left with the choice of following the fish down, or letting go/losing a \$600 or \$700 speargun. At depth, the pressure in the diver's lungs magnifies the available oxygen. At 33 feet, there is double the available oxygen. Thus the diver feels comfortable hanging onto the speargun for too long. As the diver surfaces, oxygen levels in the lungs drop precipitously and the diver can black out near or at the surface. This results in almost certain death, even if a buddy is available. This happens all the time on the coast where spearfishing is common. On scuba, spearing a fish late in the dive that drags the diver down can result in excess nitrogen built up in the blood. Upon surfacing without sufficient air left in the scuba tank to decompress, the nitrogen fizzes like in a soda can, the blood forms clots around the bubbles, and significant joint and neurological damage occurs (the 'bends'). Some of our lakes here are two or three hundred feet deep (by actual depthfinder measurement). A diver dragged deep can easily become disoriented, and cannot read the depth gauge or compass easily holding a speargun. Another issue is that scuba divers use a 'buoyancy compensator' (BC) filled with air to achieve neutral buoyancy at depth. If dragged down by a fish, the air in the BC becomes compressed, the diver becomes negatively buoyant, and starts to sink rapidly. Trying to fight a fish, determine the depth, and adjust buoyancy under these conditions is very difficult even for experienced divers. Thus the diver cannot determine the maximum depth nor control the ascent rate. Both of these are required to prevent the bends.

I am not really sure why the 20' gun line restriction is in place. If you fire a bullet into the water, it will only go a couple feet before sinking to the bottom. If you fire a speargun from common equipment used, 20' is farther than the effective lethal range. You should try it sometime. Go to some body of water and fire a speargun at a target with a 20' gun line and see what the penetration is. Thus I don't consider a fixed gun line to be a safety device, more like a device destined to kill a diver.

If you are worried about a speargun being fired in the air, the recoil is substantially more than a rifle due to the mass of the spear, and can severely injure the spearfisher. My guess is the spear would break the gunline anyway. Finally, archery gear is allowed and has far more range in air than any speargun.

Therefore worldwide there are two common solutions to the problem. Gun lines are still used, but instead of being rigidly attached to the speargun, they are attached to a spear mounted reel or breakaway float line. Thus after the fish is speared, the diver can return to the surface safely and 'play' the fish as in rod and reel fishing. A floatline is safer than a reel BTW, and also serves to mark the diver's location.

Therefore I consider the 20' fixed gun line rule to be far more hazardous than any imagined danger of a spear going across a reservoir and hitting a swimmer.

Therefore I would like to suggest modifying the rules to require a 20' max gun line, but to allow a reel or breakaway float line to be used for safely retrieving the fish.

James Pease

Bend OR

pease.jim@gmail.com

Comment:

As a frequent non-resident bird hunter in S.D. I would prefer season licenses in place of your short term ones. Seven days is not helpful to non residents who plan a longer stay. And trying to figure out dates is a pain. So how about a reasonable price for a season bird license?

Resident Nonresident

Steve Cherkas

Edgemont SD

sacherkas@msn.com

Comment:

As a resident landowner (233 acres) in fall river county I would like to see the ability for my family (son, daughters, nephews, nieces, brother in law, etc) from other states to be able to come hunt my land only (not hunt unit in general) where they do not have to go thru a draw. Similar to how the landowner resident deer license where it is cheaper than full hunt unit access.

James Kinser

Denver CO

jkinseriii@gmail.com

Comment:

If you want non resident input, then email out surveys that solicit non resident opinions. We aren't going to drive to SD for a meeting. My input is that SD is no longer worth driving to for pheasant hunting. Licenses are too expensive, the merchants gouge us knowing it's pheasant hunting bringing us there, the hunting limits are too low and the quality of hunting has been mediocre at best for the last 10 years. I won't be back.

Charles Crowell

Conway Springs KS

ccrowell@txtav.com

Comment:

My family have been coming to South Dakota to pheasant hunt for at least 20 years and after last year we have decided we will not longer return. The people are rude and do not want hunters there and we haven't had much luck the last few years with getting many birds so we have decided to hunt in Nebraska. We hunted there this year on our way back from south Dakota and had much better luck, the people were friendly and helpful and the license's were cheaper. I am taking the time to write you this so maybe you will understand that yes the state wants out of state hunters to come up and spend money and hunt but the residents do not want us there and we as a family are tired of traveling to south Dakota and spending a lot of money for few birds and deal with rude unfriendly people. The residents/farmers are not buying into wanting hunters in their state and until you can change that I fear you will lose more hunters. Thanks for your time and happy hunting. Chuck

Joe Gonzalez

Easton PA

joeg@thechildrenshome.org

Comment:

I wanted to comment prior to the upcoming hearings involving the opportunities for non-resident hunters. I have memories of hunting your beautiful, well managed state on a few occasions. I have an active application to hunt deer this fall as I write this commentary. My thoughts are as follows: I am hopeful that you decide to allow a certain number of non resident hunters to pursue big game as you have had in the past years. I have noticed that the bulk of the deer permits allocated are for resident hunters and rightfully so. That being said, I have cherished the opportunity to hunt S.D. and certainly do not mind waiting my turn to be drawn. I do realize the revenue that out of state hunters bring in, the folks that rely on that income yet recognize your need for some balance for all involved. I am hopeful that the results of your hearings will still include some options for old, N. R. hunters like me to pursue deer in your fine state. I look forward to that trip every two/three years and really at this stage do not want to go elsewhere. Also, I would hope that you discuss a crossbow season and that impact for both resident and nonresident hunters as it would generate income, allow more options and provide varied management results of the deer herd (depends who you talk to) and possibilities afield. Thank you for allowing me to voice my thoughts. I have never done this sort of thing before anywhere but wanted you to know how important your decisions made from these hearings will be on nonresident hunters as well. Thank you, Joe G.

Nicholas Hluchy

Baton Rouge LA

Nicholas.Hluchy@brrehab.com

Comment:

I would like to offer input on the topic of Resident/Nonresident opportunities. I was born and raised in South Dakota and following graduate school, opportunity led me away from South Dakota. I return regularly to visit family and friends and routinely make it a point to either hunt or fish. Since I have been away, I have been able to experience some things other states have been doing to encourage a lifetime of continued support outdoor activities. I would suggest that the Commission consider discussing lifetime licenses and/or native son/daughter options. Both encourage greater participation in the outdoors and would increase the opportunity for men and women to visit South Dakota for outdoor activities.

Thank you for your time and I appreciate the opportunity to offer input

Bob Anderson

Bismarck ND

andersonbob504@gmail.com

Comment:

I read with great interest the minutes of the past meeting and as a former resident, who pheasant hunts in the Pierre area and fishes in the Mobridge area, I would like to offer the following for your consideration.

Comparing non-resident fishing vs. non-resident is difficult at best because you can park a camper or tent, use a 14' Lund and fish 80% of the lakes in eastern South Dakota. The fishing license is annual with lake access being unlimited. The resource is managed by the GF&P, with landowner participation at a minimum.

Non-residents using a "commercial hunting" guide service or game farm are not the cause of the heartburn & and hard feelings experienced by the residents. This is caused when the residents must compete with non-residents using public shooting areas, walk-in's & road ditches. Back in the 70 and 80's, people from Sioux Falls & Rapid City were considered non-residents by the locals when they hunted at Winner & Presho. Times have changed.

I would suggest the following:

1. Have an option available for non-residents for three 3-day hunts vs the current two 5-day hunts. This would allow the multiple trips with young hunters.
2. The SD GF&P will need to take an active role in providing food plots and in some cases (releasing pheasants) in the public shooting/walk in areas as the guide services are presently providing their clients. This needs to be done thru out the season.
3. The guide service/game farm will become a dying business model due to the IRS not allowing entertainment expenses to be deducted by businesses in 2018. Companies will not host client events or weekends where the costs are \$1500/customer. This will affect local motels, restaurants, convenience stores and bars. Future sales tax income will be noticeable.
4. There are several middle & high school students joining trap/shooting clubs within the school system (I would market this group as the next generation of hunters) both out of state & local.

The South Dakota department of GF&P has a reputation of being fair to sportsman, but I am not sure this is the case with US Fish & Wildlife service. Commercial goose hunting along the Missouri River is almost non-existent compared to previous years due to some of the rules by the Fish & Wildlife.

The same is true with the wildlife refuges such as the Sand Lake Refuge where hunting would improve if a management "burn program" was instituted. This would result in improved relationships with adjoining landowners.

Good luck with your decision making, there are instances where some problems do not have a fix when you need to have someone (landowners & residents) sacrifice to benefit (non-residents & out of towners).

Milton Eisiminger

Pensacola FL

jimeisiminger@sio.midco.net

Comment:

Was a resident of SD 1983-2017.

Would like to continue to hunt/fish in the state.

Would like to see habitat preservation emphasized rather than further marginalization of non-resident sportsmen.

Chris Erickson
White Bear Lake MN
zcamp3@gmail.com

Comment:

Background... For years the SD non-resident hunting requirements have been, "...The small game lines or youth small game license is valid for two periods of five consecutive days..."

The Issue... I totally understand and accept the thought that the state of SD would like to limit out of state hunting for 10 days which I accept... Yet, for out of state residents like myself that would like to hunt SD three times or more the requirement to purchase a second license for \$130 +/- is a deterrent and in some cases will limit the number of visits that out of state residents will make to SD...

My proposal... My recommendation would be for the state of SD to continue the 10 day day limitation for out of state hunters, BUT let them choose the 10 days in which they want to hunt. It could be for 10 Saturdays, a 5, 3 and 2 day period or for an 8 day and a 2 day period... It doesn't really matter it simply is 10 for a total of 10 days....

The Cost... The current system is set up for 2 five periods, yet I have to believe that that cost of simply changing the programming of the license system would be minimal... A simple pick list from a calendar in which you select 10 days shouldn't be that hard...

The Benefit... With less of a deterrent, I believe SD will have more hunters, more \$\$ spent on gas, groceries, hotels, restaurants, etc... SD is well aware of the huge economic impact of hunting, why not try to eliminate the deterrent as a result of the 2 five day license periods..

If this is an issue in which any of the state legislative or Commission would like to take up, I think it would be greatly beneficial... Additionally, I believe the waterfowl license is for one 10 day period.... This is also certainly something worth exploring...

Thanks for bring this to the attention of the applicable commission and or legislative members...

Kevin Taft
Port Orchard WA
k_taft@hotmail.com

Comment:

Hello, I have been on both sides of the Resident/ Nonresident licensing requirements in South Dakota. I grew up in SD and graduated from Custer High School in 1996, I joined the Navy that same year. I did enjoy the benefits being an Active duty service member gave me being able to acquire hunting and fishing licenses. However I retired in 2016, and lost all of those benefits. I now purchase my non resident small game licence to hunt pheasants. I would like there to be some sort of program for retired veterans, or disabled vets. I have 60% disability. Montana has a program called "Come Home to Hunt" where they give Vets that were once residents of the state resident pricing so they will come back and hunt. I would like to see SD do something similar. I would like to be able to hunt some big game. I had 4 points in the elk draw that I lost. Can SD come up with a Program for Vets that enlisted from SD and retired else where to be able to Come back and hunt for resident prices? Thank you.

Justin Faris
Cincinnati OH
Justinfaris05@gmail.com

Comment:

I love that you guys are trying to invigorate the hunting community. It's so important to carry on traditions. One thing that concerns me is that I was born in South Dakota and my family has kept land in Lyman county for over 100 years. I grew up running around that land and have hunted since I can barely remember. There is nothing in place to give someone like myself a edge over a traditional non resident. Every year I am in a draw that gives me less than a 50 % chance to hunt on my own families land. I would love to see this addressed so I can share my love of hunting with my 11 yr old as he grows up, on the land that has been a part of our family for so long. Thanks for taking the time to read this.

Ryan Campbell
Sioux Falls SD
rkcampbell90@gmail.com

Comment:

As you gather this February to discuss how to allocate our state resources to out of state hunters, I would encourage you to think about what the goal is in regards to big game in South Dakota. With such a limited resource and your stated goal of getting more South Dakotans either into hunting or back into hunting I don't understand why we allow any out of state hunters to obtain a big game hunting license. I am old enough to remember the good old days, when we had plenty of deer and could get a tag for east river, west river and the black hills almost every year. You could buy your black hills deer at the local gas station. Now, it takes several years to get a tag to hunt deer in this state for many units. I have 3 young kids that like to hunt, but like most of us, they want the chance to hunt bucks with their dads, uncles and grand dad. There should be NO out of state big game licenses until the 4th round of drawing so South Dakotans have the chance to get tags before out of staters. Protect our hunting tradition in South Dakota!!

Bryce Schoulte
Presho SD
Bschoulte@gmail.com

Comment:

I believe it's unfair to "nonresidents" like myself. I currently live out of state but I still spend a lot time on the family farm. I look forward to hunting season every year but it's very hard to get tags.

Joseph Peschel
Phillips NE
jwp@hamilton.net

Comment:

Why aren't nonresident landowners allowed landowner deer tags----they still feed the deer on their land and pay S.D. property taxes.

Brandon Jadwin
Rochester MN

Comment:

Why are you making it more difficult for NR to hunt your great state?

James Delker
Soldotna AK
jddelker@aol.com

Comment:

I was born and raised in South Dakota and graduated from SDSU and spent the majority of the first 30 years of my life as a resident of the state during which time I enjoyed a plethora of hunting and fishing opportunities in this great state. My career path pulled me out of state and I have been in Alaska for the past 15 years. I have tried to return almost yearly to hunt with my family and friends and have not complained once about the fees to access game. I expect to pay more for same opportunity afforded to the residents of the state. That being said I have been frustrated with the NR license opportunities being so restrictive. In particular the NR waterfowl license is a crap shoot at best. The northern flight is unpredictable and scheduling a trip home to "time the flight" is nearly impossible. It seems like more birds are holding longer to the north in Canada and North Dakota and the blowing through SD more quickly than the past. Having only 10 days (not divided) to attempt to hunt is stupid and truly limits potential access for non-residents to hunt throughout the season.

More of concern to me is the lack of access to Deer tags. I truly feel residents should be given preference over NR hunters, but not to the exclusion of NR hunters entirely. Despite having relatives with acres of private land, I have not even had the opportunity to draw a buck tag East River in over 15 years. Personally I think this is ludicrous. As much as I appreciate eating good doe meat, I cannot believe I will essentially never have access to another SD buck license as long as I live here in Alaska.

I am part owner of a residence in in our hometown SD that my family owns (some residents/some non-residents) We use the basecamp "lodge" where we congregate various times each fall. We had hoped to invest in crop ground nearby to keep our family hunting traditions intact for all our family, living both near and far. We had recently made an offer to purchase a large section of land and we were looking at ground that was a combination of crop ground and wildlife habitat. In the end the deal fell apart as it made little sense to invest in land in SD. I elected to invest that money in a property in another state where hunting restrictions did not preclude me from hunting on my own property. How dumb is it that I can own land, manage it for abundant wildlife, and yet not be able hunt that same land for well populated species of game?-- just because my residency lies elsewhere?? Your regulations are discouraging investment in SD and forcing NR hunters to look elsewhere for their opportunities.

As much as I would like to return home to hunt next fall, I am planning my deer hunt somewhere other than SD.

I am exploring an opportunity to hunt on private ground in Colorado where NR hunters have a good chance to draw all types of deer tags despite their residency. As you push former residents away from their heritage and family hunting opportunities, consider all of the lost income for SD businesses that you have sent to other states that do provide NR's with hunting opportunities.

I have heard at least one state offers a return "home to hunt" licenses, where former residents who have family still in the state can obtain licenses as if they were residents. I'm not sure how the logistics and parameters work for this program but just find sad that my "home state" is essentially precluding me from hunting opportunities-- on family ground we have hunted for generations. I understand the pressure to protect opportunities for residents, but it is BS when I have hunted alongside residents who legally shot multiple bucks in the same year with archery, east river, west river, muzzle loader tags, etc ... when I can't even get a buck tag every 3rd or 4th year?? Regardless of your intent to protect opportunities for residents your lack of empathy and concern for NR hunters is saddening...at least to this former resident.

Jim Delker DVM

David Fraim
Davison MI
dfraim70@charter.net

Comment:

As a long time out of state hunter, I believe it should be easier for out of state hunters, not harder. I believe property owners should have licenses to issue to their hunters compared to how much property they own. It costs them alot of money if out of state hunters are unsuccessful in the draw.

Spring Turkey Hunting Seasons

Ronald Stephenson
Oklahoma OK
Ron@gsaokc.com

Comment:

Several of our annual Pheasant party have dropped out of going because they no longer are able to pursue A Turkey on the opening for the last 4 years.

Bret Brown
Sioux Falls SD
bbrown68@me.com

Comment:

It is nice that u are considering changing this law as it would still be hard to get away with poaching if the beard and feet were required to accompany the carcass.

I would however like to caution the eagerness to keep introducing populations into areas that don't have them. Turkey are very territorial and will drive Pheasants out of areas that they take over.

Don't believe me? Ask residents in Michigan that watched a flourishing population of pheasants disappear as the turkey population exploded to the point that they are out of control and the pheasants are gone. I saw it first hand as I moved there for awhile for work in the 2002-2011 time frame. If you would like to see an example of it locally, just drive out to the Sioux Falls water treatment area on Sycamore St. I've counted nearly 100 birds in that area at the same time during the spring. Coincidentally, I rarely see pheasants in that area anymore.

Like I said earlier.....just a cautionary tale that I have experienced and am experiencing again, and as a hunter I would much rather have the pheasants than the turkeys in my pheasant areas.

Thanks again,
Bret Brown

Turkey Transportation Requirements

Steve Griffith
Brandon SD
Pringrif@alliancecom.net

Comment:

the proposed changes for the transportation of turkeys for hunters is much needed and overdue! I am in favor of making these proposed changes.

Lawrence Webinger
Lacrescent MN
webinger@acegroup.cc

Comment:

Yes finally a good idea long in the making. Making it easier for non residents to transport their bird home .

Gary Gilbertson
Saint Peter MN
oakleaf@hickorytech.net

Comment:

Just trying to have a dialog about crossbow hunting during the archery season for seniors. A number of states are now allowing the crossbow for the archery season for seniors who have difficulty pulling back a bow. Thanks for your consideration.

Jams Wipperfurth
Sauk City WI
jwipp4@gmail.com

Comment:

I come from Wisconsin to hunt turkeys. The proposed rule change would make it much easier to transport turkeys back home and allow me to conform to the law.

Martin Wiernusz
Ossian IA
DOCMARTY@ACEGROUP.CC

Comment:

Very logical. As a hunter from Iowa this really helps us out. Thanks.

Richard Nelson
Apple Valley MN
rcnelson@arthurchapman.com

Comment:

As an out-of-state hunter, this would be a very welcome change. It is hard transporting the entire bird when getting home.

George Wilkes
Grand Marais MN
gwilkes@boreal.org

Comment:

This would be a huge improvement ! It is very difficult on a long hunting trip to keep the meat fresh while keeping the foot and beard attached. So much better to allow separation of those parts, and I can't see a lot of violations occurring because of this change.

Donald Wojciechowski
Rapid City SD
don.woj@gmail.com

Comment:

ALSO, please consider adding a fall archery only turkey season beginning around mid Sept or 01-Oct. It is unfair to archery hunters they must hunt fall turkey only during gun deer seasons.

Donna Bares
Sturgis SD
jbares@rushmore.com

Comment:

I support this change as I would prefer to be able to bone out the parts we keep and place on ice as soon as possible after the kill rather than having to wait until getting to a domicile as I usually have other family hunting and it is 60 miles to my domicile

Donald Holznagel
Mora MN
Mrdsbp@hotmail.com

Comment:

I always skin my wild turkeys and to be able to debone my bird and freeze it in individual quart bags along with the beard and spurs would be a great improvement as far as maintaining the palatability of the meat

Levi Muhl
Hastings MN

Comment:

Hunting turkeys in SD is a yearly tradition. However traveling over 10 hours and harvesting a Turkey early in the trip can be quite difficult to cool and preserve the Turkey through our trip and the way home. I support the current proposal as this will help with our travel logistics.

Robert Winter
Yankton SD
bcwinter@vyn.midco.net

Comment:

This is an excellent proposal. Not only for those traveling a distance, but also for when a turkey is taken in hot weather.

John Dunn
Eau Claire WI
dunnjc@charter.net

Comment:

Last spring I shot a beautiful Merriams on the 2nd day of a 7 day hunt. We were tent camping and had no easy way of keeping the carcass cold. Luckily, the weather was cold enough to keep the whole turkey from spoiling. It would have been much easier to cut up the turkey and keep the required parts in a cooler.

Janet Schultz
Minnetrista MN
janetcschultz@gmail.com

Comment:

support

Edward McGee
Keystone SD
mcgeehfactor@hotmail.com

Comment:

support

Mike Kervin
Brookings SD
Cmkervin@hotmail.com

Comment:

Great idea and makes a lot of sense. Also, thank you for your part of stopping rifle hunting of turkeys. The sport is so much safer without long shots .

Marv Rooney
Stillwater MN
ml_rooney@msn.com

Comment:

New reg proposal makes sense. Also strongly favor requirement to have a phone in registration procedure

Craig Sinclair
Waconia MN
craig1outdoors@gmail.com

Comment:

Thank You!

Lawrence Webinger
Lacrescent MN
webinger@acegroup.cc

Comment:

Very good idea should not be an enforcement problem.

Public Comments

Deer License Allocation

Robert Eddy
Rapid City SD

Comment:

I would like to begin by thanking you for challenging this topic and encourage you to make the best decision that benefits a majority of the states sportsmen and women.

I would encourage you to oppose this current compromise allowing hunter to apply for 2, first-round licenses. In reality, a hunter is allowed an additional Archery licence totaling 3 possible antlered deer licenses just during the first-round. The proposed compromise has complicated the system with too many variables. Help make this an equitable opportunity for everyone to obtain a licence before allowing a single hunter to obtain multiple firearm licenses.

Please support a 1 licence, first-draw for future deer hunting opportunities. Despite the very vocal opposition from a minority of opponents, many wish to have a simplistic application that provides everyone a chance at a tag first. There will be leftover opportunities for those wishing to extend their own season.

Robert Eddy
Rapid City SD

Comment:

I would like to begin by thanking you for challenging this topic and encourage you to make the best decision that benefits a majority of the states sportsmen and women.

I would encourage you to oppose this current compromise allowing hunter to apply for 2, first-round licenses. In reality, a hunter is allowed an additional Archery license totaling 3 possible antlered deer licenses just during the first-round. The proposed compromise has complicated the system with too many variables. Help make this an equitable opportunity for everyone to obtain a license before allowing a single hunter to obtain multiple firearm licenses.

Please support a 1 license, first-draw for future deer hunting opportunities. Despite the very vocal opposition from a minority of opponents, many wish to have a simplistic application that provides everyone a chance at a tag first. There will be leftover opportunities for those wishing to extend their own season.

Thank you!

Terry Spaans
Rapid City SD
terry.spaans@sdsmt.edu

Comment:

SD Game Fish & Parks give out way to many out of state hunters for Deer License and there needs to be a better way of handling this. Your lottery system has to be set up better. No reason why a 12 to 14 year old can get better tags when I did have three years preference until this year. I also have a problem with your lottery system with ELK. 12 to 14 year old can get first draw and I have 20 years preference and can't get one. Its messed up.

Daniel Kuyper
Madison SD
dan.kuyper@kibbleeq.com

Comment:

oppose

Gary Gruber
Custer SD
clawantlerhide@hotmail.com

Comment:

I thought this proposal was suppose to give more hunters, especially the young kids a better chance to get a tag.

But when you give us two chance that just cut our chance in half. I don't think you accomplished anything. One year I might get no tags and the next year I get two tags.

I think you guys caved to the game hogs.

And another thing while you have my dander up, why do you keep moving the east river season later and later? Don't you know global warming is over. The east river season keeps getting colder every year. I can't even get the wife to sit with me anymore because its been so cold. And if you don't want the next generation to become just road hunters with there heaters on then you better think twice about this late season. I hunt public land and sit out in the elements. I don't have one of those fancy tree house stand with heaters and windows. Start it a week earlier instead of later when you have a possibility of some warmer weather.

Its usually warmer out west then back east. Swap with them.

I found my first fresh deer shed when I was a kid on December 2, harvesting antlerless bucks doesn't help manage deer either.

Signed,

Gary Gruber Custer SD.

Michael Wenande
Mitchell SD
mwenande@andersencorp.com

Comment:

As a family, we always apply for East & West River deer. We have close friends that we hunt with on both seasons and it would be unjust to have to pick one over the other. Everyone should have the option of applying for first draw on both of these seasons. However, I do not agree with allowing a hunter to apply for another license within a unit (county) in which he already has a tag (whether it's the 4th or 5th round draw).

Kevin Hayes
Rapid City SD

Comment:

Why would put muzzle deer hunting in that category. It is completely. Diff type of hunting. Also how are u going to do preference morris I already have for your preferences still can't get a muzzleloader

Shannon Bruggeman

Tea SD

shannonbruggeman@yahoo.com

Comment:

What a complete waste of time. The people spoke and were clear about wanting this change, but the loudest voices in the room are all that mattered. This current proposal isn't really a change, huge amount of money wasted, and proves to me my time commenting on these issues is a waste. SDGFP is gonna do whatever the commission decides, not what people want. Except of course the vocal minority.

Rich Heiman

Canistota SD

chard@goldenwest.net

Comment:

This Proposal is better than the other with only one in the 1st draw, but I would like to see some additional options. Why not let us purchase preference points for the other four seasons in 1st draw. The reasoning would be to improve our odds when a person would like to alternate there primary two selections from year to year or if successful the prior year and preference points start over. I think this would still give everyone a better chance as in the past, as a person would be limited to only two 1st draws in a given year but would not completely remove some of those family traditions of hunting. I know some will forgo applying all together in one or more of the seasons with your current proposal. Maybe give first time applicant preference if you want to give others opportunity and to draw their attention to hunting. Maybe these have all been discussed but thought I would share my thoughts.

Cory Lacina

Elk Point SD

Comment:

THIS IS A MUCH BETTER IDEA THAN YOUR FIRST PROPOSAL. IT WILL ENCOURAGE PEOPLE TO FOCUS ON WHICH SEASONS THEY REALLY WANT TO HUNT, WHILE STILL ALLOWING THEM TO HUNT DIFFERENT AREAS IN THE STATE.

James Cantalope

Eureka SD

cantajam@yahoo.com

Comment:

Final, it's my final comment, what I'm getting is the people I ask think that this new change is going to guarantee them a tag in the unit they hunt, so you better let everyone know this draw is no different now then in the past, its still the same process, actually less chances to get deer tags!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Torrey Quella
Zimmerman MN
torrey.quella@gmail.com

Comment:

I have been hunting the East River deer area (specifically Campbell County) for a number of years. There has NEVER been any out of state Buck tags available for non-residents. But in years past you have many leftover tags for 2 antlerless deer. It looks like you are trying to actively cull the deer population. Why not open the antlered tags a little for non-residents as well.

Jack Dokken
Pierre SD

Comment:

oppose

Kelly Eilers
Canton SD
kjeilers89@gmail.com

Comment:

Please please leave this alone. There is nothing wrong with what we have. Dont try ro fix something that is not broken.

Bill Hadsell
Brookings SD
bill.hadsell@daktronics.com

Comment:

Feels like you have it right now. Great work listening to us.

Ray Konz
Brandon SD
ray@adrianstatebank.com

Comment:

is it possible to make it a little more confusing????

i just hope you are not opening the door for more commercial (pay to hunt) deer hunting.

Brett Lebrun
Brookings SD

Comment:

There is nothing wrong with the current draw system. If people are upset because they can't draw a buck tag in a specific county every year they need to step outside their comfort zone and hunt other places. Don't ruin the opportunity for us who are willing to put in the homework and draw tags in places we may have to travel to. This system is going to help anyone who is wanting to draw a high demand tag every year. Leave it the way it is

Lance Rom
Rapid City SD
lrom@qualityservices.us.com

Comment:

This system gets more convoluted all the time because you are trying to please everyone.

- 1 - Residents should have absolute preference over non-residents.
- 2 - A person should be able to submit only one application the first draw.
- 3 - Second draw one application if they didn't get license the first draw.
- 4 - After that apply for as many licenses as wanted.

Make it simpler -not more complex!!!!

James Gonsor
Webster SD
Jagonsor70@hotmail.com

Comment:

It is perfectly fine as is, i would also like to see the elimination of purchasing preference points. Earn them, stop catering to money and nonresidents!

Joe Casavan
Watertown SD
joecasavan@hotmail.com

Comment:

I am opposed to this, or any change to the current deer season drawing process.