
John Duffy
Oldham SD
jduffy03@hotmail.com

Comment:

Dear GF&P Commissioners,

I have honestly been against the deer tag allocation changes from the very beginning; however, I have spoken with and met with many people involved with this process over the last year and the newest "2 tag" proposal is a fair way of trying to compromise with the most "serious/passionate deer hunters" that still want to be able to hold more than 1 QUALITY firearm buck tag the same year (i.e. an East River AND West River buck tag BOTH or any combination of 2 of the firearm buck tags). I now support this change whereas I did not support the previous "1 tag" proposal.

Yes; you could have received leftover tags in the previous proposal starting in the 3rd drawing but they weren't as likely to actually be where you wanted to hunt (maybe a brand new county where you don't already have permission or landowner relationships built) or what species you wanted to hunt (whitetail only tags in an area that is mainly mule deer); therefore, the previous "1 tag" proposal was realistically like to be only 1 QUALITY firearm tag per year rather than now with a better chance at 2 QUALITY firearm tags with being able to hunt bucks both East River AND West River, which is what most of the passionate deer hunters wanted and weren't getting with the previous proposal(s).

During this process, I realized that at the end of the day some level of change was going through whether most deer hunters liked it or not and this newest proposal is the best compromise I've seen so far. Would I still rather leave the system the way it is? Absolutely! Will it stay the same? No; not even if 80% of us want it to. I feel that the GF&P Commission and GF&P have good intentions with this change and this will still get roughly 1,000 more people deer hunting every year. I'm willing to give up my 3rd firearm tag to make that happen. I will still be able to get a good opportunity to hunt with 2 quality tags from either ER Any Deer, WR Any Deer, or Muzzleloader Deer that I currently hunt now (or others that I don't currently apply for like BHD, CSP, RFD). Before this latest change I was going to have to pick between East River deer or West River deer hunting. That wasn't a choice I wanted to make. Hopefully now many of us will not have to.

Thank you to the GF&P and commissioners for listening to the most "serious and passionate deer hunters" at the beginning of 2019 with this newest compromise proposal (and also listening to the "less passionate deer hunters" over the previous year or two that just want 1 tag) and coming up with some level of compromise between both groups, even if it still doesn't make some hunters happy on Facebook it shows you are trying to listen and do what you think is best for hunting in South Dakota long-term. Again, I was against any change initially, and would still prefer no change, but this latest proposal is good enough for my stubbornness to accept some level of change that would benefit more South Dakota deer hunters but will still not take away so much from the other passionate deer hunters that the previous proposal would have otherwise changed deer hunting very negatively for.

Best Regards,

Ross Swedeen
Rapid City SD
reswede@yahoo.com

Comment:

Esteemed SD GFP Commissioners,

First off, thank you to the new commissioners for taking on the responsibilities of being a SD GFP Commissioner.

I got a little long winded on the last email. I will definitely save you all from a book this time! After 2 years of this seemingly never ending topic rolling on, it astounds me how many people still do not truly understand these changes! That is very evident from reading all the public comments this morning. I guess the old saying of "you can lead a horse to water, but you can't make them drink" continues to have merit.

This current proposal is better than the last one in regards to all the seasons being combined. However, the current proposal is worse off than the last proposal as a hunter now has 2 first choices. This will allow hunters to "double dip". That is exactly what got us into this situation to begin with!

I still believe the original proposal of having all the deer licenses in one "bucket" with 1 first choice was a far better proposal. It would have allowed the most unique SD deer hunters to draw a deer license in any given year. Which contributes directly to all of the 3R objectives (Recruitment, Retention and Reactivation). The original proposal would have had the greatest positive impacts on the drawing odds as well.

This current proposal is absolutely an compromise. I understand the value of compromise. However, compromise is not necessarily warranted in all situations. This just may be one of them. 67% of deer hunters in South Dakota are one license applicants (35,140 of the 52,633 applicants in 2017). We are reducing the additional unique SD deer hunters that would have otherwise not drawn a 1st choice license by roughly 66% (3000 down to 1000). Purely for the benefit of the roughly 8% of deer hunters that draw 2 or more first choice licenses (3,985 of the 52,633 applicants in 2017). I was one of those 8% in 2018. Truth be told, I was one of the 0.6% that drew 3 or more first choice licenses.

I supported the first proposal. I supported the last proposal. I support this current proposal too. All were/are better options than our current system. Please support this proposal (or some form of it) as well.

Once again, I would like to thank you for tackling this very contentious topic. No matter your decision, there will be large percentage of unhappy deer hunters. I truly wish you the best of luck!

Ken Krieger
Burke SD
oakcanyonranch@goldenwest.net

Comment:

From what I understand, with the new regulations, it will be harder for Non-residents to draw a deer tag. Restricting non-residents to less opportunities to draw a tag does not make any sense. If resident haven't established a relationship with land owners by now... having more opportunities to draw a tag will not secure them a place to hunt. Non-resident hunters will shift and hunt in other states where deer tags are available ... some of which are apply and receive a tag.

Wake-up South Dakota GF&P Commission, use some common sense and oppose the new restrictive draw regulations!

Clifton Stone
Chamberlain AZ
cstone@midstatesd.net

Comment:

Lets give it a try.

Brian Baumgartner
Sioux Falls SD
treegardener@sio.midco.net

Comment:

The description of preference points in your email is too vague and fails to help me understand how this change affects preference points and a persons chance of success in the first drawing. It is my understanding that this proposal is about improving a persons chance of success in the first drawing.

Currently I have about 5 pref. points for ERD. I do not have any for WRD nor any of the other five seasons allowed in the first draw. Since all six seasons are pooled in the first draw, are the preference points then also pooled or do they remain season specific?

For example; If I apply for only one season in the first draw, lets say WRD, and I am unsuccessful, do I then receive a point for only the season I applied for; WRD? I assume that I would not have been able to use the 5 preference points I currently have for ERD.

If this is true, I don't see any difference in the new proposal as apposed to the old system. There is effectively no change in a persons chance of success in the first draw. At this point the only change I can see is that all of the applications happen at the same time. That's nice but no big deal to me.

Thanks for your time. I look forward to a better understanding of how this new application system provides positive change.

Other

Cartor Carlson

Aberdeen SD

cartorkarlson@hotmail.com

Comment:

This is being sent in regards to the issues and rulings regarding the use of leg hold traps. Our family loves the outdoors and we spend countless hours hunting and fishing in our great state. In regards to trapping, especially leg hold traps we have some major concerns. We live in the country, however close to Aberdeen. We are not opposed to trapping, but do feel there is a time and a place where it should be and not be allowed.

We live within the three mile radius of Aberdeen and there are a number of families in our area and most have pets. Last winter our dog got caught in one of these traps close to our home and spent over 24 hours in it while the temperature was around a minus 20 degrees most of this time. He survived, however had to have part of his foot amputated by a vet because of this event.

In addition to this our son's dog got caught in one of these traps in a public hunting area during pheasant season. This area is close to town and get lots of public use.

Again, we are not opposed to trapping, but do not feel these traps should be used in populated areas close to town or in public hunting areas during certain hunting seasons. To us this is only common sense. I am sure that these types of issues happen more often than you may think .

Thanks for your attention to this issue.

Cartor Carlson
Aberdeen, SD

Tony Sieber

Deadwood SD

Comment:

I'd like to send a quick thank you to the SDGFP Commissioners for adding Lawrence County to Unit 2 this past season for Canada Goose hunting. As an avid waterfowler, it was a great benefit to be able to hunt geese into February this past season in Lawrence County. I was able to take my 14 year old son and some of his friends on numerous hunts after X-mas this year which made for great experiences in the outdoors.

Please continue to add Lawrence County to the Unit 2 Canada Goose hunting for late season opportunities.

Greg Schroeder

Hill City SD

**gregschroeder.muleyhunter@gmail
.com**

Comment:

I oppose auctioning off a bighorn sheep tag near Badlands National Park. Any revenue gained from an auction will not increase resident access to Bighorn Sheep tags, only continue to give wildlife to the highest bidder. Allow the residents of SD to continue to have a one-of-a-kind experience for a trophy sheep, not just the wealthy.

Paul Roghair

Kadoka SD

tallpaulr@hotmail.com

Comment:

I regret that I will not be able to attend this meeting due to work requirements which I cannot avoid and miss. The SDTWS meeting is scheduled for this same time and I am attending it for work please forgive my absence and do not take it as my lack of passion on this topic.

I would like to further address the committee to plead for the use of rifles to be returned for the Spring turkey season. First of all the stats show that less than half the people who hunt are worried about it. Thus the use of decoys that are more lifelike doesn't worry people. I know that they are well made, however they are not equipped to move like real live turkeys. Each rifle hunter takes that responsibility on themselves to know for sure what they are shooting at which rests with the hunter not the State. If I remember correctly one should be sure of the target and what is beyond it, not "don't worry the rules will keep you from doing anything dangerous just follow them." Give the sportsman some credit and responsibility, we all still drive cars and people get killed in them all the time, do you want to ban a type of car that has more potential to get in an accident?

Second it seems as a matter of personal preference and opinion about how much enjoyment is had by said rifle turkey hunter. You may not find it fun but others do it seems unfair to press ones definition of fun on others when it is not hurting them or inhibiting their ability to pursue game. Also as far as ammo use, I have not had any problem eating my turkeys for years and not blowing them up. Please I ask you to consider this request for what it is, an effort by some to force their style of hunting on the rest of us. If for instance I feel that everyone should hunt deer with a shotgun and not rifles because its more sporting and safer, do I have the right to press a rule in to take the rifle away from everyone? No I do not its a matter of opinion, the turkey populations do not suffer from the use of rifles, rifle hunters (few) don't take extra birds out of the population just because they use a rifle, the tags are what they are no matter how they are harvested. Each hunter has the right to choose what they want to do within the rules to harvest a turkey, please do not keep this new rule because some turn their nose up at a method that has been used here in South Dakota for years, from my understanding not all GFP is behind this change but the ones that aren't must tow the line because of who you work for.

I have enjoyed taking several turkeys with my six year old son and was able to do so because I could use a rifle.

The areas hunted provided better use of a rifle, the turkeys did as well and he got to enjoy it with me. I feel saddened that it has a chance to go way and I will have to tell him we cannot share that experience anymore because some believe it is not a "sporting way" to hunt turkeys. Not everyone gets the same thrill from scouting hours and hours and getting up super early to call birds off the roost. Some may prefer to glass the countryside, find the game and sneak into position for an opportunity, they are both methods of hunting and thus please do not keep a new rule that takes a method out of play not for any good reason besides the some "TURKEY HUNTERS" doesn't like it.

In a time of losing hunters would not taking away one more way of hunting hurt the hunting community? A rifle can be a great tool for those not equipped to absorb heavy recoil (youth and disabled in particular). Help the sportsman of South Dakota out and allow the choice. You can't make a law that says a landowner has to allow the use of a rifle, but they can let you if you want, when they don't care, why should the rule makers? Furthermore, the last fatal accident in SD for turkey hunting was with a Shotgun! So that makes the shotgun safer than a rifle? Ask to look at the data, better look it up for yourself about how safe (or concerned about safety) Turkey hunter surveys have always swung back and forth on this issue, but that makes sense that it is less likely to get surveys from people who only use rifles and are very passionate about it if there are less of

them, it seems that basing decisions on a sample of 540 out of 8750 could really swing the results either way depending on the number of rifle hunters who got to fill out a survey (I for one did not) If you want a true look put it on the turkey application and require everyone to respond when they apply for a tag, then you would know but that would take a great amount of time and money. 13% of spring firearms hunters are moderately concerned and 7% are very concerned about hunting in the spring with a full body decoy. 54% are NOT CONCERNED.... So are people saying that rifles need to be out because they feel unsafe or because it's a preference??? I think it should be compared to how safe deer hunters feel in rifle season using a full body decoy. We all do not want to see people hurt while enjoying the South Dakota outdoors, but it happens. Like the last turkey fatality.... Shotgun so they have safety issues as well. If we all want to be 100% safe, then build a bunker at every ones house and hide in it, my point there is danger in everything, don't continue to limit peoples enjoyment of this sport under the guise of unsafe, to push the agenda of some.

Consider leaving rifle use out of the Black Hills where most accidents are likely to happen because of the greater hunter density and terrain, if not that then possibly on all public hunting areas and leaving private land open to the rifle. The stats don't show more or less favor there, I believe because the people who wanted the rifles out want them out everywhere, and those who hunt with them are few enough in number that when split up in their opinions on it don't show the same statically. Rifle hunting on private land allows the landowners to hunt as they wish; several I have talked with were still totally unaware of the change. Also I believe, continuing to ban rifles it will feed into the attitude that some landowners already hold that a person should not even buy a tag because turkeys are pests. Private lands provide the hunter with a more reasonably controlled situation, I see the potential for a hunter of questionable ethics to be riding down a Forest service trail in the Black hills, spot a guys turkey decoy set up and drop a rifle out the window to shoot one. Yep that's a problem, however on private land unless you have permission to be there, there is less LEGAL chance of that happening. (yes given people poach on private grounds, but rules that restrict the one whom abide by them does not stop that) In these areas hunters should know if there are other hunters around and adjust accordingly for safety if that is truly the concern. I have never had permission from a landowner who either told me whom either told me who else was hunting or I did not ask if there were others hunting, in addition to what I was hunting with. My opinion is that the life like decoys and safety are an excuse to press some peoples or groups hunting preference and opinions on others which seems unfair and unnecessary and we have now bought into it.

I would love to see rifles returned to the spring season; yes I know it would be for the 2020 season if so. But with their return also see a simplified version of the rifle regulations to include.... Any rim or centerfire rifle cartridge greater than 1 inch in length and less than 2.5in. The upper limit would not have to be there but this would be a really simple rule to use. No charts about ammo and Foot Pounds of Energy, but a ruler. Wyoming does this for their season with Rimfires, why not use what works for them. Thank you for your time.

Paul Roghair

Kadoka SD

tallpaulr@hotmail.com

Comment:

I Strongly strongly strongly (not sure how to emphasize this enough) OPPOSE any action that leads to the Badlands Unit of the Big Horn Sheep area being valid for the auction! 1 time is all our history since the BHG came back here did a SD resident get a chance to harvest one, and now Some may want to sell that off to the rich! Not even leave it alone for the same amount of time that the Black Hills populations where? Also were would this money go??? what more can pouring more money into the sheep program do? Unless they can buy more sheep so they can issue more tags to RESIDENTS. Please don't sell out our SD sportsman. Unless we like the idea of tame world records being handed out only to the rich. Makes a ton of sense right?

Al Kraus

Rapid City SD

Bowguy@hotmail.com

Comment:

Nonresidents are ruining the public lands and the quality of our mule deer.

Jon Olson

Sioux Falls SD

jbolson426@yahoo.com

Comment:

I am very much in favor of limiting nonresident archers for both deer and antelope seasons. The ND model is a good starting point.

Wyatt Skelton

Bryant SD

wyattskelton@hotmail.com

Comment:

Have muzzleloader season open for same length as rifle antelope season. Then reopen at current date in December.

Wyatt Skelton

Bryant SD

wyattskelton@hotmail.com

Comment:

Cap the number of mule deer that may be taken by nonresident archers.

Wyatt Skelton

Bryant SD

wyattskelton@hotmail.com

Comment:

Cap tags at approximately (8%) of resident tags sold. Not 2018 total tags sold because 2018 was a large increase in nonresident tags. This is attributed to SD being a unlimited cheap out of state tag where nonresident can shoot mule deer. More mule deer are shot by nonresident than residents!

Wyatt Skelton

Bryant SD

wyattskelton@hotmail.com

Comment:

SD is currently a cheap unlimited tag for archery. Raise tag prices to be comparable to surrounding states like IA and MT. Raise amounts across the board for all nonresident licenses.

Wyatt Skelton

Bryant SD

wyattskelton@hotmail.com

Comment:

The amount of nonresident pressure is affecting the quality of the hunt for residents and overcrowding on public lands is reducing game to be found on public land.
Reduce nonresident pressure.

Wyatt Skelton

Bryant SD

wyattskelton@hotmail.com

Comment:

Public land is overcrowded and over pressured by large numbers of out of state hunters. Resident hunter experience is suffering and game is pressured off of public land. Cap number of nonresident antelope tags.

Jerry Travis

Brandon SD

jt653byu@yahoo.com

Comment:

I have 2 prior Long time residents of SD that bowhunt with me every year and they are not wealthy people. I hate to see hunting become a rich mans sport. I do support limiting NR licensing absolutely.

Resident Nonresident

Daniel Tracy

Vermillion SD

dan.tracy@usd.edu

Comment:

Why are we allowing non-residents ANY tags ahead of exhausted resident demand (draws 1-3 at least). It is already difficult to draw licenses in my county of preference WITH preference points (about 1 out of 3 years). SD residents ALWAYS deserve the best chances at drawing a tag, particularly in a county where they live or own property.

Turkey Transportation Requirements

Ross Swedeen

Rapid City SD

reswedeen@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please support the change to the turkey transportation requirements. The current transportation requirements place unnecessary burdens on the hunter with little to no positive effect to negate poaching.

Clifton Stone

Chamberlain SD

cstone@midstatesd.net

Comment:

support

GAME, FISH & PARKS

523 East Capital

Pierre, SD 57501

(605)773-3396

Fax (605)773-6425

Chris.Petersen@state.sd.us

4

REQUEST FOR LISTS OF LICENSE HOLDERS**Application**Type of List Requested Small Game Now Resident W of SDNumber of licenses in list 5805

Name of Person, Entity, or Organization requesting list:

Sunrise Ranch LLC

Address of Person, Entity, or Organization:

Box 739
EDGE MONT SD
57735

How would you like your list sent to you: (email or disk)

DISK

Phone Number

605-685-3376

Purpose for which list will be used:

CONTACT HUNTERS THAT MAY COME
THROUGH EDGE MONT**This list is Names and Mailing Addresses ONLY**

The sale of lists by the Department of Game, Fish & Parks is authorized by SDCL 1-27-1 and ARSD 41:06:02:04, 05 and 06. The fee for a Game, Fish & Parks Commission approved exception is \$100, otherwise the fee is \$100 per thousand names or a minimum of \$100 whichever is greater.

Unless requested and approved as part of this request, the license list will not include anyone under eighteen years of age. Names are for one-time use only and are to be used only by the person, entity or organization approved per this request.

Authorized Signature of Purchaser

Date

2-21-19

Date of Commission Action