

# Public Comments

## 01. Firewood Restriction

---

**Tony Voeltz**

**Marion SD**

**tvoeltz@goldenwest.net**

**Comment:**

Why can't we bring other types of wood such as cottonwood, elm, applewood that is not affected by the bug?

## 02. Fall Turkey

---

**Douglas Leighton**

**Bruce SD**

**dogleighton@dakotahgold.com**

**Comment:**

is this a one year proposal? what happens when we get back into a dry cycle and water levels recede

---

**Berdette Zastrow**

**Grenville SD**

**bzastrow@venturecomm.net**

**Comment:**

I hunt Roberts County turkeys and there are enough turkeys to support a fall season in the ENTIRE COUNTY. Please vote yes on the proposal to open ALL OF ROBERTS COUNTY to fall hunting.

---

**Harry Mitchell**

**Hot Springs SD**

**wanesharose1@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

if you need to quit turkey tags in pennington and Lawrence counties, please don't reduce black hills tags by 200 or at all. we have a lot of turkey in southern hills, but now we will have all northern hunters down here , and that will make it less chance of hunters here getting tags. thank you.

## 03. Archery Equipment Restrictions

---

**Trent Koistinen**

**SD**

**Comment:**

Thanks for the September 1st Archery opener.

---

**Dana Rogers**

**Hill City SD**

**dana.rogers.1@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

As a lifelong South Dakota Bowhunter, International Bowhunters Education Federation Instructor and Pope and Young Club member, I oppose the vast majority of changes proposed to our archery equipment recommendations.

Electronics on the bow that aid in the taking of game such as a range finding sight allow way too much technology and 'could' lead to people taking longer shots than they are capable of. Allowing telescopic sights on a bow the same.

Elk are a VERY large and tough big game animal and allowing a slight draw weight bow to use an expandable that REQUIRES more Kinetic Energy to open and penetrate is a dangerous and ethical challenge.

The arrow weight grain, arrow length, draw let-off and axle to axle length are iffy topics with all the new technology being created but we need to have minimum standards to keep archery seasons as 'primitive' and short range as possible. Just because the Archery Trade Association (manufacturers) can produce something to sell, does NOT mean we should make sweeping changes.

I'm very concerned about allowing too many technological advances in the aiding of taking game as I really enjoy our seasons and opportunities and I would hate to see the success rates jump too high due to ease of use/harvest and thus possibly lose opportunities in the future during our archery seasons.

---

**Anthony Filholm**

**Brookings SD**

**anthonyfilholm@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Most of the equipment changes are understandable but there a couple I take issue with. The most notable is the allowance of mechanical broadheads for taking elk or deer with lower poundage bows. I do not mean to educate you but mechanical broadheads require more kinetic energy to work consistently. They need to be driven faster with more power. I suggest not allowing their use with any bow that draws less than 50 lbs. It is more an energy question than which species you use them on. Use of electronic gear attached will lead to people using laser range finding auto aiming sights that will lead to more long range shots being attempted with an increase in wounding losses. Archery is supposed to be about how close you can get to your game, not how far you can shoot it at. Please reconsider these two items. Thanks for your time.

## 04. Refuge and Boating Restrictions

---

**John Heylens**

**Volga SD**

**Comment:**

Please keep the East Oakwood as a refuge as West Oakwood can be fished and the migrating and local birds need a resting point in our area. People can fish from shore if they would like. There is plenty of lake access.

---

**Jim Gruber**

**Estelline SD**

**jgruber148@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

i can only ask why? waterfowl will fly from the sight of a boat with or without an electric or gas operated boat.. most duck boats are large and require a gas motor to get to their hunting spots. little is gained by this proposal except that less people will be on the lake simply because they want to avoid the hassle and the expense . bad proposal.

---

**Stephen Gehring**

**Watertown SD**

**SHGEHRING@GMAIL.COM**

**Comment:**

Two comments:

I strongly oppose the electric motors only on Swan Lake. This is a popular fishing lake large enough for big boats.. The last few years the winters have come late.

On Horseshoe Lake in Codington County a better restriction would be to limit motorized boating to the area around the public hunting peninsula and island. I doubt the safety of an electric motor on a windy day.- at least not my motor.

Thank you for your consideration

---

**Stephen Gehring**

**Watertown SD**

**SHGEHRING@GMAIL.COM**

**Comment:**

I did not make clear that gasoline motors should be allowed on Horseshoe Lake in Codington County but should be restricted to the access and around the public hunting peninsula/island.

A few years ago a hunter was almost drowned at Waubay NR where a small craft was mandated

---

**Suzan Nolan**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**kensuz49@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Bear Butte is at the foot of a sacred mountain. It's a small lake used for fishing boats. I heartily oppose boats larger than small fishing boats that do not leave a wake used on this small and serene lake

---

**Jim Gruber**  
**Estelline SD**  
**jgruber148@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

the more i read on this the worse it seems.. 1-where did this electric motor only proposal come from/why/purpose/ 2-this whole thing has been a ploy by some wealthy and influential land owners to create their own private shooting area at the expense of the small time hunter and fisherman. it has been opposed by 90% of all involved, yet for some reason it keeps reappearing.. cant we ever leave well enough alone? pheasants are gone, waterfowl will be next.....

---

**Clint Oedekoven**  
**Sturgis SD**  
**Coedekoven**

**Comment:**

I would like to see 25 horse motor restriction stay in place.

---

**Justin Allen**  
**Pierre SD**

**Comment:**

I'm totally against any type of boating/motor restriction on Swan Lake. I live in Pierre now but moved from Florence so I know the area extremely well. The couple landowners pushing this move want nothing but better hunting for themselves and the folks they guide on said land. I find it tough to believe they care about anyone else. A large portion of the lake is public and this boating restriction will make waterfowl hunting hard to access. IMO this move is another land grab that only further commercializes waterfowl hunting in SD. Don't get me wrong waterfowl refuges are great in certain areas but not on a body of water that is largely public land under and surrounding the lake. Please leave Swan Lake as is.

---

**Terry Amy**

**Watertown SD**

**tja19@abe.midco.net**

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the proposal for Swan Lake. The only reason this is even being considered is because of wealthy landowners on the north side of the lake that want to improve hunting on their land. With the GFP losing access to many lakes we need to be looking at providing more opportunities for hunting and fishing, not limiting them. With the climate change, the main migration is not here until late November anyway. This is a great fall walleye fishing lake, lets leave it that way. Don't take away opportunities for average sportsman to appease wealth special interest.

---

**Jeffrey Liudahl**

**Pierre SD**

**Comment:**

Dear Commissioners: I'm writing to comment on the proposal to limit boating on Swan Lake in Clark County, South Dakota to electric motors only from Oct. 20 - December 31. As you recall, this matter was discussed last year and then tabled for consideration in June 2018. Public sentiment was approximately 95% opposed to the proposal of not allowing boating on Swan Lake from Oct. 20 - Dec. 31. What has changed?? Adding a little twist to the proposal by allowing electric motors changes nothing! How is a diver hunter such as myself, going to use an electric motor to travel the distance required to hunt, and then return to the boat landing in inclement weather and wind? This presents a liability issue along with obvious safety concerns. Reliable sources tell me that commissioner Doug Sharp from Watertown resurrected This proposal in spite of strong opposition. Please review and study the duties of a game commissioner. Representing all sportsmen, not just a privileged few should be the goal at all times. This proposal stinks to high Heaven! My hope is that the game commission will see that it fails. Thank you very much.

---

**Marty Mack**

**Wayertown SD**

**Macklandsurveying@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I believe that you will be putting people at risk by allowing only electric motors during hunting season. Most of the good waterfowl hunting is during times of adverse weather. By allowing only electric motors people may be in danger of not getting back to there starting point or worse yet capsizing their boat. There were 2 young men who died near Brookings and it would be a tradegy if anything like this happened again

---

**Nate Anderson**

**Webster SD**

**Comment:**

I'm opposed to any type of motor/boating restriction on Swan Lake in Clark Co. This again is another push by SD GFP commission to commercialize waterfowl hunting in SD. Just last year a petition was submitted by M&E Land Co of Watertown to close the lake in fall. You received tons of comments against the move. Now Mr. Sharpe of Watertown has proposed basically the same thing. Personal agenda? Read the comments from last year if you want to know how everyone feels about a motor/boating closure/restriction on Swan Lake. Leave the lake as is and vote against the Swan Lake proposal

---

**David Hegg**

**Watertown SD**

**dhegg@wat.midco.net**

**Comment:**

This concerns a proposal that will be considered at the July Game, Fish, and Parks Commission meeting regarding the use of motorized boats on certain lakes during the waterfowl season in South Dakota. The lakes in Codington County included in this proposal are...McKilligan Lake, Long Lake, and Horseshoe Lake. The proposal would allow the use of boats with "electric motors" to operate on the permitted lakes during the waterfowl season. I am adamantly opposed to this measure.

It is a well known fact the aforementioned lakes have served as a resting place for significant numbers of migrating birds each fall for many years. The result of this has been that many hunters have benefited from having waterfowl to hunt in a large area of NW Codington County. As the birds move back and forth each day to feed in area fields or to transit to other bodies of water, many hunters realize the benefit of having access to the birds to hunt they wouldn't otherwise have. I say this because if the birds are continually harassed and chased off those lakes, the result will be far fewer birds held in this area to hunt for everyone. They will simply move elsewhere to rest. As it is now, many hunters hunt over decoys in area fields or simply enjoy pass shooting in area road ditches. Hunting as we currently know it will most definitely change if this passes.

In some years, the numbers of migrating ducks and geese arrive in large numbers and hold on these lakes until weather finally drives them out. My fear with this proposal is that the boats will accomplish what nature does but much sooner. The result of that will be fewer birds available to hunt and for a much shorter duration. If GF&P staff didn't believe that boat traffic will disturb the birds, why does GF&P ban boating on most of Long Lake (a decent walleye fishery) in the spring and summer. Their publicly stated reason is so that nesting waterfowl are not disturbed. Nesting vs resting, there isn't much difference.

While I am a staunch proponent of public access, I am convinced this proposal will do more harm to the public's access to the waterfowl than help. I have personally seen what motorized boats can do to the resting waterfowl on Horseshoe Lake. They drive the off birds in mass numbers and if accomplished daily, will result in far fewer birds available to everyone. With electric motors as powerful and efficient as they now are, every corner of these large lakes will be quite easily accessed. The birds will be around for a couple of days - then they will leave and we all lose.

---

**Renee Allen**  
**Pierre SD**

**Comment:**

I'm opposed to the proposal to impose a restriction on motors/boating on swan lake in the fall. This nothing but a push by a couple landowners to better their hunting on dry fields around the lake. I'm sure the same that submitted the petition last year. The lake is mostly public and a great fall fishery. The restriction only hurts the vast majority of the users and only benefits a couple landowners. There is plenty of other roost water in the area that is closed to the public or has very limited access. I'm not sure who ever proposed this idea is really concerned about roost water or maybe just concerned about a couple landowners. Leave the lake alone.

---

**Jean Douglas Austin**  
**Watertown SD**  
**doug@austin-hinderaker.com**

**Comment:**

Duck population in this area has been done for a number of years. Ducks and geese need a resting place where they are not harassed. Keeping a restriction on motorized boats in effect should benefit a number of hunters in the general area.

---

**Roger Hatling**  
**Pierre SD**

**Comment:**

I've hunted in this state for 53 years. Closing this lake to boating with electric motors only in the fall not only makes it almost impossible, it makes it dangerous. At the June meeting one of your own people explained a new plan for the recruitment, retention and reactivation, closing this lake to electric motors during the peak of the migration of waterfowl is basically telling them you don't care. This WPA was paid for by sportsmen and women and should be left open. 80% of the water & the land below belong to us. If the two people in question are worried about trespassing they can post their part of the lake. As far as resting areas for waterfowl. There are many lakes & sloughs within a few miles of this lake. In closing this petition should not be passed. The SD GFP Commission is supposed to represent all sportsman and women.

---

**Robert Rousseau**  
**Watertown, Sd 57201 SD**  
**rrousseau@wat.midco.net**

**Comment:**

RE THE PROPOSAL TO EASE BOATING RESTRICTIONS ON HORSEHOE, LONG AND OTHER AREA LAKES IN CODINGTON COUNTY, I WOULD URGE YOU TO TABLE THIS PROPOSAL. THESE LAKES HAVE BEEN WATERFOWL SANCTUARIES FOREVER AND SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE TREATED AS SUCH. I WITNESSED THE EFFECT OF BOATS ON HORSESHOE LAKE SEVERAL YEARS AGO ON THE OPENING DAY OF DUCK SEASON. IT TOOK ONLY A COUPLE HOURS FOR THE BOATS TO CHASE ALL WATERFOWL OFF THE LAKE WHICH, NEEDLESS TO SAY, HAD A PROFOUND IMPACT ON THE HUNTING FOR A COUPLE DAYS FOLLOWING. THIS PROPOSAL TO ALLOW BOATS, EVEN WITH ELECTRIC MOTORS ONLY, IS A BAD, BAD IDEA. PLEASE DON'T DO IT!

## 06. Fish Limits – Reetz Lake

---

**Stephen Hay**

**Lake Norden SD**

**s.hay427@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Please approve the Reetz lake proposal for one year only. See how or if other landowners react to being "under paid". One year only then assess and evaluate any backlash then decide if you want to continue with the Reetz proposal or make any changes.

---

**Jim Gruber**

**Estelline SD**

**jgruber148@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

when we start letting landowners decide safe level harvest limits, and who will be allowed to fish it is time to say..... NO THANK YOU. and who pays for the stocking of these lakes.. hopefully the land owner from now on.. if they want so much control, i say. give it to them, and when it dries up or freezes out they can have their slough.. this nonmeandered lake thing is disgusting.. we have got to be the only place in th USA with this kind of regulation.. wondering, do the same regulations set forth by these kings apply to them also? and if so, who is going to enforce or write a ticket to one of these land owners?

---

**Jed Bertsch**

**Aberdeen SD**

**jed.climate@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I read that Access to Reetz lake will be open to the public for 5 months. With this will be special limit restrictions. I have also heard rumors that in or for this to happen the state is paying the land owners. What I get from this is that the state is going to pay the land owners, then pay to manage the lake for the landowners, pay to keep up the dock and launch, and then the land owners are going to restrict what the state tax payers can keep above and beyond normal regulations. Is it public record what if any payments are made and to who. I believe is state funds are being paid to private land owners it should be released to the public as well.

---

**Shane Ellwein**

**Fort Pierre SD**

**el.wine@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I am not in favor of opening the lake to varied catch limits. I would love to access it again but that price is too steep. I would rather see it closed for good than grant the landowner those conditions.



---

**Dennis Clemens**  
**Frankfort SD**  
**dennissclemens**

**Comment:**

The GF&P should not stock or manage any lake unless it is open year round and have the same limits as the rest of the public waters.

Opening a lake for a limited time and limited harvest so the landowner can get the lake stocked by GF&P and then have people pay their guides to catch the fish while the lake is closed to the public is WRONG!!!!

Any water getting help from GF&P for stocking or management should be open access year round without limited harvest.

I am OK with Reetz remaining a trophy lake for Walleye with all the time and money that has went into doing that from the state. but the season and other harvest limits should be open like other public waters.

---

**Mike Schortzmann**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**mjsdas@rap.midco.net**

**Comment:**

I am against the proposal by the landowners of Reetz Lake. Once we start letting landowners set rules and regulations, we open the door on many other issues. We need to explore other ways to resolve this. Blackmail is not one of them.

---

**Benjamin Minor**  
**Webster SD**  
**Bsminor@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

What are the total costs involved? There are 5 lakes currently open to the public within an hour drive that have better size and numbers on walleye populations.  
Please no short term leasing of access. Only purchasing at fair market value(submerged for decades).

---

**David Smith**  
**Pierre SD**  
**davefromtn@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I am oppose In an effort to regain public fishing access to Reetz Lake; Game, Fish and Parks staff have been working on access agreement terms and conditions with the landowners of Reetz Lake; currently a closed nonmeandered lake in Day County. The proposed harvest restrictions meet the conditions set by the landowners of Reetz Lake and if approved, Reetz Lake would be open to public fishing from May 1 – Sept.30. Fishing access from Oct. 1 – April 30 would be open by landowner permission only.

I do not believe a landowner should set the harvest limits. The landowner does not own these fish, they are through taxpayers dollars. This is a tricky slope to go down. It suggest that the landowners own these fish.

---

**Mark Richardson**  
**Aurora SD**  
**mrichar07@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Sounds like a privatizing a public resource. Can't wait for others to follow this lead. For the past few years, GFP has been trying to make regulations more standard across different bodies of water, this goes against that rule. I would rather see it total catch and release for all species.

---

**Justin Allen**  
**Pierre SD**

**Comment:**

I'm against the proposed agreement to open Reetz Lake. I think the proposal to have the lake only open to the public half the year and then permission only the rest is crazy. Either open the lake or don't. Also I find it funny that GFP press release does not include the fact the Reetz's want 8k a year to open the lake for 6 months a year. If passed this paying to fish public water with sportsman dollars will send a message to all other landowners that public water are for sale. Hold the GFP hostage that landowners need money otherwise they will close the states waters. IMO if Reetz don't want to provide fishing without a huge payment then so be it. Turn any other lake in the area into a "trophy" lake. You don't need Reetz Lake. Please do not reopen Reetz Lake under the proposed limitations and payment or anything even close to it.

---

**Katie Hansen**  
**Watertown SD**  
**kmh20@msn.com**

**Comment:**

I oppose changing the harvest rules on Reetz, and feel the lake should remain closed. \*here is my phone number 605-956-0244 if you would like to hear my reasons.

---

**Terry Amy**  
**Watertown SD**  
**tja19@abe.midco.net**

**Comment:**

I oppose the proposal for Reetz Lake. It would set a terrible precedent for these disputed waters. It would allow landowners to restrict what the public catches on these waters, while allowing them and their friends to catch and keep whatever they want. The landowner owns the land under the water, they do not own the water nor the fish in the water. These belong to the people of South Dakota. Leave the lake closed and keep the current restrictions on the lake. Also, since the lake was stocked by the GFP and this was paid for by sportsmen's license fees, if the landowner closes the lake, we should have the landowner reimburse the GFP for the money spent on stocking. These funds could be used to improve fishing on other lakes.

---

**Kyle Kaskie**

**Aurora SD**

**thefishies2003@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

The proposal for a new daily limit change and season dates for Reetz Lake, benefits the supposed landowner and does little to no good for the public access issue. This proposed change is only creating a trophy lake status for this specific lake of which will only benefit the landowner. The lake will be closed to public access during the primary fishing periods for which this lake is primarily fished (i.e. ice fishing). This only leads to a pay to play mind set which will most likely be taken advantage of down the line. This also will be than used as the precedent for future meandered waters. This is NOT how we should be trying to obtain better public access.

---

**Brian Aker**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**briandton@wat.midco.net**

**Comment:**

This is a joke. The landowner created this foolish proposal so the state maintains the boat access for his personal use.

---

**Anthony Filholm**

**Brookings SD**

**anthonyfilholm@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Dear Commissioners, I applaud your attempts to improve public access to these waters but I suggest you do not go down this road as you will be setting a precedent of allowing landowners to control wildlife on their land. They own the land but the public owns the wildlife. If you do this, are you ready to start making concessions allowing landowners to manage their wildlife as they see fit? I am not a fisherman but this does have an impact on all of us. Thanks for your time.

---

**Chuck Calyton**

**Huron SD**

**clayton@hur.midco.net**

**Comment:**

This proposal should be rejected. If we start letting private landowners dictate fisheries management, which this proposal does, and give control of public fish and water to the landowners, we are going backwards. Not one dime of public money should go to private landowners that want to dictate public access!!!!

---

**Darrin Christensen**

**Watertown SD**

**livetohunt@wat.midco.net**

**Comment:**

They should have to follow stae laws like everyone else! I oppose them getting special treatment to open the lake!!!!

---

**Randall Schleuter**

**Dell Rapids SD**

**Dakotaqball@goldenwest.net**

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Timothy Kaubisch**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Comment:**

I don't agree with sdgfp paying the reetz family for access when it would not be open year round, we as fisherman and sportsman had Paid for the body of water along with fish in the water, we shouldn't have to pay for minimal use nor pay to fish it

---

**Lane Hogstad**

**Watertown SD**

**Lhogstad@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

If it's back open it's open all or none not a state funded winter private lake. We have given enough.

---

**Frank Duin**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**f-duin@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I understand the landowners position on this matter, but I truly believe the landowners that Reetz Lake resides on are trying to take enormous advantage of their situation. This lake is full of large fish due to the harvest limits that were in place for years. There is absolutely zero chance that he is not accepting cash payments to fish this lake. If he wasn't, what is the purpose in changing the harvest limits? I feel if the landowners wanted it closed then leave it closed. If the GFP gives way for this landowner, what will happen with the rest that "own" other bodies of water with similar fish populations? Give in once and this entire situation will spin out of control. The changing of the harvest limits per season screams "guide payments" to me. Please leave it closed. Additionally, I have met the landowner that Goose Lake resides on, and his only complaint concerning his situation was that of people parking on the road while fishing thus making it difficult/impossible to drive farm equipment through. He then granted me access to park in his field driveway whenever I wanted. He made the comment that the Reetz Lake "owner/owners" are out for blood. Just food for thought.

---

**Ethan Delvo**

**Watertown SD**

**ejdelvo28@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

It is an outrage and an outright disgrace to the South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks provide what is essentially a private rearing pond in the winter for the owners and their friends to harvest from as much as they please under statewide limits, while simultaneously not allowing the public to harvest under the same regulations in the summertime. This proposal does exactly this. "By permission only" is just the owners' way of keeping the lake all to themselves in the winter while being allowed to take all the limits of fish they want. This is not a compromise, this is a one-sided deal favoring the owners. I as a sportsman would like to see a compromise that allows for modest harvest limits for everyone, including friends and family of the owners, and public access allowed all year. This would allow the owners to have their share of fish while not being unfair to the public. For example, a walleye regulation of something to the effect of 2 under 20" and 1 over 28" would be a good compromise to allow the owners to have their share of fish while maintaining the trophy fishery by protecting 20-28" fish and keeping the lake open to the public. If this "deal" goes through, it will just go to show how deep the corruption goes in our government.

---

**Matt Schoppert**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Mattschoppert@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I disagree with the president that this will set. It will incentivize other private individuals to push for closing off water for their own private interest.

Water is held in the public trust, the state is the trustee. I feel a misallocation of that right has already occurred and this is a continuation of that problem. No individual has superior rights, closed for one should mean closed for all, with no special interest benefiting in any capacity. I'd rather never fish Reetz again than set this precedent. Do not barter away public resources.

---

**Anthony Volk**  
**Aberdeen SD**  
**Advolk8@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Our state is becoming the laughing stock of the country the way you and our elected officials have been treating this matter. How much tax and license money had been spent stocking and maintaining reetz lake the last 20 years? If a landowner recieved any tax payer money or tax breaks for these flooded lands they should all be public.

---

**Mark Doty**  
**Vermillion SD**  
**doty.g.mark@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I don't want to see one cent of my tax dollars or license fees go to private lakes that the owners have control over. There are enough other public lakes that could use that money, use it there.

---

**Kent Jamison**  
**Aberdeen SD**

**Comment:**

If the landowner isn't going to open the lake for all, leave it closed. Plenty of other lakes in this area without caving to greedy landowners.

---

**Dan Waldman**  
**Aberdeen SD**

**Comment:**

I am in not in favor of the proposed agreement as written and the only part I would change would be that the size restrictions would remain the same for everyone all year long. I understand the landowners wanting privacy during the winter months. This potentially could set a precedent that more landowners could use to close water and negotiate different size restrictions and limits for a select few. I would be in favor of the closing during different times of the year but not in agreement of two different sets of regulations for the public and the landowner and his select few. Thanks

---

**Jordan Grambort**

**Watertown SD**

**jcg2496@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

It's great that you guys are trying to reopen the body of water, but the landowner shouldn't be able to do whatever he/she pleases on length and bag limits. If it is to open it should be open year round not only certain times of the year. If they do t want anything with that deal leave it and spend that money not spent on that lake elsewhere where landings or lakes that need it more. I've fished reetz lake many times and it was fun fishing but if the landowner isn't going to budge I have no problem launching my boat elsewhere

---

**Randy Albright**

**Rapid City SD**

**randyalbright2011@Gmail.com**

**Comment:**

As long as South Dakota deems water private ownership, No public monies should be spent in management of said water. If 100% public access is permitted YEAR ROUND then state monies should be allocated to managae the water and protect sportsman from illegal private interests.

---

**David Brown**

**Humb SD**

**daveandris@outlook.com**

**Comment:**

If public funds are used to maintain the fishery at Reetz lake, it should abide by statewide regulations at all times. If it is not open to public access at ANY time during the year, NO public funds should be used to maintain this fishery.

This proposal is nothing more than using public funds to build an maintain a well stocked, private ice fishing location for the landowner and whomever he grants / sells access to. This is not in the best interest of the sportsman and not what GFP should be spending it's funding doing. If a compromise cannot be reached that keeps the fishery open to the public at all times, all control and financial responsibility should be immediately withdrawn by GFP and transferred to the landowner.

---

**Derek Garner**

**Willow Lake SD**

**garner670@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

This is setting a bad presidence for other bodies of water . Do not want the state to waste money on stocking and renting a lake that you cannot fish year round . If the landowners want to fish it in the winter and take what they want then the general public funding the lake has the same right . This is a bad deal and please consider the public sportsman for once . The non meandering water issue is already bad enough. Don't make it worse and consider the public for once . Thank you

---

**Char Schleuter**  
**Dell Rapids SD**  
**dakotaqball1226@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

We have rights and game and fish have put our tax dollars into these lakes.

---

**Alex Vogel**  
**Aberdeen SD**  
**alex\_vogel99@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

It is absolutely ridiculous to let the person who owns land underneath the water dictate regulations for the fish in that body of water. It seems all of our legislators have forgotten that the water is owned by the PEOPLE, not the landowner. Guess we are saying those are his fish too since we are allowing him to dictate terms. I am done fishing any lakes over that way. Landowners apparently are more valuable than anyone else in this state.

---

**Cary Leibeg**  
**Chester SD**  
**caryleibeg@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

This is not ok, I can tell by the proposal this land owner plans on limiting fish for summer in hopes more will be available in winter. I guarantee he plans on denying access to the lake unless you pay or he plans on renting ice houses out. He wants the limits off in winter because no one would rent or pay for those highly restricted limits. This will open it up for all other "land owners" to do the same. Vote against this!

---

**Steve Schull**  
**Watertown Sd SD**  
**sandpschull@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

why close it thru the winter does not make any sense try to get permission where do you find this person probably get turned down anyway wants for own personal use is not fair to any one but the reetz buddies

---

**Sammi Blood**  
**Pierre SD**  
**missdolli.sd@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Why do landowners get to set the seasons and the harvest regulations for a lake? If there's any reason other than their own financial gain, I would like to know it. The sportsmen should have an equal voice in what happens with the lakes/seasons, not only the landowners. If this passes it will set a precedent for others to take advantage of the sportsmen.



---

**Tim Gaikowski**

**Webster SD**

**Tgaik77@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Do not pay Reetz family or agree to those terms. That will be bad for all water just close it and remove fish to put in bitter or waubay lakes. They have been making money off that water already.

---

**Corey Ragels**

**Watertown SD**

**Comment:**

Open all year round or close it for all even the farmer

---

**Landon Thompson**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Shane Andresen**

**Brandon SD**

**shane.andresen@poet.com**

**Comment:**

I like the proposal..

---

**Chad Taecker**

**Brookings SD**

**Ctaecker@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the path you guys are taking us down!

---

**Tj Hauck**  
**Ramona SD**  
**tjhauck@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

The deal is one sided. Quit worrying about lakes farmers don't want us on. Take care and use the sportsman's money to make the what is deemed to be the public's lakes better. Make them strong fisheries. Improve access. Put in more Ramps.

---

**Alex Dagen**  
**Mitchell SD**  
**Dagen384@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Ryan Wendling**  
**Beresford SD**  
**Wendl26t@yahoo**

**Comment:**

Stupid compromise. Totally disagree . But sportsman's voices haven't been heard the last few years so go ahead and screw this one up as well.

---

**Mackenzie Heinemann**  
**Dell Rapids SD**  
**mackenzie.heinemann@southeastt  
ech.edu**

**Comment:**

If this is passed, then every landowner will want to do this. This will create a pay-to-play fishing environment in this state and takes rights away from non-land owning sportsmen and women. Why should the GFP pay this guy \$8,000 for six months of open access? The lake is stocked by the GFP and if the landowner won't comply with state law then he should not reap the benefits of stocking the lake.

---

**James Vis**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**jv12480@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I am disappointed in how GFP has handled the whole situation.

---

**Jeff Sebesta**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**jsebe@outlook.com**

**Comment:**

Dear Board members, I feel paying a landowner for access to this lake is a bad idea. Did he stock the lake? Who did and who paid for the rearing of the fish and wages of those who stocked it? If this is now a private body of water should it be called a lake?

---

**Jordan Schreur**  
**Sioux Falls SD**

**Comment:**

It is great that there is a chance of getting Reetz lake back open for at least open water fishing but the start date of May 1 should be April 15 being that most years our ice is off in the beginning of April. Also we should keep the bass regulations at 14" and 1 over 18"

---

**Steven Mahlstedt**  
**Brookings SD**  
**Mahlstedt88@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I feel that adopting the landowner dictated restrictions sets a horrible precedent by allowing a landowner to dictate lake management, rather than a qualified GFP team of biologists specifically trained in this field. Also, the lake should either be open or closed to the public year round. Ice season by permission only opens it to pay to play. I would rather the lake remain closed than to see this precedent set. Thank you.

---

**Steven Mahlstedt**  
**Brookings SD**  
**Mahlstedt88@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I feel that adopting the landowner dictated restrictions sets a horrible precedent by allowing a landowner to dictate lake management, rather than a qualified GFP team of biologists specifically trained in this field. Also, the lake should either be open or closed to the public year round. Ice season by permission only opens it to pay to play. I would rather the lake remain closed than to see this precedent set. Thank you.

---

**Patrick Carney**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**Carneyp85@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I do not like the idea of using license fees to pay for limited use of Reetz lake. I would rather see those funds utilized on public waters to improve infrastructure and fish populations.

---

**Patrick Carney**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**Carneyp85@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I do not like the idea of using license fees to pay for limited use of Reetz lake. I would rather see those funds utilized on public waters to improve infrastructure and fish populations.

---

**Dan Graf**  
**Whitewood SD**  
**dan\_graf@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Leave Reetz Lake closed to public fishing. Policing the lake and the harvest restrictions would be too difficult for wardens and the land owner. Ask land owner if research could be done to study the lake and compare what fish populations do when there is no public fishing. Maybe the land owner could open lake up for one or two fishing tournaments a year. Money received from the event could be given to charity and/or Game Fish and Parks. Many fishermen would be excited to fish once or twice a year on a lake that is closed to public fishing! Fishermen would have a gem that is protected except for the one or two times a year. Everyone could win.

---

**Jeff Hanisch**  
**Montrose SD**

**Comment:**

Invest our money into bodies of water that are public.

---

**Ryan Carlson**  
**Brandon SD**  
**rynocarlson@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I oppose any deal on Reetz Lake that does not allow year round access, and ZERO cost to the GFP and the State of South Dakota.

---

**Quintin Biermann**  
**Rapid City SD**  
**Quintin.biermann@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I feel that sportsman's dollars would be better served improving docks and accesses as well as lakeside use facilities.

---

**Earl E. Nelson**  
**Erwinreetz SD**  
**dakotalabs9@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

1. Too much money for only 6 month Lease.
2. The Lake is NOT "Open" during Ice Fishing.
3. Landowner is "Double Dipping" !! Charging SDGF&P a summer fee for Trophy Fishing 6 months and Then Leasing Lake (uncontrolled) to "Whom Ever" for The Remainder of the Yeat For

---

**Mark Widman**  
**Tea SD**  
**Mwidman294@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Please do not support this proposal. It sets a bad precedent for managing our wildlife resources. All wildlife and all water is held in the public trust and should not be managed by property owners.

Use our Sportsman's dollars to net all the fish out of closed waters and move to water that is open to the public.

---

**Chad Ringgenberg**  
**Aberdeen SD**  
**1973novass@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I've fished Reetz Lake with my family for years with my two teenage boys and my wife. Rarely have I kept fish from the fishery. I was glad to see it is proposed to reopen, until I saw the details. Where is the logic behind this proposal? Are the Biologists standing behind this? It makes no sense to basically make this body of water a catch and release pond, except for the land owners. SD sportsman are to pay how much a year for access and maintain the lake? I'm sorry, but if I had a vote, I would reject this and keep the lake closed. We can't start a precedent like this on our other waters.

---

**Derek Simon**  
**Aberdeen SD**  
**dereksimon@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

The current proposal for Reetz Lake isn't one I support. The slot limits are not based on facts or put in place to create a healthy sporting lake and are arbitrary at best. In my opinion the proposal will waste fish resources and cause the majority of fish to die off before ever reaching the proposed size limits. If tax dollars are going toward the lake the GFP should be allowed to manage the lake and that includes setting limits and size restrictions. Having the lake closed for part of the year is also unacceptable. If I had to choose between the current proposal and leaving it closed. I'd choose the later.

---

**Dylan Cavanaugh**

**Aberdeen SD**

**dc571@abe.midco.net**

**Comment:**

The current proposal for Reetz Lake isn't one I support. The slot limits are not based on facts or put in place to create a healthy sporting lake and are arbitrary at best. In my opinion the proposal will waste fish resources and cause the majority of fish to die off before ever reaching the proposed size limits. If tax dollars are going toward the lake the GFP should be allowed to manage the lake and that includes setting limits and size restrictions. Having the lake closed for part of the year is also unacceptable; it removes the resource from a good number of fishermen who only ice fish. Again if tax money is going toward it the access should be dictated by the GFP and based in facts, not fluff. If I had to choose between the current proposal and leaving it closed. I'd pick the leaving it closed.

---

**Bryan Phillips**

**Aberdeen SD**

**bphillips@nvc.net**

**Comment:**

I am generally opposed to this proposal as I do not feel that there is enough information about the deal publicly and it would seem to set a very bizarre precedent.

Are the proposed daily limits based on studies, biology, etc. in ANY WAY...?  
Who will manage the fishery if the proposal is passed?

Our legislatures have made water access an even more difficult issue for all and recent legislation has in no way tackled the very complex issue. While I understand the need to honor landowner rights and wishes; there should be a general public interest that takes priority over personal demands.

This proposal does not seem to be a good deal for anyone going forward.

---

**Jenifer Ringgenberg**

**Aberdeen SD**

**sodaksun@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I do not agree with the Reetz Lake proposal. The lake should be reopened with the same rules and regulations to EVERYONE that is fishing this lake. Our tax dollars are paying for dock/access maintenance and stocking fish. I do not understand the reasoning behind a decision to allow the lake to be closed to the general public for half the year, then allow the landowners and their buddies/customers to take limits way exceeding the average sportsman fishing the same lake during months it is open to the public. It should be ALL or NOTHING. Either we ALL get the same rules and season for fishing, or NO ONE, including the landowners, get to fish our state-stocked and maintained lake.

---

**Jon Kludt**  
**Mitchell SD**

**Comment:**

I like the idea of sharing the resource. I was not going to ice fish it anyway. I like the size limits. The access lease price is what it is even though it skyrocketed.

People including myself will say this is a lopsided deal that the public gets a lemon and will always get lemons.

I guess I've made lemonade at that the lake because it provides for a good fishing trip if you like catching good fish.

I'm in favor of experimental regs. (Not every lake has to be managed the same just because its simpler to do so. ) Please consider a one over 17 inches for black bass at Reetz or wherever/whenever appropriate and won't offend to many.

---

**Trappor Masson**  
**Spearfish SD**  
**Trappor26@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

I support imposing stricter limits on harvesting fish. There should be much tighter limits on walley and other fish on the Missouri river. Fishermen are coming from out of state to harvest fish because their home states have tight limits or catch and release, and several instate firshermen and guides are out every day harvesting limits of fish.

---

**Al Engstrom**  
**Watertown SD**  
**alengstrom@iw.net**

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Brian Slack**  
**Sioux Falls SD**

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Tom Wight**

**Watertown SD**

**Dakotasatellite@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Derek Wyszynski**

**Colman SD**

**Comment:**

I ask you to please reject the proposal for the Reetz Lake access. While I can understand the payment portion of the proposal, I am strongly against allowing a more liberal harvest regulation while the lake has restricted access. In the end this is a privatization of a public resource for half of the year.

---

**Tim Amy**

**Watertown SD**

**amytim@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

It's great trying to open this body of water again but having two different season's is a NO go for me. The Reetz's owe the ground underneath the water but don't owe the water or the fish. Vote NO on this one.

---

**Jeremy Yost**

**Bowdle SD**

**jeremy\_yost@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I think this agreement would set a bad example for public access. I would rather see the money go to fighting for open access or purchasing another property in the area.

---

**Dave Martz**

**Watertown SD**

**davem@wwtireservice.com**

**Comment:**

Paying them off will open "can of worms" for other landowners to set prices for their access. At what price will it stop?



---

**Dale Olson**  
**Harrisburg SD**  
**Theolsons22@icloud.com**

**Comment:**

If the state intends to make public water private they should remove the fish and relocate them to a lake the public can fish all year long at the current limits.

---

**Justin Murphy**  
**Crooks SD**  
**justintmurphy@outlook.com**

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Jared Mouw**  
**Sioux Falls SD**

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Anthony Martinec**  
**Sioux Falls SD**  
**ajm3416@live.com**

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Jeremiah Schultz**  
**Elk Point SD**  
**Jschultz@thermobond.com**

**Comment:**

If the private owner does not have the same regulations as the public this is a bad idea all the way around .....please do not let this pass as it will start a domino effect that the gfp cannot control. Make the rules the same all year round for both parties is the only fair way to do this.

---

**Donald Noethlich**

**Aberdeen SD**

**Donnoethlich@icloud.com**

**Comment:**

I think money could be better spent on other lakes we should go in and rip up the boat Landing and remove all gravel from parking lot and put them to use at a state lake which is in need such as Reid lake which I have seen no progress on in a long time and GFP officer that I have talked to have been very rude to me on this subject as well.

---

**Chris Duklet**

**Watertown SD**

**Comment:**

I love fishing on Reetz Lake. The work and effort put in by the GF&P to make it truly a trophy lake has been exceptional. Needless to say I was very disappointed when it was closed last year. A situation that could have been avoided with some decency on the part of fishermen and some understanding by government that a landowner can't make money on flooded land. At least someone could have proposed taking the flooded land out of the tax rolls or paying it's taxes through increased license fees for residents and non-residents alike. But I absolutely, can't in any way, support such a proposal that would give a private landowner exclusive rights to a trophy fishery that has been developed with tax payer dollars to be used by that landowner for their own use, the use of selected friends or for the commercial use of this public resource by individuals who pay for the privilege. And to top it off, the landowner and their select guests, don't have to play by the same rules as the people who's taxes paid for such a terrific natural lake that was long term developed for all of us.

I get it from the landowner's perspective too. I've seen our family farm get sold when times got tough in the '80s. I get that the land is your livelihood. But I'm also very concerned when we legalize that private citizens have all the rights to water in a specific area. Long term what legal precedent are we setting?

So to the members of the GFP Commission, all state elected officials, landowners, employees of the GFP and my fellow sportsmen and women I urge you to decline this proposal for the following reasons:

1. Water and it's corresponding fisheries are a PUBLIC ASSET and RESOURCE. Keep it that way. Let all future generations enjoy it together equally as it was intended.

2. Land is needed for people to make an income, not solely as a base to levy taxes. No usable land should mean no taxes. Find a way to help the landowner, not burden them with taxes from lands that can't be used. Take the money out of this.

Thank you.

---

**Mike Reilly**

**Huron SD**

**wefish@santel.net**

**Comment:**

This will set a standard. Non-meandered water is held in trust for the public. If the public can not use the water, then the land owner should not benefit. He owns the land, NOT the water.

---

**Dale Lang**  
**Watertown SD**

**Comment:**

OPEN TO ALL OR NONE ALL YEAR

---

**James Thompson**  
**Madison SD**  
**thompsji.69@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

After reading this deal I feel that it is slanted way to much in the landowners favor and the state needs to walk away from this lake. My opinion is that these are greedy landowners that want the lake stocked at license holder expense and then want to charge the same license holder again to fish it. Take the fish out and put them in other public lakes and let the landowners deal with restocking at there own expense.

---

**Nate Anderson**  
**Webster SD**

**Comment:**

Worst deal ever. I'm opposed 100% of any deal to pay a landowner for access to public waters. Also to restrict the public 6 months out of the year and let the landowner have a free of all the other 6 months. Haha. Who with GFP even thinks of these deals? Put the time and money into one of the other 100 lakes in NE SD and let the landowners of Day Co. sleep in the beds they made.

---

**Terry Doren**  
**Mccool Lake SD**  
**Terry.doren@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Kyle Roth**  
**Hartford SD**  
**kyleroth1@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

The entire lake should be closed to ALL recreation, public or paid, and any future management instead of paying these greedy landowners.

---

**Jim Forrette**

**Milbank SD**

**Jforrette@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

You are setting a dangerous precedent if you pay for this opening. I am strongly opposed to this whole process .  
Let Mr.Reetz charge ignorant /well to do/privileged people to fish on his "private lake" do not use my license fees for this unworthy spectacle.

---

**Tyler Gill**

**Great Falls MT**

**jetsfan5657@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Erick Larson**

**Aberdeen SD**

**Ezinstaller@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Jason Devitt**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**jsndvtt@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

You need to stop letting people take all these 22-27 inch walleyes and filleting them. Are you kidding? That is the future of all lakes. You have all these lakes so messed up. Why take out the good spawners. You get paid to manage so manage!

---

**Brent Garvey**

**Goodwin SD**

**Comment:**

Please do not start using sportsmen's dollars to negotiate restricted access. Please redirect these funds to areas where all sportsmen can benefit.

---

**Andrew Davies**

**Sioux Falls SD**

**aadavies6440@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Terrible deal. This should remain open to public year round if a payment is going to be made. Additionally, the catch limits should be revisited.

---

**Chad Boike**

**Clara City MN**

**monbuck\_8@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Bryan Olson**

**Clark SD**

**comet\_52\_07@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

If the restrictions were the same for everybody, year round then it would maybe make sense. I would rather see the money go towards upkeep at other public accesses.

---

**Patrick Lauseng**

**Watertown SD**

**patlauseng@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

No comment text provided.

---

**Jon Serck**

**Alcester SD**

**jon@vistrcsd.com**

**Comment:**

I think the money could be better spent on other lakes in South Dakota. I feel if we set this as an example then other land owners will take advantage of us. If we set this example we could spend millions on stocking, upkeep, and boat ramp updates for land owners to use the lake for pay to play purposes.

---

**Jeff Kral**  
**Sleepy Eye MN**  
**jhk@newulmtel.net**

**Comment:**

sounds like a slippery slope

---

**Roger Mckee**  
**Tea SD**  
**trkyh8@aol.com**

**Comment:**

This is not an equal compromise. Only the landowner wins

---

**Brad Mork**  
**Tea SD**  
**morkbrad0524@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Regulations need to be the same year around.

---

**Paul Saylor**  
**Milbank SD**  
**paulsaylor@icloud.com**

**Comment:**

This is how compromise can work. Our best "closed waters" need to be opened. Great work...obviously a reasonable land owner. Thanks

---

**Chris Thomas**  
**Watertown SD**  
**City.thomas@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

This is NOT a good deal for the sportsman. Sounds to me like the landowner is setting himself up for a private fishery funded by the rest of our money and we get little return! This is becoming ridiculous. I see both sides of the issue but something needs to be done or kiss the revenue from fishing goodbye and can guarantee it's not just the out of state fisherman we will lose. Myself as well of thousands of other South Dakotans will also choose not to buy a license if this continues as well. Thank you and hopefully soon this issue can be resolved.

---

**Loren Kwasniewski**  
**Webster SD**  
**Classics@itctel.com**

**Comment:**

Do the right thing , just say No

---

**Robert Garner**  
**Vermillion SD**  
**rags57078@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

This is not fair for the sportsmen/women . The limits should be the same year around , what is good for one is good for all .

---

**Todd Rose**  
**Watertown SD**  
**Rosebme5@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Please don't support this access agreement. Please spend the money to fix access to another public lakes. Goose Lake by Watertown didn't have a dock in last week and needs some work to raise the ramp. This is too much money for this little access. The limits are fine, but they should be in affect year round! Who controls the limits of public water and fish?

---

**Renee Allen**  
**Pierre SD**

**Comment:**

Keep Reetz Lake closed. Landowners wanted the lakes closed now they have it. The public has plenty of other water to fish and hunt without begging certain landowners for access to public waters. No way do I want a penny of my license dollars going to a landowner to fish his lake. Spend the money with other landowners that are much more willing to work with the GFP or use the money to improve other accesses across NE SD. Any lake can be turned into a trophy lake

---

**Todd Rose**  
**Watertown SD**  
**Rosebme5@yahoo.com**

**Comment:**

Please don't support this access agreement. Please spend the money to fix access to another public lakes. Goose Lake by Watertown didn't have a dock in last week and needs some work to raise the ramp. This is too much money for this little access. The limits are fine, but they should be in affect year round! Who controls the limits of public water and fish?

---

**Nathan Nelson**  
**Lake Norden SD**  
**Infdfire@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I support the proposal to reopen reetz to the public. We fished reetz multiple times a week all summer long when it was open. Reetz is one of the funniest lakes to fish in South Dakota. Reetz has never been a lake that you go to for catching fish to take home and eat. It is good to have catch and release lakes in South Dakota cause it keeps the fishing pressure low and makes for a great time for the guys that like to catch and release. I did do some ice fishing up there but I don't consider it a lose for it to be closed for the winter. This proposal is a lot better then what we have right now!

---

**Zachery Hunke**  
**Watertown SD**  
**zach@hunkestransfersd.com**

**Comment:**

I do not support making agreements that allow for separate sets of rules for certain individuals. It is important that our game commission does not spend sportsman's dollars in this fashion.

---

**Kerry Mertz**  
**Arlington SD**

**Comment:**

Oppose any funding from the state to the landowner under the proposal.

---

**Mike Eliason**  
**Aberdeen SD**  
**eliasonmike@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

I am avid angler which had previously fished Reetz lake prior to it being removed from public use. I support the efforts of the GFP staff for their work in trying to reopen the lake for public use. I also would like to thank the Reetz family for allowing this recent proposal. I do support the fish regulations that are proposed as a "Trophy Fishery". There are plenty of lakes in the area where anglers can keep fish, so it is nice to have one that is essentially a catch & release fishery. I realize that only having the lake open to the public for a select period of time will cause some to be opposed to the proposal. Hopefully this proposal will pass and provide a good start to possibly opening the lake year round in the future.



---

**Jason Jacobs**  
**St. Cloud MN**

**Comment:**

Do not pay the land owners for access to Reetz lake. Stop stocking the lake immediately. Let all the fish die of old age. Land owners should never control public waters. I buy a South Dakota fishing license every year

---

**Jeremy Cadotte**  
**Mitchell SD**  
**cadotte210@hotmail.com**

**Comment:**

Please do not finalize this agreement with reetz lake. I've lived in South Dakota my whole life and there are so many other beautiful public lakes we can put effort into maintenance, stocking, and public Access for many recreational purposes. I have never fished reetz lake, I'm sure it's a great place, but the regulations go against state laws and that's wrong, and not to mention only turning it into a guides Haven in the winter time. Citizens should not have to pay for access or be treated differently than an out of stater with bigger pockets, or even a resident with big pockets. There's many other ways to use this money. That lake is completely private, leave the cost to keep it up in the land owners hands. I don't feel many people with benefit from this agreement and will be very disappointed to see it finalized. ??

---

**Gary Ledbetter**  
**Yankton SD**  
**Garenole@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

Pathetic Agreement

---

**Jared Pearson**  
**Summerset SD**  
**Docjcpearson@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I oppose this proposal as I feel it sets a precedent for future manipulation of public resources to benefit private entities. While these individual do own the access routes and property surface rights, it is the states waters and states resources including all fish and wildlife that use those waters.

I oppose this because of the variance in daily limits. If it is a private lake than state limits should be used year round. If it were a private lake with year round access than I would be OK with restrictions that are consistent. I oppose this because my license dollars have been allocated to pay for stocking this lake, boat landings, and state employee wages to oversee this lake.

I oppose this as the amount of funds being used for limited access and restrictions could be better used to ensure quality opportunities on WIAs or state owned lakes.

Lastly I oppose this because all access to or across any private lands should be consistent across the board and not negotiated on a personal situation basis to prevent corruption of deals to those with special contacts. This is a bad deal for the state now and for all future situations.

---

**Jeff Ringgenberg**

**Watertown SD**

**jringgenberg25@gmail.com**

**Comment:**

I don't believe there should be two sets of regulations for the different periods. I feel it should be the same, whichever the landowner decides. You are setting a bad precedent with this proposal.

---

**Brett Andrews**

**Aberdeen SD**

**Comment:**

My overall stance is I support the proposed changes to limits on Reetz Lake.

SDGFP has invested too much time and money into this lake to lose it. It has a decent boat ramp and they have stocked fish in it. It is hard to drive by the boat ramp and see it abandoned. But it is hard to blame Mr. Reetz, if I owned the lake I can see where he is coming from.

I personally love the fact it is a "Trophy Lake." And that the new regulations would extend beyond walleyes. It is nice to have a lake that you can go to and just fish to catch nice fish. I don't fish to keep fish and I am a big believer in catch and release fishing. When Reetz was open I would fish that lake 75% of the time I would go to the glacial lakes to fish.

I wish the lake would be open during ice fishing season but like I said I don't own the lake and we should take what we can get from Mr. Reetz. I believe he wants the lake to be open he just doesn't want the quality of the fishery to be ruined by people keep fish. That is why he is imposing the "trophy" length limits and quantities.

All in all; I would rather fish Reetz for a few months out of the year, than not be able to fish it at all.

---

**Matthew Johnson**

**Webster SD**

**johnsonfarms@itctel.com**

**Comment:**

Thank you Reetz farms and GFP.