

Public Comments

Black Hills Elk License Raffle

Bob Brandt

Rapid City SD

bob@cms-sd.com

Comment:

Please DO NOT give DU an CSP elk tag to raffle off . When the GF&P and the RMEF set the guidelines for the raffle we stipulated that all the money raised would go to enhance the elk population and big game habitat. If you allow this it would set a bad precedent that could allow other organizations the same opportunity. Mothers Against Drunk Driving is also a good group but they should not get a tag and neither should DU

Todd West

Florence SD

grand_west@hotmail.com

Comment:

I would like to express my concern about the possible SD GFP Commission issuing a SD Elk Tag to Ducks Unlimited to raffle. As a life member of the RMEF and an active chapter chair I would be concerned that a second SD Elk Tag raffled by another organization may adversely affect the revenue the RMEF has been able to generate since the first Elk Tag we were granted. All of which has come back to the state for elk and their habitat. I am definitely not against any conservation for the state of South Dakota. However, I would hate to see something effect what has been a positive for the state of South Dakota.

Thank-You for your time and consideration,

Monarch Plan

Craig Olson

Brookings SD

Comment:

Does anybody wonder if August Soybean Aphid spraying might be hurting the Monarch butterfly population during their migration especially insecticide spraying on soybeans the last two weeks of August.

Alicia Hofer

Sioux Falls SD

thehoferfam@gmail.com

Comment:

This is amazing. I have been waiting for environmental awareness of this level; 100% support from me!

Deborah Graham
Canton SD

Comment:

I'm glad that some action will be taken. Last year my two little sedums were covered in monarchs. This year I only had two.

Jamie Hintz
Clear Lake SD
deuelhwy@itctel.com

Comment:

I was the county weed and pest supervisor for one year and made sure my spray guys knew the difference between weeds and wildflowers and also milkweed. Area farmers were upset that I would not blanket spray the R-O-W's and that was the biggest challenge. Big ag is a huge problem as they have so much power. They don't care about anything but themselves and their wallet. There are a few concerned producers out there but not near enough. And it's my observation that milkweed is not doing well on game land that is pastured, but that's another subject and I'm sure you know my opinion on that. Thank You, Jamie Hintz, Clear Lake.

Brandie Frankman
Sioux Falls SD

Comment:

support

Kay Mehrer
Sioux Falls SD
Kmmehrer@gmail.com

Comment:

Plant small native shrubs and wild flowers in the road ditches. They are short so they won't cause an obstruction. They provide food and habitat for bees and butterflies. We won't have to spray harmful chemicals anymore! An investment in some seeds will eventually save money from not spraying. It's worked in other states it talks about it in the book 'silent spring'

Jennifer Tiehen
Harrisburg SD
Gjtjrt92@gmail.com

Comment:

Help protect them. They are needed.

Martin Toepke-Floyd
Redfield SD
mttoepke@midco.net

Comment:

I have let milkweed grow in my vegetable garden. This year I found 5 monarch caterpillars feeding on the plants in June. I hope more people allow milkweed to grow and bring back more of these iconic butterflies.

Verna Kay Boyd
Garretson SD
vkboyd.1956@gmail.com

Comment:

I am a speaker with the South Dakota Humanities Council. Monarchs are one of my programs. I raise approximately 80-100 each summer. I have several dozen milkweed plants on my acreage. I also collect milkweed plants that have been cut in ditches and rescue any eggs/caterpillars. I support the position and would like to help in any way.

Kelly Kistner
Mccook Lake SD
iwlasdpresident@outlook.com

Comment:

SOUTH DAKOTA DIVISION

The Izaak Walton League of America
DEFENDERS OF SOIL, AIR, WOODS, WATERS, AND WILDLIFE

October 23, 2018

South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks
523 East Capitol Avenue
Pierre, SD 57501

The South Dakota Division (Division) of the Izaak Walton League of America appreciates this opportunity to provide comments on the 2018 Monarch Plan by the South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks Department (GFP).

The Division agrees that the monarch butterfly is a keystone or flagship specie. We urge the GFP to continue its collaboration with our neighboring states, federal agencies, the agricultural community and the general public to ensure success of this important recovery effort.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) received a petition in 2014 to list the eastern subspecies of the monarch as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act. Subsequently working with the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, GFP developed a habitat goal to provide 68 million milkweed stems within a landscape with suitable nectar sources during the next 20 years. Sadly pollinators across the continent are becoming species of concern including honeybees. Bees are important biologically and economically to South Dakota with an economic impact of more than \$34 million.

Residents of South Dakota are very familiar with the iconic monarch butterfly in both rural and urban settings. Many scientists believe the recent population decline is the result of the loss of milkweed. It's estimated there has been nearly a 60% decline in milkweeds in the Midwest. This is thought to have contributed to the over 80% decline in the monarch production between 1999 and 2010. At the same time there has been a

tremendous increase in the use of glyphosate herbicides and an increased planting of genetically-modified crops. The Division supports more research on monarch breeding habitat and milkweed abundance and distribution while recognizing future research efforts depend on GFP's ability to fund the personnel and expenses for the work.

The Division supports efforts outlined in the strategic plan that include:

- ? Public and private habitat conservation and management
- ? Public and private rights-of-way habitat enhancement - including mowing practices
- ? Urban land habitat enhancement
- ? Education, outreach and additional research
- ? Monitoring, data management, and plan assessment

The Division also supports the goals, objectives and associated strategies outlined in the strategic plan. We especially encourage engaging communities throughout the state in the role they can play in monarch and pollinator conservation. We also strongly support the use federal and state habitat programs to increase milkweed and nectar plants on private lands. This includes the GFP Private Lands Habitat Program and the USDA's Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), Agricultural Conservation Easement Program (ACEP), and the Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP)

We also support the plan's provision of assessing the milkweed stem goal of 68 million additional milkweed stems in 5 years. We believe to be successful the plan will need to incorporate new and additional data as it becomes available.

Many of the Division's chapters and members have been taking steps to improve and increase pollinator habitat. This includes the pollinator plot planted by the McCook Lake Chapter near North Sioux City. Also at the national Izaak Walton League convention in Fredericksburg, VA this past July our members passed a resolution. The resolution states that the League: "supports all efforts to encourage all rights-of-way managers, both public and private, to prioritize the presence and health of local native plants with their right-of-way management, with the primary goal of such management to support healthy populations of pollinating insects".

The South Dakota Division of the Izaak Walton League of America thanks you for the opportunity to comment on the 2018 Monarch Plan. We ask that we be informed on all future developments, meetings and comment periods on this effort as it proceeds.

Sincerely,

Kelly Kistner
President of the South Dakota Division and National President-elect
Izaak Walton League of America
603 Lakeshore Drive
McCook Lake, SD 57049
605-232-2030 – 712-490-1726
iwlasdpresident@outlook.com

Thea Miller Ryan

Sioux Falls SD

thea.ryan@state.sd.us

Comment:

I am excited to see the increased use of citizen science and look forward to contributing to the curriculum outlined in the plan.

Dustin Long

Bozeman MT

dustin.long@retranches.com

Comment:

As a first step in monarch conservation/restoration in SD I think the plan looks good. I think more emphasis should be placed on how we find ourselves in a situation where monarch butterflies may become a listed species. As with all management plans the real challenge will be finding the resources necessary to complete the on-the-ground work necessary to meet the stated strategies and goals.

I think the most important thing the State can do at this point is standardize and provide for review the milkweed/wildflower/monarch survey techniques it intends to use. The sooner this task is completed--hopefully in time for the 2019 field season-- the sooner the State will know where it is and where it needs to be in terms of monarch conservation.

Since 2015 Bad River Ranches (west river) has been investigating methods to expand extant *A. speciosa* stands and establish new ones in support of monarchs and other native pollinators. It's been a slow process and results have been mixed but we've narrowed down what seems to work best when it comes to milkweed restoration on those landscapes and we'd be happy to share our findings with you.

Lastly, I'd like the opportunity to attend any working group or other public meetings the State intends to sponsor so will you please add my email to the State's monarch listserv?

Thanks for the opportunity to comment and fingers crossed for the monarch.

Other

Justin Allen

Pierre SD

Comment:

Please, please address the NR over the counter antelope and deer tags. Both have gotten out of control over the last 5 years. This is year is simply out of control on public ground along the Missouri River and western SD for deer. Nothing worse than working all week and showing up hunt public ground and it looks like a Wal-Mart parking lot. Lets make some changes that are supported by residents of SD... I think they deserve it after the last 18 months.

Adam Golay

Sioux Falls SD

adamgolay@yahoo.com

Comment:

Mule deer are on the decline in western states. A big reason is excessive predators that are out of control & also the one we can control is OVERHARVEST & POACHING. We need to protect our mule deer herd in South Dakota as best we can & not over issue tags for any deer. We need to keep those tags to a minimum. I think we should ban shooting mule deer does for a while also until the herd comes back. It is so hard to shoot a big mule deer buck, it's probably the hardest big game trophies to successfully harvest because of the reasons mentioned above. I know everyone & their dog loves to drive around in their truck & shoot mule deer. But the fact is that South Dakota should be harvesting way less mule deer than we are currently. We are over harvesting them right now & the gfp knows it but they want that money anyways. I can tell you how to make up for the revenue but that's another topic. Please consider reducing the any deer tags to protect mule deer for our future generations & when they bounce back (no pun intended) then we can look at increasing tags & if this works like it should can you imagine be able to pitch to non residents & residents alike that we have 200"+ muleys in this state would be heart racing & exciting.

Larry Enright
Central City SD
larrye@tbcfoodsales.com

Comment:

Hello,

I have been a resident in the state of SD for the majority of my life and have hunted and fished each season. Every time I have been in the offices in Ft Pierre and Rapid City to get a license, the "my you are a good customer" comment has been made. I am in the retail grocery business on the sales side, and I understand the difference between customers and good customers. Basically, it boils down to money spent on the goods and services I offer. The store that buys more, is often treated a bit better than the store that buys only a marginal amount. When I hear a comment about being a good customer from SD GF&P it reminds me of the hard earned money I spend each year supporting the GF&P.

Over the past several years, I have been stopped for "compliance" checks, or reports from landowners about trespassing, or some other possible hunting violations. Not one time have I been cited for a violation of the law. In this same time, I have called and reported a few violations of harassment while in the legal pursuit of wild game, with little or no response. Once in Lyman county I was told that these cases are most often impossible to follow up on and it was left at that.

Now, here we are in 2018 and the GF&P has decided to limit the number of draw tags for certain species that a "good customer" can apply for and allow for application of special buck tags and landowner tags without much change.

It seems that GF&P has slowly evolved from a state agency with the goal of promoting hunting for everyone, to an agency beholden to landowners and their demands and expectations. As a "good customer" of the GF&P I feel as though I am being screwed. I mean, what does a landowner provide to the GF&P of value? Walk in land? You guys pay for that. Access? It is under attack every single day by landowners trying to prevent legal access to public lands and the GF&P has to use resources that come from "good customers" like me to fight it. Revenue? No, landowners can hunt small game without a license on their own land AND they actually benefit from the Special Buck tag because that tag can only be used on private land that MANY have to pay for access on. I am not exactly sure what the SD GF&P mission statement is in , but it certainly appears to be less of a mission for the hunter and a bit more beholden to the landowner in this state.

I realize that this observation will fall upon deaf ears, blind eyes, and closed minds, but, as a lifelong customer of the GF&P, I felt it necessary to do share my thoughts today.

On a side note, I have spent nearly \$5k on hunting licenses in Co, NE, ID, and Wyoming the past 6 or 7 years. They seem to encourage public access and freedom to hunt in those states. I guess, as the trend to reward landowners and pay hunters continues in SD, I do have other options, and unfortunately, will probably be forced to spend that \$. The business plan you are currently operating under, may not be the best long term solution to a healthy and vibrant budget that allows SD GF&P to act arbitrarily without concern for the revenue source itself. It's my professional businessman advice to reconsider the current path of operations as the day may come when you have no choice to but to backtrack. However, by the time that happens, it may be too late.

--

Larry Enright
TBC, LLC
605-645-8310

Ron Van Straten
De Pere WI
ronald.vanstraten@graef-usa.com

Comment:

Had I known that South Dakota charges an \$8 agent fee for the purchase of a small game license I would have cancelled my trip to South Dakota. That fee is unreasonable!

Mark Constantine

Mankato MN

mark.constantine@mnsu.edu

Comment:

Hitting us non-residents with a \$8 "tax" is really sad. Aren't we already spending thousands of dollars per a five day trip to your State for pheasants. It just doesn't sit well with me and my buddies. We love SD, but these are the types of things which turn folks off!!! The \$4 fee like everyone else is one things, but gouging the non-resident is tough to swallow.

Resident Nonresident

Dana Rogers

Hill City SD

dana.rogers.1@hotmail.com

Comment:

Commissioners and GFP staff,

I respectfully request that the commission takes action ASAP on the ever increasing numbers of non-residents that are taking advantage of our unlimited archery permits for antelope and deer. The GFP staff offered a reasonable plan to limit non-resident archery permits in April that would limit pressure on large public tracts. Unfortunately, the commission tabled that and wanted to take time to have a larger and deeper discussion on the overall non-resident issue and impact. Then when the earlier archery opener date of September 1 for archery deer was passed it exponentially compounded the problem, which was predictable.

In October a GFP staff member informed me that we have already seen a 30% increase on non-resident archery deer permits for 2018. How do you think this effects our SD resident bowhunters? Particularly on public lands that already saw way too much pressure in many areas.

South Dakota residents live here, often specifically because of the outdoor opportunities. Habitat is shrinking, opportunities to access private lands are also shrinking as a result along with increased population. There are many SD residents that depend on our public lands to recreate on. To see these public lands absolutely over-run by non-residents is tough to take.

Eastern SD sportsmen have experienced much loss in their recreational opportunities as a result of the commercialization of pheasant hunting; the legislative end around in non-resident waterfowl licenses (increasing commercialization) as well as the loss of access due to the legislatures failure to act on non-meandered waters and fishing access. Certainly a lot of that isn't necessarily directly within your control. However, the direct impact of unregulated non-resident numbers on upland game, fishing and archery hunting pressure is within your control.

I respectfully ask that you act on behalf of the resident SD sportsmen and help to protect our opportunities. Whether that is an 8% of resident archery permit sales; an overall cap with a specific number of permits like 1,500; a specific cap of a finite amount of "public land" archery permits (ex 500); or a mandatory NR hunting license fee directed to public land and walk in habitat enhancement. I'm not cemented in on any one aspect. I just know that it's high time NR archery permits are limited, particularly in the Black Hills, Custer National Forest, National Grasslands, Missouri River Corridor and even east river GPAs.

Thank You!

Eric Paulson

Pierre SD

epaulson@nvc.net

Comment:

First I'd like to say I had no idea this request for input on the Resident vs Non Resident questionnaire existed until the October 4th meeting when I was able to tune in briefly. And I had to dig back to the May meeting to even find the questionnaire for the discussion. The GFP has a Facebook page and what not that I follow and as I've seen they do plenty of sharing of things on there, share things like this that you want responses too. I've seen more posts about beer and brewery stuff on the SD GFP Facebook page lately than important things such as this. Not everyone can listen in on every GFP meeting but things like this survey would be wonderful to have shared on Facebook or part of your new releases or something. You'd have hundreds of responses if it was there. Just go look at all the comments on deer allocation related things on the GFP page and other pages.

And before you read my attachment I want to preface this by saying I am in no way against non-resident waterfowling, pheasant hunting, etc. Some non-resident hunting is just fine and South Dakota can support certain levels of non-resident hunting before things become "commercialized" or "overcrowded". I've had friends who've come from out of state to hunt with us before I and I'm glad they have the opportunity to do that if they so choose. 1) Resident - "living in a place for some length of time", "non migratory" – Merriam-Webster - Someone who resides, lives, and has a South Dakota driver's license. Think of a similar way that the South Dakota State colleges determine if a student is or isn't a resident of South Dakota – my definition/interpretation Nonresident - "not residing in a particular place" – Merriam-Webster - Someone who resides, lives, and has a driver's license for anywhere outside of South Dakota. Similarly, think of a similar way that the South Dakota State colleges determine if a student is or isn't a resident of South Dakota – my definition/interpretation Based on your website as an answer under the FAQs as to what makes you a resident: You must have a fixed and permanent domicile in the state and have lived in the state for at least 90 consecutive days prior to making application. You must make no claims of residency in any other state or foreign country and have transferred your driver's license and all your motor vehicle registrations to South Dakota.

This is a pretty definitive definition on what makes you a resident in the eyes of the GFP in my opinion and I wouldn't change from this definition other than to maybe make it 180 days rather than 90. 2) Nonresidents are anyone who is not a South Dakota resident, by definition. Doesn't matter if they are family, friends, former residents, customers, etc. If you are not a South Dakota resident you are by default a nonresident. 3) Why propose restrictions on nonresidents? Give people incentive to live in the state. If you get the same privileges to those living out of state where there are better paying jobs as someone who chooses to live in state, you will lose residents in the state which will have a detrimental impact on the communities these people move from. You will have a harder time keeping younger hunters to remain as residents in the state if they can move away without losing any hunting privileges. People like myself who could very easily job shop outside of the state for a better paying job could do just that, yet I'd maintain all the same privileges as I have now and that's just not right. What incentive would there be to live in South Dakota in terms of hunting?? Residents pay property taxes in this state, eat out at restaurants more than nonresidents, buy pretty much all their groceries in this state, buy more gas in state, live in the state, work in the state, overall just allow for the economy of the state to prosper. Without residents there is no economy, there are no workers, there are no gas stations. Residents should be given advantages over nonresidents. Again, it gets back to my previous point where if a nonresident wants the same privileges as a resident then they should live in this state.

Take income taxes for example, if someone from Minnesota doesn't want to pay income taxes they move to a non-income taxing state. They don't just get to choose to stay in Minnesota and not pay taxes. Not paying income taxes is an incentive to be a South Dakota resident. Having the ability to draw an east river deer tag or hunt for more than 3-10 days for birds is an incentive to live in South Dakota. 4) Commission should consider factors including but not limited to, hunter satisfaction (if declining, maybe pressure is too high or bird numbers are too low), average daily bag (if daily bag drops then maybe bird numbers are too low and licenses need to be cut), average days hunted (if nonresidents are hunting less than before, obviously they are leaving early for a reason and it would be safe to bet success is low or hunting is tough, maybe licenses should be reevaluated). Comments from the public also need to be considered. Now comments need to be taken with a grain of salt, some residents want no nonresident hunters, I am not in that camp. I'm fine with nonresident hunting. But you also have to take what outfitters and guides are saying with a grain of salt too. One waterfowl outfitter who has been very vocal has many people out scouting and they lease land. So naturally they will have more consistent success, 5 scouters for a guide vs 1 for a normal hunter is a very large disparity. Guiding is in it for the money where freelance hunters are in it for a good time and to preserve the sport for everyone, specifically the average hunter, not just people willing to shell out big money to just show up and shoot something. 5) As far as I know of no. But it's a slippery slope if you group residents and nonresidents in the same category. The incentive to live in the state greatly diminishes if you are a hunter and you can live out of state and have the same privileges as a resident. 6) No clue what the true nonresident fiscal impact is. But be careful listening to guides and tourism folks who say that nonresident hunters are vital to small communities. Guides typically have full service operations; their clients DO NOT support the small town cafes like they may claim. Their clients eat and drink at the lodges, not the mom and pops restaurant on main street. Granted some do, but from my experiences in

talking to people and researching outfitters online, it's not going to be as drastic as they say. Also, a lot of nonresidents will bring coolers of drinks and food with them. That part always seems to be forgotten as well when nonresident issues get brought up. Typically, they are packing for their hunt in their home town and that includes everything from sandwiches to shells they'll buy before they get to South Dakota because you cannot risk planning the trip and driving to small town SD and showing up and they are out of bullets or have no sandwich meat or Gatorade left. 7) SD residents become nonresidents as soon as their permanent home/apartment or place of living becomes some place other than somewhere in South Dakota. 8) A lot of it should be just listening to the public. A lot of people felt stabbed in the back with the last waterfowl reallocation deal that passed the GFP. The only ones for it were one guide and their clients. Everyone else was against it yet it passed. At the time hunter satisfaction was down, if I remember right average daily bag was down. So, I would say yes statistics need to be included but public comments also need a very significant weight. There's things number just can't tell. Pressure is one of them. It's hard to put a number on pressure. When 5 trucks are watching one field how do I assign that a number vs providing a comment on in the field findings? 9) Meetings after 5 pm would be huge in my opinion. Most hunters have jobs and cannot take vacation time go to 2 pm meetings on Thursdays. Use social media to relay meeting agendas, etc., its already used for some things, use it to promote your meeting agendas to get people curious and get them searching your website to become more educated. Looking at the 2019 GFP calendar it's disappointing. 4 of the meetings are in Central SD (Pierre/Fort Pierre), 4 are West river, and only 2 are east river. Yet an overwhelming majority of sportsman in south Dakota live east river. There should be as many if not more meetings east river than any other part of the state. And no meetings in Aberdeen? That's where all your issues with the duck allocations were a few years ago yet meetings don't get held there regularly, why? What about Sioux Falls? The biggest city in the state! One meeting a year should be held in the state's 1st and/or 3rd largest city. Are you trying to avoid the majority of the population for some reason next year? What is brewing in the background for changes that we've not yet heard about yet? These are the thoughts that go through people's minds when common sense meeting places are brushed off. Like the deer thing, all major decisions were made at meetings west river! What the heck?!

Spring Turkey Hunting Seasons

Eric Reisenweber

Sioux Falls SD

Ereiser13@hotmail.com

Comment:

I strongly support removing rifles from the legal weapon list to take turkeys with. Turkey hunting should be about getting close to the birds and decoying them in. Or spot and stalk methods with decoys and fans. Taking a bird with a rifle is not challenging or sporting. It is also dangerous to hunt them with rifles, as decoys are becoming more and more realistic. Please strongly consider banning rifles from the sport of turkey hunting.

Brian Lee

Pierre SD

Bdlee@pie.midco.net

Comment:

According to the Pierre paper only 6.8% of use rifles for spring turkey hunting so I imagine we won't have much input on the GFP proposal. And I say GFP proposal and not the commision. There is no real reason to ban there use. Using realistic decoys is a very lame excuse. As much as 'not many hunters use rifles so let's ban them'. No logic there at all. The last time I heard of anyone being injured by a rifle while turkey hunting was over 30 years ago. If you want to use that logic, shotguns should be banned immediately for pheasant hunting! Please don't take this aspect of turkey hunting a few of us enjoy! You have already taken enough away. Have these public comments ever prevented a proposal from being passed? Thank You

Jerrad Swier

Brookings SD

Jerradswier1982@gmail.com

Comment:

I believe the turkey numbers in the hills are way down. I feel u need to consider limiting the number of hunters. Starting with the nonresident.

Jay Hauer

Wrenshall MN

jayhauer@aes04.com

Comment:

I have been hunting turkeys in South Dakota for 38 years because you can hunt with a rifle. In that time I have never felt unsafe or in danger while out hunting turkeys. The only times I felt unsafe or in danger was driving from my home to the area I was turkey hunting. Had to be very alert and avoid a few unsafe situations while driving but never out hunting turkeys. Do not restrict turkey hunters from using rifles because a few life like decoys are being use. Have the hunters using life like decoys put orange ribbons on there decoys and ware orange hats. Thank you for your consideration on this issue.

Scott Hokeness

Lakeville MN

shokeness@gmail.com

Comment:

I have hunted turkeys in the Black Hills for over a decade and have never been concerned for my safety due to the use of rifles.

David Brown

Magnolia TX

brownklan7@gmail.com

Comment:

I grew up in South Dakota, hunted in SD, graduated from college in SD, worked for the State of SD for nearly five years. I return nearly every year, am an out-of-state hunter, to hunt Spring Turkey. I am very opposed to banning rifles (I do use one) for turkey hunting. Never had, never seen, nor heard of a safety problem while using a rifle for over 40+ years hunting turkeys. Decoys are 99.9999% hens not gobblers, and if someone is clueless about using a gobbler decoy they shouldn't be in the woods hunting. Ban decoys before you ban rifles. Rifles are more humane (less lost birds) than shotguns. It is my opinion that this proposed rifle ban is about the bigger issue of limiting the use of firearms, not a safety issue. If rifles result in a higher harvest rate (concerned about population numbers), the solution is to reduce the number of licenses available for harvesting turkeys. This spring was horrible for turkey numbers in the southern Black Hills because a) incredibly cold winter and related die off, and b) trapped birds were relocated. Ban rifles, and SD will lose turkey hunters.

Buddy Shearer

Sioux Falls SD

anita.louise@sio.midco.net

Comment:

There is no more danger in the spring than in the fall!!! If there is publish it!!!

Paul Roghair

Kadoka SD

tallpaulr@hotmail.com

Comment:

I do not feel like it matters much what is said here, however i will take the time just to let you know that i would be very dissatisfied if the use of rifles was removed from the west river spring turkey hunting season. i realize i might be in the minority and thats "not how real hunters hunt turkey" but i have enjoyed it for years to stalk and take turkey with a rifle. If the rules change I would not participate in the season. Thank you for your time.

Scott Schroeder

Foley MN

Carolscottschroeder@gmail.com

Comment:

I just read a newsletter that said the GFP Commission is proposing that rifles no longer be a legal firearm for spring turkey.

I'd like to go on record as opposed to this proposal. As a non resident I don't expect that my opinion carries much weight but I can tell you that a primary reason that I buy the non-resident license and leave money spread from Souix Falls to Custer and back is for the opportunity to use a rifle for the spring hunt.

From my view behind the rifle scope I fail to see how someone can mistake a motionless or nearly motionless decoy with a live turkey. I have not heard of any hunters being shot by rifle bullets turkey hunting but unfortunately I've heard of far too many hunters shot by shotgun hunters as they call from a blind. Clearly more hunter safety training would be a bEtter focus of the Commission.

In a time when we struggle to maintain hunter numbers and recruit new ones this is an unnecessary change and I'll advised.

Bruce Endris

Hills IA

bendris@sharontc.net

Comment:

I hunt in the NW part of the state with a rifle and shotgun; usually taking both afield and use the one most applicable to the situation. On public land a restriction might be useful for safety but not on private land with a limited number of hunters.

Waterfowl Hunting Seasons

Larry Minter

Jefferson SD

lrminter@longlines.com

Comment:

I would like the state to reconsider the duck and goose season dates for the Low Plains South Zone, especially Union Co. I live and hunt west of Elk Point on the Missouri River. Most hunters I've heard of from Springfield on down purchase non-resident Nebr. Waterfowl permits and they enter and exit the river from the S.D. side, which I understand is legal. But the state is only kidding itself to think these hunters are waiting for our dates, Nebr. makes more money. Nebr. goose Oct. 6th. S.D. goose Nov. 5th. Nebr. duck Oct. 6th. S.D. duck Oct. 27th. Whats even more confusing on the East side of I29 (Low Plains Middle Zone) the duck season starts Sept.29th. There,s nowhere to hunt waterfowl this far south. My hunting partner and myself are getting older and tired of fighting the river and our late season dates. I can see why younger hunters down here have no interest in Waterfowl hunting. Please reconsider our season dates down here. Thank You Larry Minter

Joe Jares

Sioux Falls SD

Joe.Jares@gmail.com

Comment:

I oppose the proposed 2019 hunting season dates. I would like to see some thought given to a split season - i.e. Season begins September 28 and runs for 2 weeks, then closes for 2 weeks, then reopens. This would provide hunters more opportunities for hunting larger migrating birds later in the season. This could also potentially deflect any issues with hunting pressure overlap on public hunting ground for pheasant hunters and duck hunters for the opening weekend of pheasant hunting if timed correctly.