Comes, Rachel

From: Miller, LouAnn
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 12:04 PM
To: Comes, Rachel
Subject: FW: [EXT] Elk tag reduction

Categories: Commission

-----Original Message-----
From: Adam Hughes [mailto:adamcasey34@icloud.com]
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 12:00 PM
To: SDGFPINFO
Subject: [EXT] Elk tag reduction

ATTENTION COMMISSIONERS

I understand that u are reducing the number of cow tags. I live and ranch in unit 2. I went to feed cows and was not surprised to see a herd of 100 elk standing and eating every blade of green grass that pops up. Grass that my cattle should be eating this spring. I was not surprised cause I see this almost everyday. I was excited last year with the increase Of tags because I thought it was gonna be an opportunity to get the size of this herd down. I am not against elk we just need to get the number down to a manageable size. I understood that the increase in number of tags was supposed to be set for two years why are u going in and changing it after one? We all know that with the success ratio of elk that are actually harvested and the number of calves that are about to be born we aren't going to decrease the population of this herd it is only going to grow. We need to get a better plan and stick with it.

Adam coy
Reno gulch rd hill city
Sent from my iPhone

Comes, Rachel

From: Miller, LouAnn
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2017 1:26 PM
To: Comes, Rachel
Subject: FW: [EXT] Commission Members agenda item Waterfowl legislation
Attachments: untitled-[2]

Categories: Commission

-----Original Message-----
From: rosie@sdglaciallakes.com [mailto:rosie@sdglaciallakes.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2017 12:28 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] Commission Members agenda item Waterfowl legislation

April 3, 2017,
To the SD Game Fish and Parks Commission,

On behalf of our association, we also approve and support the contents of this letter.
Sincerely,
Rosie Smith
Executive Director
Glacial Lakes and Prairies Tourism Association

---------- Original Message ----------
Subject: Consact Commission
From: "Norb Barrie" <norbarrie@nvc.net>
Date: Sat, April 1, 2017 7:04 am
To: "Norb Barrie" <norbarrie@nvc.net>
Cc: "InsuranceEric@aol.com" <insuranceeric@aol.com>
"Greg Borchard" <gborchard@avastonetech.com>
steve@ercjobs.com
"Jones Samuel" <samcjones@bellsouth.net>
"Benj Stoick" <bjstoick@westriv.com>
"John Langdell" <johnlangdell@rushmore.com>
"John Sturgeleski" <jsturgeleski@hotmail.com>
don@jaspercompany.com
jrose@whitebearlake.org
"Nina Kunz" <contactus@northernkrosslodge.com>
ecdc@valleytel.net
"K Crim" <kcrimminger@gmail.com>
johnso2000@aol.com
"Kristi Wagner" <kristi_wagner@rushmore.com>
hautmanstudio@hotmail.com
"richard simms" <richard@sceniccityfishing.com>
"Howard Goetsch" <comthngoetsch@hughes.net>

"Kermit Born" <kdborn@nvc.net>
"Lucien P Laborde" <llabor2@lsu.edu>
"Joe Uran" <t08051@yahoo.com>
rlhasn@aol.com
pauldolezal21@yahoo.com
lonestherapy@cs.com
janderson@tctcircuitsupply.com
"Jeff & Donna" <jdzeratsky@hotmail.com>
"David Dybdahl" <dybdahl@armr.net>
minuch@aol.com
dana.randall@raymondjames.com
mphunts@gmail.com
"Lorin Pankratz" <ldpankratz49@gmail.com>
mail@buffalorock.net
"Michele Harrison" <michelekharrison@gmail.com>
"Ron Mittleider" <mitt5@valleytel.net>
slyons@sdra.org
"Rosie Smith" <rosie@sdglaciallakes.com>
wdtrucking@valleytel.net
trevorcramer@yahoo.com
mspeck@cbgundaker.com
jeff@wranglerinn.com
crtburdess9804@aol.com
"Tom Badger" <tbadger@valleytel.net>
kroontje@valleytel.net
robert529@outlook.com
info@mobridge.org
atkinson@mobridgetribune.com
"John Lake" <Lakeforhouse@gmail.com>
"Karen Kern" <info@sdmissouririver.com>
"David Peterson" <dwpeterson@itascacol.com>

GFP meet Thur, Apr 6th, Watertown

I / we approve the contents of this letter. Time to represent all South Dakotans.

Your Name

of Enterprise if applicable

City

Date

On behalf of our association, we also support the

South Dakota Game, Fish & Parks Commission wildinfo@state.sd.us
April 1, 2017

Dear Commission Members:

The South Dakota Waterfowl Association and South Dakota Wildlife Federation sent a proposal to the Commission in March of 2017 suggesting that the Commission consider increasing resident waterfowl hunting opportunities by stopping the commercialization of waterfowl hunting and by drastically reducing the number of nonresident waterfowl licenses.
Specifically, their suggestion was that the Commission eliminate all three-day waterfowl licenses with the exception of 500 that are restricted to private land in the Missouri River Unit and to limit the number of 10-day nonresident licenses each year to eight percent of the average number of resident waterfowl licenses sold in the prior three years.

This letter is submitted in opposition of these proposals by the
following: The South Dakota Hotel and Lodging Association, South Dakota Opportunity Group, South Dakota Migratory Bird Association, Flatland Flyways, Brock Greenfield, Senator District 2, Charlie Hoffman, former state legislator District 23, former state legislator District 22 Dick Werner a member of the 2014 Non Resident Waterfowl License Working Group and others.

First, the individuals and organizations above would ask the Commission to keep in mind that the Commission acts for the benefit of all people in the state of South Dakota and not just for the resident waterfowl hunter. This is clearly evidenced in the Commission's mission statement: "Acting within its legislative mandates, the Commission serves as the advocate and liaison between the South Dakota Game, Fish & Parks and its stakeholders - the people of South Dakota."

The people of South Dakota include not only individual residents, but also those citizens engaging in commercial hunting operations as well as the owners, operators and employees of hotels, restaurants, and small businesses situated throughout our state.

This group asks that the Commission reject the proposals submitted to them as they fly in the face of reason, both economically as well as biologically and also are unduly restrictive of the rights of landowners.

The proposal submitted to the Commission correctly notes that the number of resident waterfowl hunters has plummeted in recent years. However, the numbers suggested by the proponents do not appear to be accurate. According to a news article published in the Mitchell Republic on September 22, 2016, for the first time on record, there were fewer than
12,000 resident waterfowl hunters in 2015. Attached you will find a copy of the news article, along with a graph representing resident duck hunters. These numbers are in line with data that GFP staff provided this Commission at its March 2017 meeting as evidenced in the attached Commission Action Finalization on the Duck Hunting Season. This differs markedly from the 30,000 number cited by the proponents. Conversely, the number of waterfowl is at an all-time high. Also attached is a graph compiled by Game, Fish & Parks demonstrating that duck populations have steadily increased to now record populations.

With resident hunters at an all-time low and waterfowl populations well above long term averages, there is no biological reason to consider a reduction in the number of licenses available to nonresident hunters. In fact, a good argument could be made for increasing the numbers of these licenses. While the proponents of the proposal suggest that reducing the number of nonresident hunters will increase the number of resident hunters, there is no evidence to support that suggestion. Clearly, there are a multitude of reasons why resident waterfowl hunter numbers are at an all-time low,

including a national trend in the decline of waterfowl hunters. Parents are not instilling the hunting tradition with their children and as a result these traditions are not being passed down through generations. There are many other activities that demand an individual's time today including family, children and sporting events, not to mention the younger generation's obsession with social media, video games and electronic devices. Also, we believe that hunters' relationships with landowners aren't what they used to be. We encourage resident hunters to continue establishing and maintaining good relationships with landowners and accept commercial hunting and nonresident hunters (many of whom are South Dakota natives) which clearly benefits all of our state.
The fact that nonresident hunters have a positive impact on the economy is best evidenced by a comparison of the economic impact which nonresident pheasant hunters have made in recent years. According to numbers issued by Game, Fish & Parks, nonresident pheasant hunters had over a $200,000,000 economic impact on our state in 2016. Any suggestion that nonresident hunting does not create economic benefit to our state is clearly without merit.

The proponents also suggest that opportunity would be increased for residents by stopping the commercialization of hunting as commercial waterfowl operators lease the best hunting opportunities for their paying customers. Residents have the same opportunities to lease property or develop relationships with landowners as do commercial operators or nonresidents. Further, by preventing landowners the opportunity to lease their properties to whomever they see fit is interfering with their landowner rights. How can any state agency tell a farmer or for that matter a bed and breakfast or hotel that they cannot rent their property to a resident or a nonresident customer?

Furthermore, the proponents suggest that the commercialization of waterfowl hunting is depleting the opportunities for residents in the areas that they can hunt. We would strongly suggest that this argument is backwards. First, with only 2,000 nonresident three-day licenses available, there is simply no way that nonresidents or commercial hunters are tying up all the land. Further, the sales of nonresident licenses actually increase the opportunities for residents. As many of you know, the original purpose behind the designation of the special three-day tags in the Missouri River Units was conditioned upon the proceeds from the sales of the licenses being used to lease ground available only for resident waterfowl hunters. Drastically reducing the numbers of licenses not only takes away the economic opportunities, but also will decrease the amount of funds available for leasing of these public hunting lands.

In 2015 the lease payments for these lands totaled $274,000. In 2016 the lease payments were $236,000 and in 2017 it is expect it will be close to the 2016 lease amount. A drastic reduction of the licenses will only deplete the funds available to lease these properties. The Game, Fish & Parks data for numbers of nonresidents three-day licenses issued in 2015 totaled 874 licenses: 500 licenses in the northeast unit and 374 in the Missouri River unit. These license sales produced $75,164 in revenue. In
2016 there were licenses: 500 in the northeast unit and 628 in the Missouri River unit, producing total revenue of $97,008.

If the Commission were to accept the proposal and reduce the number of three-day licenses, where would the funds for the lease payment shortfall come from? We would suggest that the proposal submitted is more likely to reduce opportunity for resident hunting rather than to increase them.

The proposal also suggests that the number of nonresident 10-day licenses be tied to eight percent of the three-year average of resident hunters.
Today there are 4,000 10-day licenses issued. For purposes of discussion, if the three-year average of resident hunters is 30,000 (as suggested by the 2015 numbers in the proposal) eight percent would be 2,400 licenses.
Further, according to proponents the all-time record number of resident hunters was 43,500 in 2001. Eight percent of that number is 3,480, again a decrease from the 4,000 issued today. Even if the resident numbers rose to their peak, the Commission would not be issuing as many licenses as they do today. These numbers demonstrate that proponents' proposal simply does not add up. Clearly, the proponents' goal is to decrease nonresident hunting opportunities at whatever the cost.

For these reasons and for common sense we would ask that the Commission reject the proposal of the South Dakota Waterfowl Association and South Dakota Wildlife Federation and leave the numbers where they stand.

Thank you so much for your service to the State and your consideration of this very important matter.

Sincerely,

South Dakota Opportunity Group

Norbe Barrie, President Turton SD

605 897 7589

Comes, Rachel

From: Miller, LouAnn
Sent: Wednesday, April 05, 2017 8:19 AM
To: Comes, Rachel
Subject: FW: The Sandbox

Categories: Commission

From: p3bfco@nrctv.com [mailto:p3bfco@nrctv.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 05, 2017 7:27 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] The Sandbox

Good morning GF&P Commissioners,

I am sending you this note in support of non-resident waterfowl hunting. As a fiction writer in South Dakota, I would like to tell a short story below:

The Sandbox

Two boys were in the city park playing in the sandbox. After a while, they got bored with the sand and moved to the swings. As they were swinging, two more boys came into the park and started playing in the sandbox. As they did, one of the boys left the swings and walked up. “Do you boys live in town?”
“No, we’re visiting.”
“Then you can’t play in our sandbox. It is ours and not yours.”
“But you’re not using it.”
“It doesn’t matter. It is ours and you can’t play in it.”
As the boys stood up toe to toe facing off in what was soon to be a fight, two grown men arrived. “What’s going in here?” one man asked.
“They won’t let is play in the sandbox,” the boy answered.
“Were they using it?”
“No, they were on the swings.”
“Then I don’t see a reason for you not to play.”
“Wait a minute," the other grown-up said. “This sandbox was built for our boys. “You people are not from here. You don’t have the privilege of residency. Your boys can not play here.”
“But your boys aren’t using it,” the other man replied.

“It doesn’t matter. It is not yours to use. Please take your boys and leave. You’ll just ruin it for us.”
“What if I offered to pay for extra sand and spent some money improving the park?”
“No,” the man answered, "We do not want your kind here and that’s that. Now leave or I’ll call the authorities.”

I penned that scene to point out the selfishness of the people behind the South Dakota Wildlife Federation and their fellow travelers in the ‘Keep it all for Myself’ crowd. They are no better than the boys in the sandbox.

Even though the waterfowl population continues to grow, there are fewer and fewer resident waterfowl licenses requested each year. Despite that, the SDWF continues to coerce SD Game Fish and Parks into refusing to let non-resident hunters into the sandbox. Out of state hunters bring in money for habitat renewal and for support for our local small towns at a daily rate better than ten to one.

There is plenty of sandbox for everyone if GF&P regulates it properly. I urge you to favorably consider the petition submitted by The Opportunity Group

Thank you,

Rick Skorupski
Frankfort, SD

Petition to implement rules HB 1185 (2014)

SOUTH DAKOTA OPPORTUNITY GROUP

Dedicated to growing South Dakota’s tourism economy

for the benefit of all South Dakotans

My name is Norbe Barrie. I am President of SD Opportunity
Our mailing address is PO Box 155, Turton SD 57477
Our cell phone number 605 897 7589
Our e-mail address is norbarrie@nvc.net

RULE IDENTIFICATION

HB 1185 (2014) authorizes the following amendments:

Beadle County Sportsmen's Club
Huron, SD

March 15, 2017

Department of Game, Fish and Parks Commission

523 East Capital Avenue

Pierre, South Dakota 57501

Dear Commission:

The Beadle County Sportsman's Club is a member of the South Dakota Wildlife Federation and is comprised of 217 members. One of our many purposes is to support, expand and maintain the wildlife and fishing resources and species in South Dakota for the benefit of all sportsmen, their families and the general population of South Dakota.

The acquisition of the Bob Roe property in Beadle County provides a unique opportunity to obtain 320 acres of prime wildlife habitat that has been under the watchful eye of Mr. Roe until his passing. We understand it was his wishes and desire for this land to remain for such use and benefit for wildlife and fellow South Dakotan's.

Therefore, the Beadle County Sportsmen's Club and its members wish to go on record supporting the acquisition of this 320 acre tract for the benefit of wildlife, education and the resident and nonresident sportsmen and women. In addition, we want to remind all that taxes will be levied on the land in accordance with the soil productivity.

We thank you for this opportunity to express our position and thank you for the many responsibilities the Commission has in maintaining one of the finest hunting and fishing opportunities in the United States.

Sincerely,

Dave Eichstadt, President
Dave Eichstadt
Beadle County Sportsman's Club

March 24, 2017

South Dakota Game Fish and Parks Commission

523 East Capital Avenue

Pierre, South Dakota 57501

Dear Commission,

It has come to the attention of the Bell Prairie Township in Beadle County, SD, that the land owned by Robert Roe is under consideration of being acquired by the GF&P. The township board is neither for nor against the acquisition but we are concerned with the consequences of this acquisition.

Access to the land is on township roads. Increased traffic on these roads will add additional wear and tear. The upkeep for these roads is the responsibility of the township board. We are not flush with funds to keep up with the higher maintenance that will be required because of increased traffic. The funds we are able to use are tax dollars and we are good stewards of those dollars.

Another concern of the board is that the new owners pay the same amount of property taxes that the current owner currently pays. If this property is taken off the tax rolls it will hurt the township financially. We understand that at this time, it is in the Constitution and in Statute that GF&P pays the same amount of tax as paid by other landowners. We appreciate this and hope it continues.

Owning agriculture land means dealing with weeds. We understand not every weed can be taken care of but at least trying to control them is most helpful to all other landowners. We know in the past this wasn't always the case. We hope that at least an attempt will be made.

As a board we understand the joy of hunting and managing wildlife for all to enjoy but we want you to understand, as a township, we cannot be asked to take on the additional financial burden.

Thanking you kindly for your consideration.

Belle Prairie township board

Comes, Rachel

From: Franny <fvfritz@santel.net>
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 10:01 AM
To: Comes, Rachel; Coughlin, Paul; VanderBeek, Steve
Cc: Todd Peskey; Stan and Judy Dubro
Subject: Roe Land acquisition
Attachments: Belle Praire letter to GF&P about Roe's land March 19, 2017.docx

Good morning.
Attached you will find the letter to the GF&P Commission about the Roe land. We do want to be good neighbors and hope we can work together in the future.
Thank you to Mr. Coughlin and Mr. VanderBeek for meeting with the township board. We appreciate you taking the time to drive out here and understanding where we are coming from.
Sincerely,
Belle Prairie township board.