

Minutes of the Game, Fish, and Parks Commission
March 4-5, 2021

Vice Chairman Doug Sharp called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. CT. Commissioners Travis Bies, Jon Locken, Russell Olson, Charles Spring, Robert Whitmyre. Public and staff were able to listen via SDPB livestream and participate via conference call with approximately 85 total participants via zoom.

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION

Conflict of Interest Disclosure

Vice Chairman Sharp called for conflicts of interest to be disclosed. None were presented.

Approval of Minutes

Sharp called for any additions or corrections to the January 28-29, 2021 regular meeting minutes or a motion for approval.

Motion by Whitmyre with second by Locken TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE January 28-29 MEETING. Motion carried unanimously.

Additional Commissioner Salary Days

Sharp called for additional salary days. Bies and Spring each requested a salary day for participation in the Elk Stakeholder and Mule Deer meetings. Motioned by Locken, second by Whitmyre TO APPROVE THE ADDITIONAL SALARY DAY. Motion carried unanimously.

License Sales Request

Chris Petersen, administration division director, presented the full fee license list request for preserve hunting lodges received from Jake Hyland, of Windsor, CO to be used for real estate purposes.

Motioned by Bies, second by Locken TO APPROVE THE LICENSE LIST REQUEST. Motion carried unanimously.

Wildlife Damage Management Specialist of the Year

John Kanta, terrestrial's chief, presented the wildlife damage management specialist of the year award.

SDPRA Education Award

Katy Hiltunen on behalf of the South Dakota Parks and Recreation Association presented GFP education staff the Citation Award which recognized the efforts of the department to promote and support recreation in local communities by providing alternative programming and events during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Legislative Update

Interim Secretary Kevin Robling provide a legislative update on bills introduced pertaining to GFP.

Can-Am Raffle Update

Nick Harrington, digital content strategist, provided the Commission with an update on a Can-Am raffle to benefit the Second Century Habitat Fund. The raffle is courtesy of a partnership between GFP, the Department of Tourism, Can-Am Off Road and R&R Pheasant Hunting. The raffle prize is a Can-Am Defender Limited, a UTV valued at \$53,000. It was mentioned that the tickets would be \$100 for individuals and would be available for sale beginning March 8, 2021 and run through October 2021.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Public Hearing began at 2:00 p.m. and concluded at 2:10 p.m. The minutes follow these Commission meeting minutes.

OPEN FORUM

Jon Kotilnek, senior staff attorney, opened the floor for discussion from those in attendance on matters of importance to them that may not be on the agenda.

Nest Predator Bounty program

Carol Merwin – Rapid City, SD said she doesn't agree with the program as these animals are a part of nature.

Chris Hesla, SDWF – Pierre, SD oppose the program for several reasons. He wants to know if there is data to support a good return on investment for the 1.6 million that has been spent. Wondering what the return would be if we used this money to bus children to the outdoor campus

Sandra Seberger – Rapid City, SD president Biden carries a slip of paper with the number of people who have died from COVID. Following his example, she is doing the same with nest predators.

Jamie Al-Haj – Rapid City, SD continues to oppose the program and speak for the native SD wildlife that doesn't have a voice. Doesn't understand why this program continues. Hope all are taking notice of the number of people expressing opposition. It is a tremendous amount of money that could be used in other ways like building habitat or an incentive for landowners.

Nancy Hilding, Prairie Hills Audubon Society – Black Hawk, SD (also wants to speak on endangered species issues or prairie dogs) continues to question if this is a legal meeting. Just attended a legislative hearing to merge agencies which would save about the same amount that is funding this program. Complains that prairie dog plan should have acreage surveys done more often. Wants to know how other obligations are met when money is spent on this program. Referenced survey that provides more information on the demographics of the study.

Cody Hodson Black Hills Sportsman Club – Rapid City, SD does not support the bounty program. Wonder what this program will look like 8-10 years down the road and what else that 5 million can do for the department and state.

Zebra Mussel Prevention work with GFP on Enemy Swim

Tom Grady – Sioux Falls, SD cabin owner at Enemy Swim. Concerned that zebra mussels which have recently been found at Pickrel. Formed association of 250 cabins on the lake to prevent infestation of zebra mussels. Want to know if it would be possible for GFP to eliminate one boat ramp and work with tribe to borrow a cleaning machine and residents to volunteer to clean, drain and dry.

FINALIZATIONS

Aerial Permit Adjustments

Kanta presented the finalization to modify existing administrative rule to remove application requirements for submitting pilot certificate data and medical certificate data. He explained aerial hunting is a highly regulated activity in South Dakota and to obtain an aerial hunting permit, pilots must file an annual application with GFP. While applicants will still need to confirm they possess valid certifications, they will not be required to provide a copy of the pilot's certificate data (i.e. pilot's license) and medical certificate. This will help simplify the application process.

Motioned by Whitmyre, second by Bies TO MODIFY EXISTING ADMINISTRATIVE RULE TO REMOVE APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBMITTING PILOT CERTIFICATE DATA AND MEDICAL CERTIFICATE DATA. Motion carried unanimously.

Big Game Ammo Minimum Size and Type

Kanta presented the Departments recommended change to allow for the use of monolithic copper fluted bullets to be used to take big game animals by adding "expanding bullet" which means any bullet designed by its manufacture to create a wound channel larger than its diameter.

Motioned by Bies, second by Olson TO THE REJECT THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE TO ALLOW THE USE OF MONOLITHIC COPPER FLUTED BULLETS TO BE USED TO TAKE BIG GAME ANIMALS. Roll Call Vote: Bies – No, Locken – No, Olson – Yes, Sharp – Yes, Whitmyre – No. Motion failed 2-4

Nonmeandered Waters Navigation Lane Process

Jon Kotilnek requested that the Commission approve two rules to implement the requirements of SDCL 41-23-16. He described that the two new rules would create a petition process for individuals to request for a transportation lane through a closed nonmeandered body of water. He further explained that the burden to meet the criteria found in statute to create these lanes is high. The closed nonmeandered lake must be directly between a point of legal access and a portion of a nonmeandered lake open for recreational use and there must be no alternative legal public access to the portion of the nonmeandered lake open for recreational use. The two rules would establish a process for a member of the public to petition the Commission as well as notification requirements for the landowner. Furthermore, the rules would require the Department to evaluate established lanes on a yearly basis and bring recommendations. Finally, it was emphasized that any person, at any time, could petition to remove an established transportation lane through the normal rule amendment petition process.

Commissioner Whitmyer acknowledged the Commission's obligation to create some sort of process. The Commission has already implemented the other provisions required by SDCL 41-23, this is just one last piece that we had not implemented yet.

Motioned by Bies, second by Whitmyre TO FINALIZE THE CHANGES TO CREATE NEW RULES TO ESTABLISH A PROCEDURE TO REQUEST NAVIGATION LANE CLOSURES. Motion carried unanimously.

Waterfowl Refuge

Chad Switzer, wildlife program manager, presented the recommended changes to waterfowl refuges to remove the private property currently within Antelope Lake Waterfowl Refuges in sections 19 and 29, township 116 north, range 57 west in Clark County. He explained there has been a recent change in ownership of private property. The new landowner of the private property within the current Antelope Lake State Waterfowl Refuge boundary in section 19 desires to be able to hunt his property, thus he has requested his property be removed from the refuge. Due to the request, Department staff visited with the other two landowners within the boundary in sections 29 and 30. The landowner in section 29 would also like to remove his property from the refuge. Landowner in section 30 would like private property to remain in refuge status. Therefore, the recommendation is for all of Section 30 to remain in refuge status and remove private property in sections 19 and 29 from refuge status at the request of the landowners.

Motioned by Whitmyre, second by Locken TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE TO REMOVE THE PROPERTY AT ANTELOPE LAKE FROM THE REFUGE. Motion carried unanimously.

Waterfowl Season Recommendations

Switzer presented the recommended change to Waubay State Game Refuge and Waubay Lake State Game Refuge to Waubay State Game Bird Refuge in the following Administrative Rule chapters: 41:06:22:02. Restricted areas -- Exceptions. The archery deer hunting season is restricted in the following areas with the applicable restrictions or exceptions noted: (4) Waubay Lake State Game Bird Refuge and Waubay National Wildlife Refuge in Day County are open September 1 through January 1, except during the refuge firearm deer seasons established in chapter 41:06:36; 41:06:36:01.02. Waubay deer hunting season established -- Number and type of licenses. The Waubay deer hunting season is open within the boundaries of the Waubay National Wildlife Refuge and the Waubay Lake State Game Bird Refuge from one-half hour before sunrise to one-half hour after sunset daily as provided in § 41:06:36:02.02. No more than 20 one-tag deer licenses may be issued to residents. 41:06:45:02.01. Closed areas. The general muzzleloader deer hunting season is closed and licenses are not valid in the following areas: (4) Waubay National Wildlife Refuge and Waubay State Game Bird Refuge in Day County.

Motioned by Spring, second by Bies TO APPROVE THE RECOMMEND CHANGES TO WAUBAY STATE GAME BIRD REFUGE. Motion carried unanimously

Switzer presented the recommended change to the license validity date found in ARSD 41:06:02:01.04 from "Any license is valid from December 15 preceding the printed year on the license to January 31 following the printed year on the license, inclusive" to "Any license is valid from December 15 preceding the printed year on the license to January 31 following the printed year on the license, inclusive unless otherwise specified".

Motioned by Whitmyre, second by Locken TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE TO VALID DATES OF THE STATE MIGRATORY BIRD CERTIFICATION PERMIT. Motion carried unanimously.

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the duck hunting season to as follows:

1. During the first 16 days of the season an additional two blue-winged teal may be harvested in addition to the daily bag limit for the Tier 1 Option only.
2. Include mergansers in the daily bag limit of ducks for the Tier 2 Option only.

Motioned by Bies, second by Whitmyre TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE DUCK HUNTING SEASON. Motion carried unanimously.

Switzer presented the recommended change to the goose hunting season to Modify the open area to include that portion of Meade County south of South Dakota Highway 34 and the counties of Aurora, Beadle, Bon Homme, Brookings, Brown, Clark, Clay, Codington, Davison, Day, Deuel, Edmunds, Faulk, Hamlin, Hanson, Hutchinson, Grant, Jerauld, Kingsbury, Lake, Lincoln, Marshall, McCook, McPherson, Miner, Minnehaha, Moody, Roberts, Sanborn, Spink, Turner, Union and Yankton.

Motioned by Whitmyre, second by Locken TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO MODIFY THE OPEN AREAS FOR GOOSE HUNTING AUGUST MANAGEMENT TAKE. Motion carried unanimously.

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the early fall Canada goose season to change the start date from the first Saturday of September to September 1st and increase the daily bag limit from 8 to 15.

Motion by Whitmyre, second by Bies TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE EARLY FALL CANADA GOOSE SEASON. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Lands and Waters

Scott Simpson, parks and recreation regional director, presented the recommended changes to North Point Area of Lake Francis Case:

- (1) In the North Point Area of Lake Francis Case in the waters of St. Francis Bay and Prairie Dog Bay starting at the center of the respective boat ramps and extending outward in a 150-yard radius are is a "no wake zone"
- (2) In the North Point Area of Lake Francis Case in the waters of St. Francis Bay and starting at the center of the respective boat ramp and extending outward in a 350-yard radius is a "no wake zone"

Switzer explained that Due to a significant increase in beach use, recreational boating, and fishing; staff has seen an increased risk for accidents in this congested area making public safety a concern. The St. Francis beach is the North Point Rec. Area's largest and most popular swimming beach in the district. Due to the topography it is protected from high winds, making it a very popular area for swimmers and kayakers alike. From the swimming beach buoys to the opposite shoreline there is approx. 200 yards of distance. This is a narrow area for the multiple recreational boaters that are towing skiers and tubers just outside the swim area, along with fisherman who go back and forth from the boat ramp. North Point Rec. Area offers four public boat ramps with the St. Francis Bay ramp being the smallest of the four. The other three boat ramps all have larger parking lots and are in proximity, with St. Francis Bay offering 25 parking stalls, Prairie Dog - 201, North Point Bay - 60, and the Fort Randall Marina at 30. No Wake buoys would be placed across the bay at approx. 100 ft in distance between each other.

Motioned by Locken, second by Whitmyre TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO EXTEND THE NORTH POINT AREA NO WAKE ZONE. Motion carried unanimously.

PROPOSALS

Deer Season

Chad Switzer, wildlife program manager, presented the recommended change to the mentored youth big game license to be any antlerless deer or antlerless whitetail deer license. He explained Mentored deer hunting units would correspond to those of the apprentice deer hunting season. The establishment of these units and license types will reduce harvest of antlerless mule deer in select hunting units to increase mule deer population growth rates, while maintaining current apprentice deer harvest and desired growth rates in other hunting units. Provided the population is growing, increasing growth rates will reduce time to achieve management objectives where the desire is to increase the mule deer population. On average, during 2017 to 2020, about 450 female mule deer were harvested by mentored or apprentice hunters in proposed unit MHD-13. The recommended management change to create a whitetail only mentor and apprentice hunting unit will reduce statewide mule deer female harvest by about 30%.

Motion by Locken, second by Whitmyre TO APPROVED THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE TO MENTORED YOUTH BIG GAME LICENSES. Motion carried unanimously.

Switzer presented the recommended change to the disabled veterans hunting season as follows:

1. Within Article 41:06 (Hunting Seasons and Methods) of the Administrative Rules of South Dakota, create Chapter 41:06:63 (Deer Hunting Season for Disabled Veterans).
2. Deer hunts authorized for qualifying disabled veterans and purple heart recipients may be established anytime during any open deer season upon application by a sponsoring nonprofit organization.
3. These deer hunts are valid for residents only and statewide on private lands only.
4. Available only to those disabled veterans and purple heart recipients that were unsuccessful in obtaining an "any deer" or "any whitetail deer" during the first lottery drawing.
5. Up to 50 resident "any deer" licenses shall be made available, with no more than 10 resident "any deer" licenses per sponsoring nonprofit organization.

6. Sponsoring nonprofit organization will be responsible for license fees.
7. Sponsoring nonprofit organization shall complete and submit an application to the department stating the name, address, and phone number of the sponsoring organization; the requested dates of the hunts; the location of the hunt; and the name of any host landowners providing the land for the hunt.
8. The sponsor of a deer hunt for disabled veterans or purple heart recipients shall provide a report to the department after the conclusion of the seasons. The report must include the name and address of each participant and the total number of deer harvested during the season.

He explained all Americans owe a debt of gratitude to our military veterans, especially to those who may have suffered disabilities as a direct result of their military service. In an effort to provide the opportunity for qualifying disabled veterans to participate in a special deer hunt, the Department, in cooperation with sponsoring nonprofit organizations in South Dakota, would like to encourage the Commission to create a small number of resident “any deer” licenses valid on private land only. These licenses would be issued to qualifying disabled veterans participating through a sponsoring nonprofit organization approved by the department. Due to the limited numbers of licenses issued through these deer hunts, along with the fact that these licenses will be valid only on private land, these deer hunts would not impact the odds of drawing a big game license for any of our states other big game applicants.

Motioned by Bies, second by Whitmyre TO APPROVE THE CHANGES AS PROPOSED. Motion carried unanimously.

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the apprentice deer hunting season to modify the statewide unit and “any antlerless deer” licenses to the following:

- a. Unit APD-03: West River Units 02A, 15A, 15B, 31A, 35A, 35C, 35L, 49A, 49B, 53A, 53C and 64A (See map for open area)
 - i. Single tag “any antlerless deer” license
- b. Unit APD-13: That portion of the state not included in Unit APD-03 (See map for open area)
 - i. Single tag “antlerless whitetail deer” license

He explained the establishment of these units and license types will reduce harvest of antlerless mule deer in select hunting units to increase mule deer population growth rates, while maintaining current apprentice deer harvest and desired growth rates in other hunting units. Provided the population is growing, increasing growth rates will reduce time to achieve management objectives where the desire is to increase the mule deer population. On average, during 2017 to 2020, about 450 female mule deer were harvested by mentored or apprentice hunters in proposed unit APD-13. The recommended management change to create a whitetail only mentor and apprentice hunting unit will reduce statewide mule deer female harvest by about 30%. Of the 4,302 apprentice hunter deer licenses issued for the 2020 deer hunting season, 674 licenses (16%) were issued to residents that were 18 years of age or older.

Motioned by Whitmyre, second by Bies TO APPROVE THE CHANGES AS PROPOSED. Motion carried unanimously.

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the archery deer hunting season as follows:

1. Adjust license numbers from no more than 500 one-tag “any antlerless deer” to 1,000 one-tag

“any antlerless deer” for current and future archery deer municipality hunting units.

2. Adjust number of access permits from no more than 5 “any deer” and 30 “antlerless whitetail deer” to 10 “any deer” and 50 “antlerless whitetail deer” for Adams Homestead and Nature Preserve.

3. Adjust number of access permits from no more than 5 “any deer” and zero “antlerless whitetail deer” to 10 “any deer” and 25 “antlerless whitetail deer” for Goode Earth State Park.

Motioned by Bies, second by Whitmyre TO APPROVE THE CHANGES AS PROPOSED. Motion carried unanimously.

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the Black Hills deer hunting season to adjust the number of resident licenses from no more than 4,800 one-tag deer licenses to no more than 5,500 one-tag deer licenses.

Motioned by Locken, second by Whitmyre TO APPROVE THE CHANGES AS PROPOSED. Motion carried unanimously.

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the Custer State Park deer hunting season to Adjust the number of resident licenses from no more than 88 one-tag deer licenses to no more than 100 one-tag deer licenses.

Motioned by Bies, second by Locken TO APPROVE THE CHANGES AS PROPOSED. Motion carried unanimously.

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the muzzleloading deer hunting season to adjust resident license numbers from no more than 1,000 one-tag “any deer” licenses to 1,500 one-tag “any deer” deer licenses.

Motioned by Bies, second by Whitmyre TO APPROVE THE CHANGES AS PROPOSED. Motion carried unanimously.

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the national wildlife refuge deer hunting season as follows:

1. For Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge, adjust resident license numbers from no more than 105 one-tag deer licenses to 200 one-tag and 100 two-tag deer licenses.
2. For Lacreek National Wildlife Refuge, adjust resident license numbers from no more than 20 one-tag deer licenses to 100 one-tag and 50 two-tag deer licenses.
3. For Waubay National Wildlife Refuge, adjust resident license numbers from no more than 20 one-tag deer licenses to 75 one-tag deer licenses.

Motioned by Whitmyre, second by Locken TO APPROVE THE CHANGES AS PROPOSED. Motion carried unanimously.

Switzer presented the recommended change to the West River deer hunting season to adjust resident license numbers from no more than 12,308 one-tag, 5,220 two-tag deer licenses and 400 three-tag deer licenses to 20,000 one-tag, 15,000 two-tag deer licenses and 10,000 three-tag deer licenses.

Motioned by Locken, second by Bies TO APPROVE THE CHANGES AS PROPOSED. Motion carried unanimously.

Switzer presented the recommended change to the East River deer hunting season to adjust resident license numbers from no more than 24,510 one-tag and 2,800 two-tag tag deer licenses to 30,000 one-tag and 15,000 two-tag and 5,000 three-tag deer licenses.

Motioned by Whitmyre, second by Locken TO APPROVE THE CHANGES AS PROPOSED. Motion carried unanimously.

Upland Game

Switzer presented no recommended changes to the youth pheasant hunting season

Switzer presented no recommended changes to the resident pheasant hunting season

Switzer presented recommended changes to the pheasant hunting season to

1. Modify the season dates for Unit 2 (Renzienhausen Game Production Area, Renzienhausen State Game Bird Refuge including its shooting and retrieval zones, Gerken State Game Bird Refuge, and White Lake State Game Bird Refuge).
 - a. The season in Unit 2 is open beginning on December 1 and remains open for the remainder of the season ~~through the first Sunday of January~~; and
2. Modify the season dates for Unit 3 (Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge in Brown County).
 - a. The season in Unit 3 is open beginning on the second Monday of December and remains open for the remainder of the season ~~through the first Sunday of January~~.

Motioned by Whitmyre, second by Bies TO APPROVE THE CHANGES AS PROPOSED. Motion carried unanimously.

Switzer presented the recommended change to the grouse hunting season to modify the season start date from the third Saturday of October to the third Saturday of September for Lacreek National Wildlife Refuge and modify the season end date from the first Sunday of January to January 31.

Motioned by Bies, second by Locken TO APPROVE THE CHANGES AS PROPOSED. Motion carried unanimously.

Switzer presented no recommended changes to the quail hunting season

Switzer presented no recommended changes to the mourning dove hunting season

Switzer presented no recommended changes to the partridge hunting season

Switzer presented no recommended changes to the crow hunting season

Switzer presented no recommended changes to the cottontail hunting season

Switzer presented no recommended changes to the tree squirrel hunting season

Depredation Hunts

Kanta presented no recommendation to depredation permits but asked for the to grant the department authority to issue a specific number of depredations permits to respond to property damage by game animals that cannot be resolved by any other method.

Motioned by Whitmyre, second by Bies TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 21-04 (Appendix A) granting the department authority to issue depredation hunts for the next three years. Motion carried unanimously.

CWD Regulations

Kanta provided the recommended changes to the disposal of carcass remains for deer and elk as it pertains to chronic wasting disease.

CURRENT RULE 41:06:03:15. Chronic Wasting Disease endemic area defined. For purposes of §§ 41:06:03:16 through 41:06:03:19 and § 41:09:11:07 an endemic area is defined as any firearm deer or elk hunting unit in which any portion of a county confirms the presence of chronic wasting disease. In addition, any deer harvested during the archery, muzzleloader, and apprentice deer seasons and any elk harvested from Unit PRE-WRA within a county where chronic wasting disease has been confirmed would be subject to §§ 41:06:03:16 through 41:06:03:19 and § 41:09:11:07.

RECOMMENDED RULE Repeal existing rule.

CURRENT RULE 41:06:03:16. Interstate cervid carcass transportation restriction. Whole or partial cervid carcasses and head with antlers attached may not enter this state unless delivered to a licensed taxidermist, a game processor, or to the hunter's domicile. Cervid carcasses passing through the state are exempt from this section. The provisions of this section are effective July 1, 2020.

RECOMMENDED RULE 41:06:03:16. Interstate cervid carcass transportation and disposal requirement. Unless delivered to a licensed taxidermist or game processor, anyone transporting whole or partial cervid carcasses from another state into South Dakota shall dispose of all remaining cervid carcass parts with a waste management provider or a permitted landfill. Whole or partial cervid carcasses being transported through the state are exempt from this section.

CURRENT RULE 41:06:03:17. Intrastate cervid carcass transportation restriction. Whole or partial cervid carcasses and head with antlers attached may not be transported from an endemic area unless delivered to a licensed taxidermist, a game processor, or to the hunter's domicile. The provisions of this section are effective July 1, 2020.

RECOMMENDED RULE Repeal existing rule.

CURRENT RULE 41:06:03:18. Carcass disposal for hunter-harvested cervid. A person who transports cervid carcass parts from outside this state shall dispose of all remaining cervid carcass parts through a waste management provider or a permitted landfill. A person who transports cervid carcass parts from an endemic area in this state shall dispose of all remaining cervid carcass parts through a waste management provider or a permitted landfill. Cervid carcasses taken from an endemic area in this state that test negative for the disease are exempt from this section. The provisions of this section are effective July 1, 2020.

RECOMMENDED RULE 41:06:03:18. Intrastate cervid carcass transportation and disposal requirement. Unless delivered to a licensed taxidermist or game processor, anyone transporting

whole or partial cervid carcasses from the county of harvest shall dispose of all remaining cervid carcass parts with a waste management provider or a permitted landfill.

CURRENT RULE 41:06:03:19. Carcass disposal for wildlife processing facilities. Wildlife processing facilities, as defined by § 41:06:03:10, shall dispose of all remaining cervid carcass parts obtained from outside this state through a waste management provider or a permitted landfill. Wildlife processing facilities shall dispose of remaining cervid carcass parts obtained from an endemic area within this state through a waste management provider or a permitted landfill. Game processors licensed by another state or federal entity shall dispose of carcasses as required by the conditions associated with the license. The provisions of this section are effective July 1, 2020.

RECOMMENDED RULE 41:06:03:19. Carcass disposal for wildlife processing facilities. Wildlife processing facilities, as defined by § 41:06:03:10, shall dispose of all remaining cervid carcass parts with a waste management provider or permitted landfill. Game processors licensed by another state or federal entity shall dispose of carcasses as required by the conditions associated with their license.

CURRENT RULE 41:09:11:07. Cervid carcass disposal. A taxidermist shall dispose of remaining cervid carcass parts obtained from another state into South Dakota through a waste management provider or a permitted landfill. A taxidermist shall dispose of remaining cervid carcass parts obtained from a known chronic wasting disease endemic area within this state through a waste management provider or permitted landfill. The provisions of this section are effective July 1, 2020.

RECOMMENDED RULE 41:09:11:07. Cervid carcass disposal for taxidermist. A taxidermist shall dispose of all remaining cervid carcass parts with a waste management provider or permitted landfill.

Motioned by Whitmyre, second by Locken TO APPROVE THE CHANGES AS RECOMMENDED. Motion carried unanimously.

DIVISION OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Bridge City Lease Extension

Scott Simpson, parks and recreation division director, presented an amendment to extend the Bridge City lease for an additional 5 years.

Motioned by Whitmyre, second by Bies TO APPROVE THE BRIDGE CITY LEASE EXTENSION. Motion carried unanimously.

Lake Hiddenwood Access Road

Adam Kulesa, planning and development administrator, provided information to the commission included a background of the recreation area, explanation of the earthen dam/spillway breach that happened in 2018, and details about the latest proposal to restore access to the recreational area. The new proposed access road will come from the west and tie into the existing road infrastructure to access the park. Coordination with the local non-profit group is ongoing to see this project through completion. The department has committed to \$50,000 towards completion and the remaining will be come from local fundraising, volunteer labor, equipment, and donated materials.

Spring Creek Renovations

Brandon Brake, park manager, explained the Spring Creek Recreation Area is in the process of remodeling cabin 10, part of the restaurant kitchen and the C store. Cabin 10 has been placed on new concrete pillars to level it. The kitchen has a new wall behind the dishwasher with washable backsplash. The c store has new floor and has been partially shipped lapped with cedar planks from the old C dock. Our team has been very successful, and we are proud of our craftsmanship.

Swan Creek Indoor Fish Cleaning Station

Ryan Persoon, District Park Supervisor, presented information on the partnership between GFP and the SD Walleye Classic Inc. at Swan Creek Recreation Area. This partnership resulted in the construction of an indoor facility to provide sportsmen and women a heated and cooled place to clean their catch at all times of the year. This indoor fish cleaning facility enhances year-round recreational opportunities at Swan Creek Recreation Area and is a large economic benefit for the local community by drawing fishermen who take advantage of such a state-of-the-art facility.

Regional Technical Education Center Training

Lewis & Clark Recreation Area District Park Supervisor Shane Bertsch gave a presentation on an investment that was made in park staff. Park Maintenance Technical Training was held January 25 – 29, 2021 and February 8-12 at the Regional Technical Education Center in Yankton for 20 recently hired park maintenance and park managers from state parks and recreation areas across the state. Participants plan to pass on the training to other permanent and seasonal staff they work with in their parks. The cost per student for the 2 weeks of training was \$1,650.

DIVISION OF WILDLIFE

Nest Predator Bounty program

Keith Fisk presented the recommendation to extend the nest predator bounty program for 2021 and 2022. He explained the primary goal of the program is to enhance nest success for pheasants and ducks at localized levels by removing primary nest predators, like raccoons, striped skunks, opossums, red fox and badgers from the landscape. It is designed to increase youth and family participation in understanding and experiencing the tradition of trapping while enhancing our strong outdoor heritage.

Whitmyre noted it used to be 16 and under to trap without a license and new legislation makes it 18 and under. Pushed hard to begin trapping in March, could we make March a youth component for 2022 since we cannot in 2021.

Fisk explained the program requires a license to participate and if you begin the program April 1 it aligns with statutory requirements and for 2022 we would be able to allow the early start in March for youth as they will not require a license.

Whitmyre said while he would like to see the program start early, he does not want people to think they do not need a furbearer license to participate.

Fisk followed up noting the program will run from April 1-July 1, 2020 (unless \$500,000 cap is met) and March 1 -April 1 (for youth under 18 years of age) and then April 1-July 1 for all other participants (unless \$500,000 cap is reached).

Motioned by Whitmyre, second by Bies TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 21-06 (APPENDIX C) IMPLEMENTING THE NEST PREDATOR BOUNTY PROGRAM FOR 2021 AND 2022. Motion carried unanimously.

Wildlife Damage Management Strategic Plan

Kanta provided the Commission the wildlife damage management strategic plan for their approval.

Motioned by Whitmyre, second by Bies TO APPROVE THE WDM STRATEGIC PLAN. Motion carried unanimously.

Wild Turkey Management Plan

Chad Lehman presented the wild turkey management plan for the Commission's approval.

Motioned by Bies, second by Whitmyre TO APPROVE THE WILD TURKEY MANAGEMENT PLAN. Motion carried unanimously.

Land Donation – Pennington County

Paul Coughlin presented information regarding a land donation from Pennington County of the Wicksville Dam area. GFP has been managing Wicksville Dam as a GPA, but the County desires to transfer title to GFP. Resolution 21-05 in support of accepting the property was presented and adopted unanimously by the GFP Commission.

Motion by Bies, second by Spring TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 21-05 (APPENDIX B) AUTHORIZING THE TRANSFER OF THE WICKSVILLE DAM GAME PRODUCTION AREA TO GFP FROM PENNINGTON COUNTY. Motion carried unanimously.

Canada Goose Management Plan

Rocco Murano, senior wildlife biologist, presented a detailed PowerPoint on the Canada Goose Management plan.

Motioned by Whitmyre, second by Locken TO APPROVE THE CANADA GOOSE MANAGEMENT PLAN. Motion carried unanimously.

Preserve Update

Mark Ohm, Regional Supervisor, provided a brief update on private shooting preserve participation numbers. Records from the 2019-2020 season were analyzed. Almost 45,000 lines of records were entered and compared with the license database. These records indicated that 20,679 individuals hunted on preserves during this season which included 16,787 non-resident hunters, 3,561 resident hunters, and 331 that were not found in the license database. An electronic record database is being developed for

preserve operators to use that will be more efficient and more accurate than current record keeping/reporting processes.

Habitat and Access Update

Coughlin presented an update regarding Wildlife Division efforts to develop a Habitat and Access Plan. Priorities are to thoroughly examine aspects of the Private Lands Habitat Program, the Hunting and Fishing Access programs, and the public land management programs, and developing recommendations to reprioritize resources towards aquatic and terrestrial habitat and access efforts. A plan is scheduled to be available for implementation by July. Coughlin then presented information about 2020 Habitat Stamp projects completed on GPAs, and a rundown of projects slated for completion in 2021.

Jason Jungwirth, senior fisheries biologist, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding Aquatic habitat stamp funds which will be spent on three types of projects: 1) Large scale lake restorations, 2) Small scale habitat and access projects, and 3) Dam maintenance projects. A number of aquatic habitat stamp projects have already been completed including Long Lake boat ramp updates, Murdo Dam spillway repair and Belvidere Lake spillway repair. Partnerships have been and will continue to be critical in maximizing the amount of projects that are accomplished.

Lake Alvin and Fairfax Dam Updates

Jason Jungwirth, senior fisheries biologist, presented information on two projects that have directly benefited from habitat stamp funds are the Fairfax Dam repairs and the Lake Alvin major restoration effort. Issues that were addressed in the Fairfax Dam repairs were filling a large void under the spillway, seepage under the spillway, concrete deterioration, leveling the embankment, grading and armoring the approach channel and updating the rip rap. Making this a joint, well rounded project, all the trails were updated with a new gravel base and the terrestrial staff is in the process of a new shrub planting on the Game Production Area. The Lake Alvin major restoration project is an update on the progress that has been made since the idea was presented to the Commission about a year ago. A GFP regional work group has been formed to work toward the restoration effort. A couple meetings have taken place to better define the issues and start working on developing the desired outcomes. Plans are to continue with internal meeting, start reaching out to potential stakeholders/partners and to start the process of hiring a professional engineering firm that specializes in this type of work.

Lake Francis Case and Lewis & Clark Fisheries Updates

Chris Longhenry, fisheries biologist presented an update on the fisheries at Lake Francis Case and Lewis and Clark.

License Sales Update

Heather Villa, administrations chief, provided an update on resident and nonresident license sales.

Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Kevin Robling', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Kevin Robling, Interim Department Secretary

Appendix A
RESOLUTION 21-04
BIG GAME DEPREDAATION HUNTS

WHEREAS, pursuant to SDCL 41-6-29.1, the Game, Fish and Parks Commission may authorize the Secretary of the Department of Game, Fish and Parks to issue a specific number of depredation permits to respond to property damage by game animals that cannot be resolved by any other method, and the Commission has promulgated rules to provide for big game depredation hunts designed to assist in reducing wildlife damage to property by big game species (deer, elk, antelope, and turkey); and

WHEREAS, applications for depredation permits have been received and a random drawing held to establish the lists of depredation pool hunters for each county or area; and

WHEREAS, it is anticipated that high populations of big game animals may cause property damage which in some instances cannot be resolved by any other method except by reducing the number of animals in a specific geographic area;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that for the next three years (2021, 2022 and 2023) the Game, Fish and Parks Commission authorizes the Secretary of the Department of Game, Fish and Parks or his designee to issue no more than 600 permits plus an additional 200 landowner/operator permits) for each species (deer, antelope and turkey) per year and no more than 100 elk depredation permits per year, as the Secretary may deem necessary to respond to property damage caused by big game animals.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in issuing all big game depredation permits, the Secretary of the Department of Game, Fish and Parks or his designee is authorized to establish when and where each permit is valid and the number, species, and sex of the big game animals permitted to be taken by the holder of each big game depredation permit.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, this resolution shall replace in its entirety Resolution No. 16-13 previously adopted by this Commission to authorize the Secretary to issue depredation permits to respond to property damage caused by big game animals.

Appendix B
RESOLUTION 21-05

WHEREAS, the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks (GFP) has expressed an interest in acquiring real property (Property) presently owned by Pennington County, which Property is described as:

The NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 32 in Township 2 North, Range 13 East of the BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota, containing 40 acres, more or less; and

WHEREAS, Pennington County, acting through its elected Board of County Commissioners, desires to gift and transfer title to the Property to GFP for use as a Game Production Area, conditional on its continued use for wildlife habitat, public hunting and fishing access, and other wildlife related outdoor activities; and

WHEREAS, the Department has for the previous 50 years managed the Property as the Wicksville Dam Game Production Area under a long-term Management Agreement with Pennington County, acting through its elected Board of County Commissioners; and

WHEREAS, the Department has evaluated and determined the Property continues to serve very well as a Game Production Area, offering wildlife habitat, public hunting and fishing access, and other wildlife related outdoor recreational opportunities; and

WHEREAS, the Department is authorized to accept gifts of property for Game Production Areas per SDCL 41-2-19, and desires to accept the gift of the Property upon confirmation of the gift by the Game, Fish and Parks Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Game, Fish and Parks Commission desires to acknowledge the Department's acceptance of this gift of the Property for continued use as a Game Production Area from Pennington County, acting through its elected Board of County Commissioners, and further acknowledge the extreme generosity and vision of the Pennington County Commission in taking such action to ensure outdoor recreation opportunities are available to all South Dakotans and visitors.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Game, Fish and Parks Commission does hereby confirm the decision by the Department to accept the transfer and gift of the Property from Pennington County, acting through its elected Board of County Commissioners, conditional on its continued use as a Game Production Area offering wildlife habitat, public hunting and fishing access, and other wildlife related outdoor recreational opportunities.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Game, Fish and Parks Commission, on behalf of the citizens and sportspersons of South Dakota, does hereby acknowledge and express its deepest appreciation and gratitude to Pennington County, acting through its elected Board of County Commissioners for their generosity, and further acknowledge the outdoor recreation opportunities this gift will provide to South Dakotans and visitors for many years to come.

Appendix C
RESOLUTION 21-06

WHEREAS, pursuant to SDCL 40-36-9, SDCL 41-2-16, and SDCL 41-2-34, the Department of Game, Fish and Parks may conduct programs to control wild animals. The removal of nest predators from the landscape can enhance the nest success of pheasants, ducks and other ground nesting birds in South Dakota. Furthermore, such programs have proven to expose people to the trapping tradition and the outdoors; and

WHEREAS, Predator removal efforts on properties with habitat to increase nest success of pheasants and ducks has been used as a management technique in South Dakota for decades; and

WHEREAS, intensive predator removal efforts can enhance nest success of pheasants and ducks at localized levels when implemented at high intensities during the nesting season; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Game, Fish and Parks has previously operated this program and paid all expenditures for this program from the fund established in SDCL 41-2-34 (license dollars) and plans to utilize these funds for 2021 and 2022.

Now, therefore be IT resolved, that the Game, Fish and Parks Commission recognizes the Department of Game, Fish and Parks' desire to conduct the Nest Predator Bounty Program for 2021 and 2022 and proposes the following: 1) an expenditure of ten dollars per tail not to exceed \$500,000 for the bounty of nest predators each year, 2) participation is limited to South Dakota residents, 3) participants under the age of 16 and landowners harvesting nest predators from their own land are not required to have a license. All other participants must have a hunting, fishing, or trapping license, 4) during the 2022 program, from March 1 to April 1, only youth under the age of 18 will be eligible to participate and no license is required, 5) beginning April 1, 2022 all other ages may begin to participate but must have a hunting, fishing or trapping license for 2022 (except participants under the age of 18 and landowners harvesting nest predators from their own land) .

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Nest Predator Bounty Program shall be operated from April 1 to July 1, 2021 and March 1 to July 1, 2022, to coincide with spring activity/movements of nest predators and the primary nesting season of pheasants, ducks, and other ground nesting birds. The method of take includes the shooting and trapping of nest predators in South Dakota. Some of these goals include but are not limited to: removal of 50,000 nest predators, expand the ETHICS SD program by 20%, and have 20% of bounty participants under the age of 18.

Public Hearing Minutes of the Game, Fish and Parks Commission
March 4, 2021

The Commission Vice chair Doug Sharp began the public hearing at 2:00 p.m. CT via conference call. Commissioners Travis Bies, Jon Locken, Russell Olson, Charles Spring, and Robert Whitmyre were present. Kotilnek indicated written comments were provided to the Commissioners prior to this time and will be reflected in the Public Hearing Minutes. Kotilnek then invited the public to come forward with oral testimony. Written comments attached.

Aerial Permit Adjustments

No verbal comments

Big Game Ammo Minimum Size and Type

Jeremy Silko – Rapid City, SD agrees with the verbiage to note it as expanding ammo.

Nonmeandered Waters Transportation Lane Process

Nancy Hilding, Prairie Hills Audubon Society – Black Hawk, SD raised a point of order that this may not be a legal meeting if Governor Noem appointed commissioners and they are not present. Voiced concerns about the process for NM transportation lanes. As for the most direct path language she feels it should be modified to sure it is safely navigable to ensure it is safely

Waterfowl Refuge

No verbal comments

Waterfowl Season Recommendations

No verbal comments

Public Lands and Waters

No verbal comments

The public Hearing concluded at 2:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Kevin Robling, Interim Department Secretary

Public Comments

Big Game Ammo Minimum Size and Type

Brett Donley

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Crossbows should be allowed to be used by everyone not just disabled persons.

Lacie Smith

Manhattan SD

Position: support

Comment:

I'm Lacie Smith—writer, artist and inspirationalist. My words have touched millions over the past two decades through my children's books and gift products.

Basically I put love into words and help you connect with the people + moments that matter.

Nest Predator Bounty Program

Steven Nash

Prairie City SD

Position: other

Comment:

Being a producer and a landowner I am in favor of the nest predator program. I do want to offer a couple suggestions for the implementation.

First being the March 15-July 1 season.

In regards to the nesting period of pheasants why not continue the program until August first. Any producer could tell you hens are still setting. If not then why hold off on haying CRP acres until August 1? Lengthening the season would show more transparency between programs.

Second being the animals targeted.

Is there a specific reason coyotes are not part of the bounty? If the 75% of all nests disturbed number is accurate. I don't believe that number is attainable without coyotes. Here on the plains of northwest South Dakota, the coyote is the lead predator. I have many other comments about the coyote, but I will keep this specific to nest predators. None of the pelts are worth anything to the fur market, so if nothing else I would appreciate a few good reasons as to why they are not part of the nest bounty.

Thank you for your consideration.

Robert Whipple

Wilmot, Sd SD

Position: support

Comment:

My son and I have participated the last two years in the program. The first year we trapped 50 raccoons, last year we got 30. Our ranch is located in a mostly range area with some crops. Our pheasant numbers have never been very good. During the last two years, our pheasant numbers have been increasing. I contribute that mostly to our trapping efforts. Also it has gotten my son involved in trapping. Please continue the program. I believe it its worth! Thanks

Scott Christopherson

Volga SD

Position: support

Comment:

Awesome! This is an awesome program. I participate in the program but do not claim payments. This program is keeping nest predators at bay. It would be hard to imagine how many predators would be on the landscape without this program. Albeit, it would be great to include coyotes in the program and remove badgers. Increasing the payment back to \$10 will keep the interest with people that are going out after nest predators. Thank you GF&P and commission.

Jacob Geis

Parkston SD

Position: support

Comment:

I appreciate the changes proposed for the program this year. \$10 per tail and starting in mid-March are both great ways to get folks interested.

James Horning

Watertown SD

Position: support

Comment:

I fully support the Nest Predator Bounty Program. However, raccoons mate from Jan-Jun and moreso in Feb so we should be trapping them now.

Maia Moore

Brookings SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Betty A Deberg

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The most effective way to increase pheasant population is by increasing/improving habitat. Please dump the cruel, anti-wildlife bounty program in favor of better incentives for landowners to plant buffer strips along waterways. More pheasants and a cleaner Big Sioux! THAT'S good public policy.

Dianne Schnabel

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Heidi Madsen

Carpenter SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program is inhumane and adds suffering to animals. Also, pets can get stuck in traps and die from the traps not being checked daily. No evidence has been shown that this program has increased pheasant population.

Renee Lefthand

Freeman SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

All this does promote cruelty

Teresa Hicks

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a terrible waste of money and animals lives. It does not work! Put money towards habitat for pheasants not killing animals.

Eva Scott

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Cruel, inhumane and unnecessary! This whole program is a total waste! Get rid of it.

Lynda Powell

Garretson SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Linda Greene

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Cruel and not necessary

Sharee Heier

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Susan Schlichenmayer

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Rhonda Doyscher

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jon Sorensen

Monroe SD

Position: support

Comment:

One thing i wish was that a trapping license be required to do this program for those that need one. (age) i feel it would slow down the people cutting tails off on the highway so much. Since it was announced that we will have the program in 2021 i have already seen many animals with tails cut off along side the road. It would also get more income back into the state for license fees.

Michael Stark

Mitchell SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Unnecessary program

Shannon Steckelberg

Harrisburg SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Traps are cruel. They may not only harm the animal you intend to trap, but others or people as well. It was not hugely successful last year and did not save pheasants. If we do not have enough predators we end up with more of their prey, which can cause problems to farmers and homeowners.

Steven Rindsig

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I have been a hunter and trapper for more than 50 years and I am a supporter of the GFP and, almost without exception, its policies and programs. I am not, however, in favor of killing wildlife for the sole purpose of preventing it from living and eating other wildlife. Either the pelt or the meat (or both) must be used out of respect for the animal and to not give those opposed to hunting/trapping in general additional fuel for their fire. The program's stated goal to increase nesting success is valid, but I believe the same results could be achieved by focusing instead on improving nesting habitat. Alternatively, pay a bounty to hunters and trappers for full pelts which they either can sell themselves or donate to a charity. GFP even could enlist experienced hunters/trappers to show young hunters/trappers how to properly skin, flesh, and stretch pelts and market them. This is particularly important now when pelts prices are low. Thank you.

Don Andersen

Hill City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I feel it is inhumane, trapping without an ID on a trap leads to a trapper (experienced or a "hobbiest) being a bit lax on checking their traps. (all they need is a tail)

Douglas Block

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

For 53 years of my life I have been a resident of SD. Grew up on dairy farm, have a BS in Agriculture and own a couple agricultural properties in the state including our four generation family farm. I have a strong interest educating and conserving our natural resources and perhaps most importantly married to another SD resource proponent and together attempting to guide our three children into adulthood with a responsibility for conservation. That background is necessary to provide perspective on why I strongly oppose the "Nest Predator Bounty Program". At best this program is misdirected if not outright deceptive. Even the title is strategic to demonize these ecologically critical natural mammals. The science certainly does not support that reducing these select mammals will have any significant effect on nesting success overall. It is clear that this effort is merely a guise to provide attention that the state is doing something tangible to enhance the economics and optics of pheasant hunting and ever dwindling next generation participation in GF&P relevance and licensing funds. It is boasted that the funding for the bounty comes exclusively from mandatory "habitat" licensing fees. Did it ever occur to the Commission that it is exactly these ever increasing fees that discourage the very next generation you are attempting to court into GF&P regulated activities? It is disingenuous to rationalize increased engagement because of the "bounty" financial incentive. If one has to subsidize such engagement, just to get them to engage, then consider their true interest/commitment to the activity. I cringe when I hear GF&P personnel on the radio touting how these new habitat fees are merely, "one time fee". Under that logic, all reoccurring licenses, fees, taxes etc etc. are "one time fees". In my family, we pay hundreds of dollars each year and my college age children are suggesting it is just not worth it anymore to keep paying such fees to perhaps fish out of our canoes once or twice a year. Yes, another example, our four canoes have never seen a boat ramp or any other GF&P improvement, polluted any waters, yet annually taxed to pay for "economic generating" GF&P "improvements". My point is the bounty does not improve nesting success, is paid for, and hence discourages the very participants you are purporting to attract, the "nest predators" targeted are clearly an ecological critical component to healthy ecosystem. This is all much to do about non-native pheasants, not even that it improves those nesting successes, rather that it provides good optics for economic marketing and justifies ever increasing GF&P fees. There is indeed a serious shift in SD outdoor "traditions" but healthy, diverse habitat and education is the cornerstone. Consider that perhaps it is the policies of the various "governing" agencies that is actually distancing the people ever further from knowledge or interest in the natural resources. Please do not blame and disparage the fox for doing what it does natural. The natural ecosystem lived in harmony long before humans "improved" it.

Thanks for considering my perspective.

Paula Edwards

Hot Springs SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please don't renew this program.

Catherine Foos

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Elizabeth Adamson

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I see this as a reason for all the SouthDakotans with guns to go out and shoot em up.
Send them to the mall to the shooting gallery.

Ferne Odegaard

Keystone SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Lusa Quellar

Hermosa SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am rural resident that has to deal with alot of dying babies I have been here for 11yrs and never have I ever had so much wildlife looking for help than I did last year . This program needs to stop there are other ways to keep wildlife in check that to do this inhumane way I

Antonio Felix

Hermosa SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Ridiculous way to be rid of wildlife

Kristi Petersen

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

These are species important to our local ecosystem. The eliminate pests, pocket gophers, gophers, snakes, insects, rats and mice, and the list goes on. More nests are damaged by farm cats and dogs than by these native species.

Kathy Flanagan

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Amy Poole

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

To kill fur bearing animals in the spring and summer wrong.
Their fur is no good, and they are raising their young.

James Leflore

Belle Fourche SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Charlotte Johnson

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Penny Kemmer

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I OPPOSE!!-I feel this is very inhumane to stalk a nest or den site to kill the mother and all the young.

Pamela Dereu

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Suzann Stoner Wyngaarden

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jennifer Mccambridge

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Savannah Johns

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Do not approve this barbaric and cruel program. We need to protect our wildlife.

Jake Waldner

Salem SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Adair Fisher

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is incredibly inhuman and disappointing. I would think we are more civilized than this.

Matthew Konrad

Watertown SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

There is no evidence to support the efficacy of this program. Nuisance animals don't deserve cruelty.

Johannas Stahl

Wessington Springs SD

Position: support

Comment:

I think this program is great for getting the younger generation interested in the outdoors. And basically all the other reasons our awesome governor started it for.

Nonmeandered Waters Navigation Lane Process

Sandy Antijunt

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am totally against this program! It is inhumane and anyone with feelings for animals would never approve of the conditions that these poor creatures have to endure. Please stop this program.

Reuben Parks

Webster SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

My name is Reuben Parks.

I oppose the non-meandered proposal.

My feelings would be that a property owner needs to be informed and needs to be allowed the time to litigate and prepare for rebuttal before any action would be taken.

The standards for approval of a lane of ingress and egress need to be set " high" to protect property rights and to avoid abuse of a new rule.

Only after taking into account all of the impact to the existing property, should such a ruling be made.

We all know that it takes very little disturbance to effect things on a property.

Property owners need to have input in establishing the criteria in this proposal.

I would suggest the following:

1. the existing conditions and recreational opportunities that exist prior to a transport lane need to be maintained in a pre- corridor condition.
2. only after taking into consideration the impact on the existing conditions on the property, should a lane be established.
3. the effected landowner needs to be allowed an appropriate amount of time to prepare a rebuttal and defense , if said landowner wishes to challenge said petition before a petition is finalized by the commission.
4. the act of ingress and egress will not allow hunting, fishing, trapping, lingering in the corridor, nor shall it cause an undue disturbance to the property or the wildlife on the adjoining property.
5. any violation of these terms will be considered a violation punishable by fine, a loss of a person`s license , and a review of the ingress- egress permit.

Thank you and please consider these proposals to your action.

Reuben Parks

district 1 landowner

Other

Kevin Osborn

Rapid City SD

Position: support

Comment:

I understand you are going to set the August Canada season boundary which is west of the Cheyenne River. I would recommend you please extend it to include the entire county. Allowing the boundary of all of Pennington County would increase the land mass to hunt geese, help control the goose population and increase hunting numbers for waterfowl which are falling each yr.

Thanks for your consideration.

Anthony Filholm

Brookings SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Leave the preference system as it is. People are always trying to tweak it to move things in their favor.

Steven Nash

Prairie City SD

Position: other

Comment:

I would like to discuss the habitat stamp and its correlation to the food plot program. My family and I have voluntarily taken part of the food plots provided by the game and fish. While most of you know what the terms are I would like to give a background as to how I understand the program.

We provide up to 3– 10 acre plots on different quarters. We control the weeds and plant seed. We keep the cows out of the crop and ensure that the crop is left specifically for the wild life.

We are given the seed and compensated 20 per acre.

While I realize private rental rates in western South Dakota are less than eastern South Dakota, we still elected to do the program.

With the new habitat stamp in place I feel as though I am paying myself to plant food plots. Furthermore many of my family members buy a habitat stamp.

We are already giving up the production on those acres.

I purpose any producer who voluntarily participates in conservation or habitat programs in South Dakota should be exempt from the habitat stamp.

Brad Schriber

Sioux Falls SD

Position: other

Comment:

I'm not in favor with the 3 splash daily limit of ducks. This could well be 3 hen mallards or 3 hen pintails. This doesn't appear to address the problem of people to lazy or ignorant to study ducks and be able to identify their birds before shooting.

Rodney Worth

Shawnee KS

Position: other

Comment:

Hello. My name is Rod Worth. I live in Shawnee, Kansas but was raised in Keya Paha County Nebraska which is just south of Tripp and Todd county South Dakota. I own 950 acres in Tripp County South Dakota along the Keya Paha River. I pay over \$5000/yr in property taxes. My question is: Why is there not a landowner permit available for nonresident landowners? I currently have to pay \$286 just to get a bow permit and have to purchase many preference points just to have a chance at a rifle permit to hunt on my own land. I'm being treated the same as a typical nonresident hunter who does not own any land or pay taxes. Please create a nonresident landowner deer permit that gives out of state landowner/hunters like me to have a better chance at attaining a rifle permit and turkey permits at a reduced rate since we contribute large amounts of property tax revenue to your state. Please make this happen and respond to my email. kcrodworth@yahoo.com Thank you.

Dorn Barnes

Harrold SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

we have been hearing rumors' that GF&P is considering raising the Peasant bird limit to 4 birds a day. We are totally apposed to that. The bird numbers are getting better but as a hunter guide service I feel it would be bad for that would make for longer harder hunts. We only hunt wild birds and if the limit is 4 birds the hunters will not want to stop until they get there limit, and if they don't get there limit they will feel that it wasn't a good hunt. It's hard enough trying to get a three bird limit most of the time. What will happen is we will have to raise our prices so we can get the same income we do now because there are only so many birds out there. That will make it harder for hunters to find decent places to hunt, that will discourage hunters from coming to S. Dakota to hunt, and that will cut down on the licenses that you sell.

Waterfowl Refuge

Chuck Clayton

Huron SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

On the Antelope Lake Refuge change, If the boundaries are to be changed, the the restriction on boating after Oct. 1 on the Indian Springs portion of the water body should be removed. The private gun club that owns the north side of what is a refuge now, should not get to have parts of what used to be a refuge to hunt and keep the public off the rest of the water body for access to fishing and hunting. The hunting club on the north side has been working at this for years.

Waterfowl Season Recommendations

Tyler Steen

Pierre SD

Position: other

Comment:

I feel your recommendation on the "Splash Option" is a good concept but requiring hunters to make the decision on whether they are going to hunt Tier 1 or Tier 2 at the time they purchase their license is wrong. No one has the ability to know what the migration may look like in the fall and by forcing hunters to choose one option before the first shot is fired will cause hunters to not hunt at all. We in South Dakota have the benefit of having many species of waterfowl migrate through our state. Some days you may see 10 different species on a particular body of water, another day you may only see one. If there is an abundance of pintails on a pond, the hunter who choose Tier 2 would shoot three pintails be done for the day. Another hunter in the same group chose Tier 1 and was only able to shoot one duck that day because of his selection. The argument can be made that if the hunter who only shot one duck the first day limited with six ducks the next day and the "splash hunter" also limited their averages would be the same. Like in any situation, the more options you give individuals the more likely they are to select one that works for them. Allowing the hunter to opportunity to choose which option they are going to take each day they hunt will promote the program and achieve the intended goal.

Public Comments

Nest Predator Bounty Program

Peter Sonstegard

Sioux Falls SD

Position: support

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Paul Lepisto

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

On behalf of President Kelly Kistner, please see the attached comments from the South Dakota Division of the Izaak Walton League of America in opposition to the nest predator bounty proposal.

Shari Kosel

Lead SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Susan Braunstein

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I would like to state that I strongly oppose the continuation of the Nest Predator Bounty Program. The slaughter of our native animals to protect a bird that is really just being used to make money by bringing hunters to our state doesn't make sense. Can't the money budgeted for this killing spree be better used to create new habitat. Numerous wildlife biologists have researched bounty programs and discovered they are really not effective in increasing specific bird populations. When I was researching this program last year I asked Keith Fisk if there have been any studies on the populations of the targeted predators and said there have not been any such studies so we have no idea how many we have of any of the predators. We could potentially wipe out certain ones.

Please don't do this again. It just wrong on so many levels. Thank you for your time.

Angela Antijunti

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jeanie Dumire

Hot Springs SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This just makes no sense. These animals have a purpose and consume many of the insects and rodents that tend to become a problem. Maybe it's time to think about the humane thing and not the financial aspect of this.. killing these animals to make it easier for pheasants to flourish and the state to make money on hunters coming... seems so wrong.

Michele Lewon

Mccook Lake SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Deb Dickson

Piedmont SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Instead of killing animals to protect the pheasant population why not start pheasant production farms and then release the birds as adults for hunting. Guaranteed healthy bird populations . Win win

Mary Hertz

Menno SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

As a James River landowner with many acres committed to CRP and CREP I am in strong opposition to this program. If I find anyone trapping on my land I will seriously reconsider public access. It is cruel and unnecessary. There was no bird count done last year. You have no evidence or history that this expensive program works.

Jan Humphrey

Hill City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Adamantly OPPOSE this heinous practice. These are key species in the habitat. The practice is during birthing season so entire populations are wiped out. Children nor adults should not be out killing animals that are part of the environment and eco system. They were here first. This is all about money for that Governor who has a breeding pheasant farm. Shame on her and her cronies. If I find anyone out near my property trapping, shooting or trespassing in my neighborhood I will be sure to take extreme measures to prosecute them to the max of the law.

Amanda Johndon

Yankton SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

As a lifelong South Dakotan, I strongly oppose this program. It is not only ineffective and ridiculous but incredibly cruel. We cannot sit back and let this pass through once again. It's an embarrassment to our state. It is an excuse to kill for fun with zero accountability. People hunt and people trap but putting a program like this in place and encouraging it by paying for tails it is beyond unacceptable.

Amy Johnson

Yankton SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Wolfgang & Kathleen Schmidt

Nemo SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program has gone on now for two years using taxpayer funds and it should be stopped. These animals are part of our ecosystem and they all contribute in some way or another. The little opossum alone eats ticks and has provided an anti-venin for snake bites due to the fact it can withstand bites from rattlesnakes and coral snakes. Skunks and Raccoons eat a lot of insects. Killing red foxes when they eat voles and mice? We are overrun with voles where we live. It certainly makes sense to let the predators eat mice, rather than using poison to kill these rodents. Do you have any idea of the damage you are doing with killing all of these small "predators"? You are supposed to be in charge of all wildlife by caring and protecting them. The Nest Predator Bounty Program is inhumane and needs to be stopped. Maybe you should educate yourselves with what each of these animals' diet consist of and become more aware of what you are doing by killing all of them by the hundreds and probably thousands after approving this for another year in 2021. Please stop interfering with nature and have some compassion. This is an expensive and unnecessary program that was hatched up by Gov. Noem. If you can't say no, maybe it's time to let the people vote on it.

Jennifer Hubert

Vermillion SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This program is a waste of taxpayer funds and ineffective for its purpose. If you want more pheasants then work on saving their environment stopping farmers from constantly tearing out trees/bushes. Pheasants are an invasive species anyway.

Barbara St. Clair

Brookings SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please do not let this program continue. It is inhumane, it is not the correct approach to helping pheasants, and it should never be considered appropriate family outdoor time to kill helpless animals. This program has not been supported by those who study pheasant populations and it is an embarrassment for South Dakota.

Amy Deberg

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Bad program for South Dakota. We need the natural balance.

Cheyne Cumming

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I strongly oppose the murder of badgers, raccoons, opossums, foxes, and skunks. Teaching children to have no respect or compassion for wildlife is criminal. Paying them to torture small animals is truly sick. Is South Dakota really this mentally ill? Do not approve this disgusting practice!!!

Christy Kellen

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Mahala Bach

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

STOP ENCOURAGING CHILDREN TO KILL SMALL ANIMALS BY PAYING THEM. THIS PROGRAM DOES NOTHING BUT ENCOURAGE CHILDREN TO HAVE NO RESPECT OR COMPASSION FOR WILDLIFE. SOUTH DAKOTA NEEDS TO LEAVE THIS 1800's MENTALITY BEHIND. STOP THIS PROGRAM NOW!

Katie Campbell

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Michael Stark

Mitchell SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Emily Dunn

Mitchell SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Renee Lefthand

Freeman SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Wrongcan hurt pets and childrenalso its 2021 not necessary to cruel period

Wendy Cota

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Tania Taylor

Mitchell SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is an inhumane and cruel practice. I do not support this as a tax payer. We have got to be better than this.

Kim Tysdal

Rapid E SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Nest predator is nothing but a way to destroy predators, which are essential to controlling the ecosystem of the land.

Brittany Kimball

Brandon SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Janet Berman-Lalley

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

PLEASE don't allow this!!!!!!!!!!

Jana Haecherl

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Estelle Johnson

Yankton SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is flagrant abuse against animals!! I oppose it and it should never be a program of which individuals or kids should be a part of it!!!!

Rich Blechinger

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Raise birds quit messing with the ecosystem.

Cindy Rains

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

So very cruel and heartless, for nothing except Kristis family business(does not help pheasant population) All life is sacred and senseless killing will come back to you. PLEASE, STOP the senseless killing and torture of innocent animals!!!

Karen Gerety

Vermillion SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please end this cruel program. It's horrid waste of money.

Christina Long

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Samantha Priest

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Matthew Priest

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Cheryl Long

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Danielle Priest

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Amy Harmon

Mission SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Stacy Braun

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Maia Brusseau

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Elaine Hantke

Meckling SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Pheasants are not native to SD. Promotes animal cruelty. Damages ecosystems. How many more studies and proof do you need??????

Stephanie Farac

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is cruel and wrong

Adrienne Freyer

Hermosa SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a ridiculous & costly program. And, it inhumane! Other animals to include dogs & cats end up in these traps.

Jacqueline Hatzell

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Kathryn Hess

Nemo SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please stop this inhumane cruelty. You don't count the pheasant population, so how do you know if it helps. I import you, this doesn't help it only inhumanely kill animals that benefit the environment. Thank you,

Tim Hanson

Vermillion SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Come on. You can do better than this

Leah Kelly

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Chad Taecker

Brookings SD

Position: support

Comment:

I have noticed more pheasants these last few years. I think we still need to focus on creating more suitable habitat though. Thanks good job

Michelle Valadez

Apple Valley MN

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Lisa Rathbun

Volga SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Can we please NOT place the money/pheasant above our natural species. They are all part of our SD ecosystem, and it's horrific to try to eradicate them just for the sake of an introduced species and the sport of hunting them.

Maia Moore

Brookings SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Chris Krohmer

Mitchell SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is a horrible program. Please just stop it! Are we just going to continue to kill anything that touches a pheasant nest until we no longer have any of the animals that make South Dakota beautiful and unique? This has to stop. Please step up to the plate and make that happen.

Deborah Burnight

Yankton SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Kaitlyn Cloney

Custer SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Stricter laws and enforcement surrounding this program should be put into place before allowing any more culling of native species. The potential suffering of entrapped animals with no recourse to the hunter responsible needs to be addressed.

Kris Norlin

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The amount of money being requested for this horrendous program is outrageous. This program encourages senseless killing of our natural wildlife. There are so many other positive programs for youth that could be supported. Please reconsider and use funding other areas of outdoor engagement that do not kill our natural predators, inflict needless suffering and leaving young wildlife abandoned, as well as sending a message to kids that it is ok to kill for a tail.

Ima Citizen

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

For being so prolife, this state sure loves to kill things.

Jeanne Pawlowski

Sturgis SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Wendy Parent

Brandon SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Rebecca Porter-Watson

Sturgis SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I oppose this program due to the complete lack of evidence that it helps the pheasant population. The enhancement of habitat and the weather have much greater impact on the population. I realize the economic impact of pheasant hunting, however I do not condone the killing of native animals for supposed protection of a non-native species. The \$500,000/year would be better spent on habitat.

Mickie Hortness

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please end this inhumane and wasteful program. Aren't there more productive and positive ways to spend \$1,000,000 over the next two years? Why not try something like getting kids interested in bee keeping? I mean, after all, wasn't the goal of the Nest Predator Bounty program to get kids outside more? Some states have implemented bee keeping programs. Why not use the money as a fund for additional habitat restoration for pheasants? Even Noem admits that the key to increasing pheasant numbers is habitat. Hey, speaking of pheasant numbers, why not use the money to fund the Annual Pheasant Brood Survey that has gone by the wayside. I understand it costs about \$90,000 for that survey to be completed each year. Without the survey how is anyone going to know whether the pheasant numbers are increasing or not? It'll just be guesswork and the powers that be can spit out any number they want to the public. And meanwhile tens of thousands of our native mammals will be killed in a failed attempt to save a species that is not native. It's shameful. It's greed. All meant to attract those out of state hunters who come to South Dakota to hunt pheasants and spend their money. And our native mammals are paying the price for this human greed.

Paula Pillatzki

Labolt SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Jennifer Lofswold

Northville SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Unnecessary and cruel to animals

Donna Fisher

Deadwood SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I object to spending SD tax dollars on programs that are not cost effective. Larkin Powel, Professor of Animal Ecology and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, is only one many expert who testify that habitat management should be the primary tool to increase pheasant population. Well-designed habitat projects can reduce predation by up to 80 percent. Even professional methods are too expensive for use on a landscape basis and do not significantly increase the number of nesting birds over the long term. Random trapping by non-professionals, some of them children, is economically and scientifically ridiculous. Habitat management comes at a fraction of the cost of other predator reduction methods. When predators are stressed by irradiation methods like trapping, their reproduction rate goes up. Finally, predators take out mice, voles, prairie dogs—in the case of possums who tick gobbling machines we get cost-effective control of tick-borne illness. Conclusion: save my tax dollars and say no to Gov. Noem's silly and unscientific Nest Predator Control. Use these \$\$ on habitat and help South Dakota farmers and ranchers develop habitat in the process.

Teah Homsey-Pray

Deadwood SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please take another close look at this program. Look at what this program is doing environmentally as well as what it is teaching our youth. An archaic practice that has little to do with scientific data.

**Sandra Out Sebergerblack Hillls Nf
Seberger**

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

In the 2019 Pheasant report, I learned the total cost is \$1.7 million. I also learned the PPM [pheasant per mile] index of 2019 decreased 1 7%. Why are we, the people of South Dakota spending our valued tax dollars on failing performance that other states have already discovered?

Constance Kushman

Spearfish SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Concerned about over hunting species...

Nancy Hilding

Black Hawk, SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am opposed. Despite the 2019 expenditure of 1.7 million on the NPBP, "South Dakota Pheasant Brood Survey 2019 Report" showed that the statewide Pheasants Per Mile (PPM) index for the 2019 pheasant brood survey decreased 17% (2.47 to 2.04, 90% confidence interval = -32 to 0%) compared to 2018.

SD's 2019 Pheasant Brood report:

https://gfp.sd.gov/userdocs/docs/PBR_2019FINAL.pdf

For statements that predator control won't work well in large areas visit these links on predator control and pheasants/ducks:

I refer you to Pheasants Forever's web page on "Effects of Predators",

<https://www.pheasantsforever.org/Habitat/Pheasant-Facts/Effects-of-Predators.aspx>

& Ducks Unlimited's web page on "Ducks, Habitat Conservation & Predators":

[https://www.ducks.org/media/Conservation/Conservation_Documents/_documents/Ducks and Predators low res.pdf](https://www.ducks.org/media/Conservation/Conservation_Documents/_documents/Ducks%20and%20Predators%20low%20res.pdf)

Also see page 11 of SD GFP's Pheasant Management Plan, in the section on predators:

"Where predator control may be considered as a management option, managers should be aware that cost, logistics, and lack of effectiveness often limit success when compared to habitat management."

<https://gfp.sd.gov/UserDocs/nav/pheasant-mngmnt-planpdf.pdf>

Greater prairie chicken's IUCN Red List web page.

Please remember the exotic male pheasant fight over territory with and drive off the male Greater prairie chickens and female pheasants lay eggs in the chicken's nest, which hatch before the chickens, causing moms to abandon their own eggs:

<https://www.iucnredlist.org/species/22679514/92817099>

<https://www.iucnredlist.org/species/22679514/92817099> - assessment-information

Nancy Hilding

Black Hawk, SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

WHY?OPPOSE?

This killing of predators is not scientifically justified. ----

- Wildlife biologists agree that nest predator control is ineffective unless it is extremely intense and carried out annually.
- Effective nest predator control may require hundreds of dollars & man-hours per year & per section of land. The Governor's budget is not enough to cover the state.
- Even intense predator control has limitations. Those animals that escape capture or death often reproduce at a higher rate. This means more effort must be expended and more money must be appropriated each year.
- Nature does not exist in a vacuum. When one animal is removed, others move in, including other species that may be more effective predators.
- Nest predators also feed on rodents. Opossums also eat ticks. If these nest predators are successfully controlled, an explosion in rodents can be expected, with a huge and potentially devastating impact on farmers and ranchers. Rodents eat grain in the field, & infest grain bins, outbuildings and farmhouses. In SD rodents carry Hantavirus or fleas/ticks that can have bubonic plague, or Lyme disease. These costs must also be considered.
- Some nest predators are protected by state and federal laws. This would include ALL raptors. (Hawks, owls and eagles are examples.)
- The nest predator bounty may encourage illegal activity, from trespassing and unlawful night hunting to submitting tails collected out-of-state. NO funds have been allocated for the extra law enforcement.
- The nest predator program is fiscally irresponsible. The money is desperately needed on habitat programs that actually do provide a return on the investment.
- Habitat improvements can be cost shared at a rate of 50% to over 75% through a variety of programs. GF&P receives 75% cost share on habitat purchases and improvements through Pittman Robertson funds.
- Predation is much lower when sufficient habitat for nesting birds is provided.
- Successful nesting will not occur where there is not sufficient habitat, regardless if most predators are removed or not.
- Good habitat also provides high-protein food sources, clean water and protection from the elements, all in a suitable arrangement. Habitat for pheasants/ducks also benefits various other wildlife &?bird species.
- This is a statewide program, but areas with pheasant and duck populations are much more limited West River. Why pay bounties for West River predator tails?
- Much of SDGFP budget derives from sale of licenses and most hunters do not want GFP's limited budget spent on this program.
- GFP has spent 2 million in the last two years on this program and will spend a million more in the next two years, that money could be spent on more productive uses to benefit wildlife and GFP programs in SD.
- Pheasants are an exotic species that competes with a native species - the greater prairie chicken, whose range and population are declining -- losing half its' population every decade.
- Accidental take of threatened and endangered species may occur. The swift fox is state listed. The black-footed ferret is listed federally. There is a petition before the USFWS to list the plains spotted skunk and the prairie grey fox under the Endangered Species Act. The American Martin is a "sensitive species" for the Black Hills National Forest.
- This program will result in animal cruelty. Some trappers will be trapping with leg-hold traps or snares, or body crushing traps. Some will use live traps. People should realize that in SD the law allows for animals to be left in traps West River for three and a partial day and East River for two and a partial day. Trapping can be cruel. In high heat or bitter cold, an animal in a box can die in half a day. Animals in boxes or leg-hold traps can freak out and damage their bodies and/or teeth & thus not survive even if released. Dead animals or animals in boxes or traps can't feed their dependent young. Even via a "live trap" non-target species adults and their dependent young will die, in addition to target species.
- Part of the rational/spin for the program is to introduce children to nature & trapping. Why not introduce children to nature via non-lethal interactions with wildlife such as wildlife watching and spend money on nature guidebooks, binoculars, cameras & not via bounties & traps?
- Empathetic children may encounter moral dilemmas such as how to kill the 12 or 13 babies in an opossums pouch, and later learn that they did this killing of babies, based on lies told them by SD GFP about effects of a bounty program on nesting success. How does this engage children with nature or give them trust in government?
- A reduction in bounty amount by half price reduced the tail submission by half. The Commission is increasing the bounty to increase participation. This calls into question if this is about recreation or connecting families/children with nature, if the trappers/hunters have to be paid enough to make participation worth their while.

Mike Feimer

Yankton SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I strongly OPPOSE this program. South Dakotans do not want or need this program. Beyond being ineffective and wasteful it's completely cruel. Please do not reenact this horrible program.

Nancy Hilding

Black Hawk, SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

SURVEYS

The Humane Society of U.S. (HSUS) funded a public opinion survey on the Nest Predator Bounty Program (NPBP) of 1,000 random people that got much different responses, than SD GFP funded public opinion survey.? HSUS asked some of the same questions and some different questions than SDGFP. After a series of questions 26% approved of NPBP and 53% disapproved. Link to HSUS report:

<https://www.humanesociety.org/sites/default/files/docs/South-Dakota-General-Election-Survey.pdf?fbclid=IwAR0TzQSvscZeSc-C1dgSxBjt0sCzgSSX5jxks-wOtFMdjFHv4FgSQCvHKBI>

Link to the SDGFP's public opinion survey of 400 random people - GFP funded both a NPBP participants and a public opinion survey (found in the second half of report). Link to survey:
https://gfp.sd.gov/UserDocs/nav/SD_2020_Nest_Predator_Bounty_PPT.pdf

GFP references this study in the resolution about the 2020 NPBP and on their web page about the bounty program. SD GFP's hired survey (of random people) found that 62% South Dakotans had no clue about the Nest Predator Bounty program and only 38% knew about it, of which 43% were mostly positive about it (which would be 16% of the population supported it, before being read GFP's description of program). (Page 44 of report)

Survey staff then read the respondents a short 3 sentence description of the program, which description convinced some more of them to support it and then survey then claimed 83% of SD folks support the program. (Page 45). This is what GFP and Governor seem to brag about.

HSUS funded a larger study and found different results...In this larger study (involved more than twice as many people) in a cold ask 50% of respondents did not know about the Program, 25% approved of program, & 25% disapproved. After prompted asks 26% approved, 53% disapproved and 21% not sure.

Please compare GFP survey with HSUS's funded survey (scroll up), some questions are the same cold asks but then the two studies have different prompted questions — with different paragraphs read into the prompted/shepherded questions. The two surveys get different answers when people are prompted differently.

SD GFP can't rely on that 83% support of NPBP, it is a prompted and manipulated response. The cold asks tells you what people think...at least 50% of people had no clue what the questioners were asking about in the "cold asks".

The Remington Research Group Study is attached "South Dakota General Election Survey" (opinion survey on NPBP)

Paula Radel

Mitchell SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Program is a waste of time and money, which could be better used.

Karen Farnham

Tucson AZ

Position: oppose

Comment:

I implore you, beseech you, beg you ... have compassion, show kindness to the animals of South Dakota. Dare to be different from those who get their jollies by torturing and abusing innocent beings with whom we share this earth. Rise above the lowest common denominator, show them the way. In the name of God, have a heart ... behave in humane ways and feed your soul, knowing you dared to stand up for what is right. Would you treat your family pet this way???

Jamie Al-Haj

**2525 Sunset Vista Rd, Rapid City,
Sd 577 SD**

Position: oppose

Comment:

I totally oppose this senseless program. The 83% of the general public that supposedly support it, is as skewed a number, as the number of pheasants you say the program helps. All of the pheasant hunters and trappers I have spoken to despise the Nest Predator Bounty Program. The consensus has is and always been that the decrease in pheasant population is related to the lack of or poor habitat. Instead of wasting \$500,000 on the annihilation of South Dakota native wildlife, it would be far better spent in incentives for landowners to provide a natural environment that would protect and nourish pheasants.

It is appalling that you are proposing that another 50,000 animals die again this year for a program that has no rhyme or reason. Add the number of lives that have been wasted over the two previous years this program has been implemented, including the offspring that would also have died in utero or by starvation, the count of 250,000 is so large it is hard to wrap one's head around!

Please uphold the duty of your position, to provide responsible management and stewardship of our wildlife. A half million dollars could be used so much more productively this year to benefit the people, pheasants, and wildlife of South Dakota!

Moiria Curry

Brookings SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I strongly oppose the nest bounty program. Traps are dangerous and indiscriminate about what types of animals they maim or kill. We've already had to do front paw amputations on domestic cats in the last month because of traps used in these types of bounty programs.

Julie Anderson

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The Nest Predator Bounty Program is a vehicle for Governor Kristi Noem to promote trapping and use the SD GP&P to implement it. She ignores science, surveys, public opinion or anyone who opposes this program. GF&P now spends millions of dollars to support this killing spree and is no longer a legitimate, science based agency. When the program wasn't meeting the numbers of participants hoped for, the shooting of animals was added into the program. Children should never be taught that the only way to appreciate wildlife is to kill them. This money should be used to buy binoculars, cameras and sponsor outdoor classes that allow children to learn about wildlife in a nonviolent way. But those who oppose this program like myself know it will never happen under the current administration or this Commission. This agency is corrupt to the core with only one focus in mind - the killing of wildlife for money and twisted entertainment. If there is anyone on this Commission with any morals I ask you to stand up to the Governor and oppose this blood bath.

Jj Renli

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Ethan Lamgley

Tankton SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Nonmeandered Waters Navigation Lane Process

Paul Lepisto

Pierre SD

Position: support

Comment:

On behalf of President Kelly Kistner please see the attached comments from the South Dakota Division of the Izaak Walton League of America on the nonmeandered waters navigation land process.

Curtis Foster

Britton SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Curtis Foster, Marshall Co resident. I oppose any rules for access that are not supported by the property owner. I will correct a typo in my last statement submitted for your last meeting. My belief is access is provided for in 41-23-4 and 41-23-15. These 2 sections of Chapter 41-23 should be the foundation for any other considerations for access.



SOUTH DAKOTA
DIVISION

The Izaak Walton League of America

DEFENDERS OF SOIL, AIR, WOODS, WATERS, AND WILDLIFE

February 26, 2021

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

Dear Commissioners,

The Izaak Walton League of America's South Dakota Division (Division) thanks you for the opportunity to comment on the nest predator bounty proposal that would utilize sportsmen and/or Game, Fish and Parks (GFP) funds. An amended Nest Predator Bounty resolution for 2021 and 2022 came out of your January meeting that includes a \$10 payment for each predator killed, capped at \$500,000 each year, and it changes to the dates of the program.

The program's stated goal is to enhance nest success for pheasants and ducks by removing predators including raccoons, striped skunks, opossums, red fox, and badgers while increasing youth and family participation in the tradition of trapping.

The Division vigorously encourages getting youth and families involved in the outdoors. But according to the last year's numbers from the nest predator bounty program only 16 percent of the participants were 17 or younger. The Division believes this program is missing its mark and it is not meeting the intended goals, especially when considering the high cost of the program.

The Division believes the lack of abundant quality nesting habitat is the reason for the high level of nest predation in South Dakota. Based on the state's land mass, trapping 50,000 predators across the state eliminates 1 predator per 1,000 acres. A statically insignificant figure that comes at an extremely high cost.

Bounty and nest predator trapping efforts have been studied numerous times. Those studies show the only way trapping can impact nest success is when the predator removal effort is highly intensive and done in a small well-defined area of high quality nesting habitat. We believe many residents will remove nest predators without a sponsored bounty program simply because they want to "do the right thing".

Again, the Division strongly supports programs that encourage people, especially youth and families, to engage in outdoor activities including hunting, fishing, trapping, and learning about conservation and habitat. We eagerly support programs and efforts that engage youth and other people in the benefits South Dakota's great outdoors provides.

Instead of authorizing this program we suggest the Commission spend these funds on habitat enhancement and on information programs that teach the benefits quality habitat provide for our fish and wildlife and all the citizens of the state.

We cannot support a program that gives our youth and others a false perspective that a bounty program, conducted in what at best is a patch-work effort, will make a meaningful difference in pheasant, duck, or any other bird's nesting success rate.

The Izaak Walton League of America's South Dakota Division respectfully requests that the South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks Commission not authorize the use of any funds from the Department of Game, Fish and Parks, or state general funds, for the Nest Predator Program in 2021 and/or 2022.

We respectfully ask you to reject this proposal.

Thank you for your time and consideration and for your work for all the people of South Dakota. Stay safe and well.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Kelly Kistner".

Kelly Kistner

National IWLA President and President of the South Dakota Division of the IWLA
603 Lakeshore Drive
McCook Lake, SD 57049
605-232-2030 (H) – 712-490-1726 (C)
iwlasdpresident@outlook.com



SOUTH DAKOTA
DIVISION

The Izaak Walton League of America

DEFENDERS OF SOIL, AIR, WOODS, WATERS, AND WILDLIFE

February 26, 2021

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

Dear Commissioners,

The Izaak Walton League of America's South Dakota Division (Division) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed rule to establish a procedure for the public to request a navigation lane through a closed nonmeandered body of water.

The Division supports a rule that establishes:

- A procedure to request a navigation lane through a closed nonmeandered body of water when no other legal access is available.
- A way to petition the Commission to establish a navigation lane, then following the administrative rule change process provide public notice, a public comment period and allow public testimony during a public hearing prior to finalization.

The Division supports the language of the Sample Rule:

ARSD 41:04:06:06 – The transportation lane petition. Upon receipt of a petition to establish a transportation lane the commission shall, at their next regularly scheduled commission meeting, consider the request and either deny, grant, or modify the petition. The department shall notify any landowner that may be affected by the proposed transportation lane. If the commission grants or modifies a petition, it shall be established by rule pursuant to SDCL 1-26 in this chapter. The petitioner shall demonstrate the necessity of a transportation lane by meeting the criteria as laid out in SDCL 41-23-16.

ARSD 41:04:06:06.01 – Transportation lanes established. While accessing the transportation lane, the individual shall take the most direct path to the open nonmeandered body of water and shall not hunt, fish, or trap in any manner while in the transportation lane. The department shall be responsible for marking all transportation lanes established pursuant to this chapter. Transportation lanes established in this rule shall be reviewed for necessity and reported to the commission prior to December 1 of each year.

Approval of the rule would fulfill a provision the legislature passed in 2017. That legislation requires the Commission to promulgate rules establishing a public petition process allowing a person to request that a portion of a closed nonmeandered water be opened for limited transportation to areas of that nonmeandered water that is open for public recreational use but does not have other legal public access.

The Division supports inclusion of a 60 day public comment period in the new rule, and creation of a process that allows landowner and the public input into the establishment of navigation lanes.

The Izaak Walton League of America's South Dakota Division thanks you for this opportunity to comment on the proposed rule.

We ask for your support the proposed rule.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to the people of South Dakota.

Stay safe and well.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Kelly Kistner".

Kelly Kistner

National IWLA President and President of the South Dakota Division of the IWLA

603 Lakeshore Drive

McCook Lake, SD 57049

605-232-2030 (H) – 712-490-1726 (C)

iwlasdpresident@outlook.com



February 26, 2021

TO: South Dakota Game Fish & Parks Commission

FROM: South Dakotans Fighting Animal Cruelty Together (SD FACT)

RE: OPPOSE Nest Predator Bounty Program

Dear Interim Sec. Robling, Director Kirschenmann, Chairman Olson, and Members of the Commission:

South Dakotans Fighting Animal Cruelty Together (SD FACT) again writes strongly in opposition to continuing the Nest Predator Bounty Program into the future and to any potential department sponsored legislation for 2021/22. With support from over 5,000 members, we provide the following:

We remain vehemently opposed to the inhumane Nest Predator Bounty Program (NPBP). The long check-times, the lengthened season, and the unlimited numbers allowed all contribute to the inevitability of suffering for target animals and those that are indiscriminately trapped by happenstance.

There does not appear to be any scientific review of predator numbers and the effect of the bounty program upon these species. As a public resource, it is vital that accurate and unbiased information concerning predator numbers be researched. Also, given the vital role provided by these native species and their control of ticks and other disease-carrying varmints, a review of potential negative effects on human health is required.

We are requesting the Commission reverse their position to forego an environmental impact assessment under SDCL 34A-9-4 on the bounty program given these serious concerns. Failure to gather information and conduct assessments concerning the continuation of this radical program would be knowingly negligent and a clearly unwarranted abuse of your discretion as a public entity in charge of preserving a public resource and maintaining public health.

We once again remind you that every animal has its role to play in an ecosystem and contributes to human health & quality of life. Here's why these varmints are so important to all of us:

Raccoon

Raccoons are scavengers and therefore are an important part of cleaning up carrion. They also dine on many other species we consider pests when numbers get out of control; including snakes, frogs, lizards, wasps and rats.

Striped skunk

Skunks do an amazing job at helping to keep insect populations in check- insects like grasshoppers, beetles, crickets and wasps. Skunks are one of the best examples of how an animal we really want to avoid is actually one we want to keep around.

Badger

Scientists call the badger a sentinel species, one that provides clues about the health of its ecosystem. They are excellent hunters of earth-dwelling prey including rabbits, groundhogs, ground squirrels, mice and snakes.

Opossum

Opossums are incredibly useful, and often misunderstood. Ticks, particularly the black-legged ticks like deer ticks that are responsible for the spread of Lyme disease, are a top item on the opossum's menu. Just one opossum eats, on average, 5,000 ticks each year. This means the 5,700 opossums trapped by past NBPB's has resulted in 28.5 million more ticks throughout our state.

Red fox

These varmints have a helpful side for farmers and ranchers. Like their larger canid cousin the coyote, red foxes are wonderful at keeping rodent populations down. They hunt chipmunks, rats, mice, voles and all sorts of other small rodents that can become more of a pest to humans than the fox themselves. They also eat carrion and like other varmints on this list, are part of an important cleanup crew for their ecosystem.

Trapped animals can languish and die slowly from shock, dehydration, starvation and exposure to the elements. In addition, because the NBPB was initiated when these animals were rearing their young, those babies were left to die a cruel death when their mothers were killed...for their tail. Each year, traps in the United States injure and kill millions of "non-target" animals, including companion animals and endangered species. Because of this cruel and unnecessary practice, and the importance of the animals involved, SD FACT strongly opposes the Nest Predator Bounty Program and urges the commission to consider all aspects of the ecosystem.

Finally, as tax paying citizens we vehemently object to the needless expenditure of state funds on this exercise. It is your duty to spend public monies wisely and preserve our way of life for the "next century" by meeting our constitutional budgetary obligations of which this unscientific, ideological giveaway runs far afield.

Respectfully submitted,

SD FACT Board of Directors

Shari Kosel, Lead

Sara Parker, Sioux Falls

Joe Kosel, Lead

sdfact.org



REMINGTON RESEARCH GROUP

SOUTH DAKOTA

STATEWIDE

2020 GENERAL ELECTION

February 2020

Survey conducted February 10 through February 11, 2020. 1,001 likely 2020 General Election voters participated in the survey. Survey weighted to match expected turnout demographics for the 2020 General Election. Margin of Error is +/-3.1% with a 95% level of confidence. Totals do not always equal 100% due to rounding.

800 W 47th Street · Kansas City, Missouri 64112 · 816-407-1222
www.RemingtonResearchGroup.com



REMINGTON RESEARCH GROUP

Q1: In general, do you approve or disapprove of legal trapping in South Dakota?

Approve: 37%
Disapprove: 31%
Not sure: 32%

Q2: How much have you seen, read or heard about the South Dakota Nest Predator Bounty Program?

A lot: 15%
Just some: 31%
Nothing at all: 54%

Q3: Based on what you know, do you approve or disapprove of the South Dakota Nest Predator Bounty Program?

Approve: 25%
Disapprove: 25%
Not sure: 50%

Q4: Do you think people are **illegally** trapping raccoons, striped skunks, opossums, badgers, and red foxes in South Dakota?

Yes: 37%
No: 28%
Not sure: 35%

Q5: South Dakota's native wildlife species like raccoons, striped skunks, opossums, badgers and red foxes increase biodiversity, protect crops, and control disease transmission by keeping rodent populations in check.

Do you agree or disagree that raccoons, striped skunks, opossums, badgers, and red foxes are an important asset to South Dakota's ecosystems?

Agree: 68%
Disagree: 16%
Not sure: 16%



REMINGTON RESEARCH GROUP

Q6: South Dakota Game, Fish & Parks touted its Nest Predator Bounty Program as providing trapping opportunities for state residents, while also removing species that they suggested might prey on pheasants during their nesting season. Program participants received a bounty of \$10 for each tail of a raccoon, striped skunk, badger, opossum or red fox they killed.

In general, do you approve or disapprove of the Nest Predator Bounty Program in South Dakota?

Approve: 37%

Disapprove: 43%

Not sure: 20%

Q7: The Nest Predator Bounty Program was launched in early 2019. This program was portrayed as an attempt to reduce predation on pheasant nests by native wildlife species. But while South Dakota Game, Fish & Parks estimates that they spent upwards of \$1.7 million on the program in 2019, they have yet to produce any evidence of an increase in pheasant numbers. Therefore, many have questioned why the agency has spent so much of the state's money on such a highly ineffective effort.

Knowing this, do you support or oppose the Nest Predator Bounty Program?

Support: 22%

Oppose: 55%

Undecided: 23%

Q8: Wildlife management professionals state that bounty programs for predator control are ineffective. Hunting groups like the South Dakota Wildlife Federation have advised against a bounty program, and instead urge a more science-based focus on habitat improvement to increase pheasant numbers.

Knowing this, do you support or oppose the Nest Predator Bounty Program?

Support: 28%

Oppose: 47%

Undecided: 25%

Q9: Animals caught in traps can languish and die slowly from shock, dehydration, starvation or exposure to the elements. Those who survive long enough for the trapper to return may be killed by inhumane methods. Additionally, nursing mother animals may be killed, leaving young animals to die; or those young animals may themselves be captured, killed, and their tails submitted for a bounty.

Knowing this, do you support or oppose the Nest Predator Bounty Program?

Support: 25%

Oppose: 61%

Undecided: 14%



REMINGTON RESEARCH GROUP

Q10: Encouraging citizens, including children, to kill the state's native wildlife species for a cash reward is a slap in the face to South Dakota's hunting tradition of sportsmanship, fair chase and respect for wildlife. By allowing mass slaughter and inhumane deaths to our native species for a cash bounty, the state is abandoning our long-held tradition of sportsmanship.

Do you support or oppose the Nest Predator Bounty Program?

Support: 25%

Oppose: 55%

Undecided: 20%

Q11: Science shows that nest predator bounty programs are counterproductive to their stated goal of reducing the number of predatory species. Random killing of these species may stimulate the animals to adapt, which results in more predatory animals in the future.

Do you agree or disagree that South Dakota's Nest Predator Bounty Program will have unintended consequences for native wildlife in the state?

Agree: 46%

Disagree: 28%

Undecided: 26%

Sometimes in a survey like this, people change their minds. I will now read you one of the original questions again. Please feel free to change your answer if you so choose.

Q12: Based on what you know, do you approve or disapprove of the South Dakota Nest Predator Bounty Program?

Approve: 26%

Disapprove: 53%

Not sure: 21%



REMINGTON RESEARCH GROUP

Q1: In general, do you approve or disapprove of legal trapping in South Dakota?

Column %	RAPID CITY	SIOUX FALLS
Approve	36%	37%
Disapprove	33%	29%
Not sure	31%	33%

Table 1. Q1 by DMA - Categorical

Column %	Republican	Democrat	Non-Partisan
Approve	43%	29%	33%
Disapprove	25%	39%	34%
Not sure	33%	32%	33%

Table 2. Q1 by PARTY

Column %	Conservative	Moderate	Liberal
Approve	45%	30%	33%
Disapprove	25%	34%	42%
Not sure	30%	37%	25%

Table 3. Q1 by IDEOLOGY

Column %	Female	Male
Approve	28%	47%
Disapprove	37%	24%
Not sure	36%	29%

Table 4. Q1 by GENDER



REMINGTON RESEARCH GROUP

Q2: How much have you seen, read or heard about the South Dakota Nest Predator Bounty Program?

Column %	RAPID CITY	SIOUX FALLS
A lot	13%	15%
Just some	30%	32%
Nothing	58%	53%

Table 5. Q2 by DMA - Categorical

Column %	Republican	Democrat	Non-Partisan
A lot	15%	14%	14%
Just some	30%	31%	35%
Nothing	55%	54%	52%

Table 6. Q2 by PARTY

Column %	Conservative	Moderate	Liberal
A lot	16%	12%	19%
Just some	29%	36%	21%
Nothing	55%	51%	61%

Table 7. Q2 by IDEOLOGY

Column %	Female	Male
A lot	12%	18%
Just some	28%	34%
Nothing	60%	48%

Table 8. Q2 by GENDER



REMINGTON RESEARCH GROUP

Q3: Based on what you know, do you approve or disapprove of the South Dakota Nest Predator Bounty Program?

Column %	RAPID CITY	SIOUX FALLS
Approve	20%	27%
Disapprove	29%	25%
Not sure	51%	48%

Table 9. Q3 by DMA - Categorical

Column %	Republican	Democrat	Non-Partisan
Approve	30%	18%	25%
Disapprove	20%	35%	27%
Not sure	51%	47%	49%

Table 10. Q3 by PARTY

Column %	Conservative	Moderate	Liberal
Approve	32%	19%	23%
Disapprove	20%	29%	31%
Not sure	48%	52%	47%

Table 11. Q3 by IDEOLOGY

Column %	Female	Male
Approve	18%	34%
Disapprove	25%	26%
Not sure	57%	40%

Table 12. Q3 by GENDER



REMINGTON RESEARCH GROUP

Q4: Do you think people are **illegally** trapping raccoons, striped skunks, opossums, badgers, and red foxes in South Dakota?

Column %	RAPID CITY	SIOUX FALLS
Yes	37%	37%
No	25%	29%
Not sure	38%	35%

Table 13. Q4 by DMA - Categorical

Column %	Republican	Democrat	Non-Partisan
Yes	35%	37%	41%
No	28%	29%	26%
Not sure	37%	34%	33%

Table 14. Q4 by PARTY

Column %	Conservative	Moderate	Liberal
Yes	34%	41%	33%
No	29%	26%	29%
Not sure	37%	32%	38%

Table 15. Q4 by IDEOLOGY

Column %	Female	Male
Yes	41%	32%
No	20%	37%
Not sure	40%	30%

Table 16. Q4 by GENDER



REMINGTON RESEARCH GROUP

Q5: South Dakota's native wildlife species like raccoons, striped skunks, opossums, badgers and red foxes increase biodiversity, protect crops, and control disease transmission by keeping rodent populations in check.

Do you agree or disagree that raccoons, striped skunks, opossums, badgers, and red foxes are an important asset to South Dakota's ecosystems?

Column %	RAPID CITY	SIOUX FALLS
Agree	74%	66%
Disagree	13%	16%
Not sure	13%	18%

Table 17. Q5 by DMA - Categorical

Column %	Republican	Democrat	Non-Partisan
Agree	63%	77%	66%
Disagree	17%	13%	17%
Not sure	20%	9%	18%

Table 18. Q5 by PARTY

Column %	Conservative	Moderate	Liberal
Agree	63%	73%	70%
Disagree	18%	13%	16%
Not sure	20%	13%	15%

Table 19. Q5 by IDEOLOGY

Column %	Female	Male
Agree	70%	65%
Disagree	12%	20%
Not sure	18%	15%

Table 20. Q5 by GENDER



REMINGTON RESEARCH GROUP

Q6: South Dakota Game, Fish & Parks touted its Nest Predator Bounty Program as providing trapping opportunities for state residents, while also removing species that they suggested might prey on pheasants during their nesting season. Program participants received a bounty of \$10 for each tail of a raccoon, striped skunk, badger, opossum or red fox they killed.

In general, do you approve or disapprove of the Nest Predator Bounty Program in South Dakota?

Column %	RAPID CITY	SIOUX FALLS
Approve	29%	39%
Disapprove	50%	41%
Not sure	21%	20%

Table 21. Q6 by DMA - Categorical

Column %	Republican	Democrat	Non-Partisan
Approve	45%	23%	35%
Disapprove	35%	58%	44%
Not sure	20%	19%	21%

Table 22. Q6 by PARTY

Column %	Conservative	Moderate	Liberal
Approve	46%	28%	32%
Disapprove	34%	51%	51%
Not sure	19%	22%	17%

Table 23. Q6 by IDEOLOGY

Column %	Female	Male
Approve	26%	48%
Disapprove	49%	36%
Not sure	24%	15%

Table 24. Q6 by GENDER



REMINGTON RESEARCH GROUP

Q7: The Nest Predator Bounty Program was launched in early 2019. This program was portrayed as an attempt to reduce predation on pheasant nests by native wildlife species. But while South Dakota Game, Fish & Parks estimates that they spent upwards of \$1.7 million on the program in 2019, they have yet to produce any evidence of an increase in pheasant numbers. Therefore, many have questioned why the agency has spent so much of the state's money on such a highly ineffective effort.

Knowing this, do you support or oppose the Nest Predator Bounty Program?

Column %	RAPID CITY	SIOUX FALLS
Support	15%	24%
Oppose	64%	51%
Undecided	20%	24%

Table 25. Q7 by DMA - Categorical

Column %	Republican	Democrat	Non-Partisan
Support	25%	15%	26%
Oppose	49%	66%	52%
Undecided	26%	19%	23%

Table 26. Q7 by PARTY

Column %	Conservative	Moderate	Liberal
Support	28%	17%	18%
Oppose	48%	60%	60%
Undecided	24%	22%	22%

Table 27. Q7 by IDEOLOGY

Column %	Female	Male
Support	15%	30%
Oppose	59%	50%
Undecided	26%	20%

Table 28. Q7 by GENDER



REMINGTON RESEARCH GROUP

Q8: Wildlife management professionals state that bounty programs for predator control are ineffective. Hunting groups like the South Dakota Wildlife Federation have advised against a bounty program, and instead urge a more science-based focus on habitat improvement to increase pheasant numbers.

Knowing this, do you support or oppose the Nest Predator Bounty Program?

Column %	RAPID CITY	SIOUX FALLS
Support	22%	29%
Oppose	55%	45%
Undecided	23%	26%

Table 29. Q8 by DMA - Categorical

Column %	Republican	Democrat	Non-Partisan
Support	32%	19%	30%
Oppose	40%	60%	47%
Undecided	28%	21%	23%

Table 30. Q8 by PARTY

Column %	Conservative	Moderate	Liberal
Support	35%	21%	23%
Oppose	39%	56%	49%
Undecided	26%	23%	28%

Table 31. Q8 by IDEOLOGY

Column %	Female	Male
Support	21%	35%
Oppose	49%	45%
Undecided	30%	20%

Table 32. Q8 by GENDER



REMINGTON RESEARCH GROUP

Q9: Animals caught in traps can languish and die slowly from shock, dehydration, starvation or exposure to the elements. Those who survive long enough for the trapper to return may be killed by inhumane methods. Additionally, nursing mother animals may be killed, leaving young animals to die; or those young animals may themselves be captured, killed, and their tails submitted for a bounty.

Knowing this, do you support or oppose the Nest Predator Bounty Program?

Column %	RAPID CITY	SIOUX FALLS
Support	20%	26%
Oppose	68%	58%
Undecided	11%	15%

Table 33. Q9 by DMA - Categorical

Column %	Republican	Democrat	Non-Partisan
Support	32%	13%	26%
Oppose	52%	79%	57%
Undecided	16%	8%	17%

Table 34. Q9 by PARTY

Column %	Conservative	Moderate	Liberal
Support	34%	17%	18%
Oppose	52%	69%	66%
Undecided	14%	13%	15%

Table 35. Q9 by IDEOLOGY

Column %	Female	Male
Support	18%	33%
Oppose	68%	54%
Undecided	15%	13%

Table 36. Q9 by GENDER



REMINGTON RESEARCH GROUP

Q10: Encouraging citizens, including children, to kill the state's native wildlife species for a cash reward is a slap in the face to South Dakota's hunting tradition of sportsmanship, fair chase and respect for wildlife. By allowing mass slaughter and inhumane deaths to our native species for a cash bounty, the state is abandoning our long-held tradition of sportsmanship.

Do you support or oppose the Nest Predator Bounty Program?

Column %	RAPID CITY	SIOUX FALLS
Support	23%	26%
Oppose	62%	53%
Undecided	15%	21%

Table 37. Q10 by DMA - Categorical

Column %	Republican	Democrat	Non-Partisan
Support	31%	16%	25%
Oppose	46%	72%	54%
Undecided	23%	12%	21%

Table 38. Q10 by PARTY

Column %	Conservative	Moderate	Liberal
Support	32%	20%	20%
Oppose	46%	65%	58%
Undecided	22%	15%	22%

Table 39. Q10 by IDEOLOGY

Column %	Female	Male
Support	18%	34%
Oppose	62%	48%
Undecided	20%	18%

Table 40. Q10 by GENDER



REMINGTON RESEARCH GROUP

Q11: Science shows that nest predator bounty programs are counterproductive to their stated goal of reducing the number of predatory species. Random killing of these species may stimulate the animals to adapt, which results in more predatory animals in the future.

Do you agree or disagree that South Dakota's Nest Predator Bounty Program will have unintended consequences for native wildlife in the state?

Column %	RAPID CITY	SIOUX FALLS
Agree	51%	45%
Disagree	29%	27%
Not sure	20%	28%

Table 41. Q11 by DMA - Categorical

Column %	Republican	Democrat	Non-Partisan
Agree	41%	56%	44%
Disagree	32%	22%	26%
Not sure	27%	21%	30%

Table 42. Q11 by PARTY

Column %	Conservative	Moderate	Liberal
Agree	40%	53%	47%
Disagree	33%	23%	27%
Not sure	27%	24%	26%

Table 43. Q11 by IDEOLOGY

Column %	Female	Male
Agree	48%	44%
Disagree	24%	33%
Not sure	28%	23%

Table 44. Q11 by GENDER



REMINGTON RESEARCH GROUP

Sometimes in a survey like this, people change their minds. I will now read you one of the original questions again. Please feel free to change your answer if you so choose.

Q12: Based on what you know, do you approve or disapprove of the South Dakota Nest Predator Bounty Program?

Column %	RAPID CITY	SIOUX FALLS
Approve	21%	27%
Disapprove	60%	51%
Not sure	20%	22%

Table 45. Q12 by DMA - Categorical

Column %	Republican	Democrat	Non-Partisan
Approve	31%	15%	28%
Disapprove	43%	71%	52%
Not sure	26%	14%	20%

Table 46. Q12 by PARTY

Column %	Conservative	Moderate	Liberal
Approve	34%	19%	18%
Disapprove	43%	61%	63%
Not sure	23%	21%	18%

Table 47. Q12 by IDEOLOGY

Column %	Female	Male
Approve	17%	35%
Disapprove	59%	46%
Not sure	24%	18%

Table 48. Q12 by GENDER



REMINGTON RESEARCH GROUP

DEMOGRAPHICS

	%
RAPID CITY	25%
SIOUX FALLS	72%

Table 49. DMA - Categorical

	%
Republican	52%
Democrat	30%
Non-Partisan	18%

Table 50. PARTY

	%
Conservative	46%
Moderate	42%
Liberal	12%

Table 51. IDEOLOGY

	%
Female	53%
Male	47%

Table 52. GENDER