

From: [Comes, Rachel](#)
To: [Kierl, Liz](#)
Subject: FW: [EXT] Non Res Archery
Date: Tuesday, December 6, 2022 5:15:19 PM

From: Beatis <beatis@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 6, 2022 5:14 PM
To: Spring, Charles <Charles.Spring@state.sd.us>; doug.sharp@state.sd.us; Locken, Jon <Jon.Locken@state.sd.us>; Bartling, Julie A (GFP) <JulieA.Bartling@state.sd.us>; locken@nrctv.com; Comes, Rachel <Rachel.Comes@state.sd.us>; Whitmyre, Robert <Robert.Whitmyre@state.sd.us>; Olson, Russell <Russell.Olson@state.sd.us>; Rissler, Stephanie <Stephanie.Rissler@state.sd.us>; Bies, Travis <Travis.Bies@state.sd.us>
Subject: [EXT] Non Res Archery

Hello

I am commenting on the proposal brought forward for the GFP on archery deer and antelope. While I feel this is a step in the right direction, it is still very flawed in the fact the you still offer unlimited tags. I have a personal experience with non-resident archery mule deer hunters.. Dakota Safaris used to have a bunch land leased in the area I hunt. Jack Links has purchased most of the land in that area now. I have seen a steady increase in mule deer bucks since this time. Dakota Safaris cash crop was archery mule deer hunters and they harvested many young mule deer. It was rare to see very many deer on the adjacent BLM properties. Deer and antelope do not know the difference between public and private land. An overharvest of deer on private land does affect public land. Please look at the biology and not the economics on this one. I recognize the fact that most landowners do a fine job of managing their wildlife but here are some that do not. Ask the landowners what is a fair number of tags to allow on their property and please do away with unlimited tags.

I am asking for to please change this proposal before you send it forward
Thanks for your time

Jeff Olson
Rapid City