

Minutes of the Game, Fish, and Parks Commission  
January 11-12, 2018

Chairman Barry Jensen called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. CT at RedRossa Convention Center in Pierre, South Dakota. Commissioners Barry Jensen, Gary Jensen, Russ Olson, Scott Phillips and Douglas Sharp were present. Approximately 35 public, staff, and media were present. Commissioner Mary Anne Boyd joined via phone.

**DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION**

**Conflict of Interest Disclosure**

Chairman B Jensen called for conflicts of interest to be disclosed. None were presented.

**Approval of Minutes**

Chairman B Jensen called for any additions or corrections to the December 14-15, 2017 minutes or a motion for approval.

Motion by Olson with second by G. Jensen TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 14-15, 2017 MEETING. Motion carried unanimously.

**Additional Commissioner Salary Days**

Commissioner G. Jensen requested 4 additional salary days for participation in the WAFWA mid-winter conference.

Motioned by Phillips, second by Sharp TO APPROVE THE ADDITIONAL SALARY DAYS. Motion carried unanimously.

**License List Request**

Chris Petersen, administration division director, informed the Commission that no new licenses lists have been requested.

Petersen invited the Commission to attend the department budget hearing scheduled for the joint appropriations committee on January 16, 2018.

**Department Education Plan**

Taniya Bethke, wildlife division staff specialist provided a brief recap of the education plan that was presented to the Commission at the previous month's meeting. With no questions posed by the Commission she requested adoption of the plan.

Motioned by Sharp with second by G. Jensen TO ADOPT THE DEPARTMENT EDUCATION PLAN. Motion carried.

**Legion Lake Fire**

Matt Snyder, parks and recreation regional supervisor, detailed the impact of the Legion Lake fire on the natural resources, bison, burro, roads and fences in Custer State Park. He noted the fire burned approximately 24,000 acres of the forest and woodlands and 12,000 acres of grasslands and while this will change the look of the park there will be minimal impact on the public's experience.

Tom Kirschenmann, wildlife deputy director, detailed the impact on wildlife specifically elk that have dispersed and mortalities and injuries due to the fire although none where of major significance. Due to the fire and the park being closed the last 3 antlerless elk hunts were cancelled, deer antlerless season was shorted by 4 days. Mountain Lion and coyote seasons will proceed as planned.

Snyder thanked the incident command team that managed the fire

Phillips thanked Snyder and Custer State Park staff for their efforts and inquired about planting of hardwood trees and wanted to know if volunteers from local organization would be available to help with plantings.

Snyder said staff have already been working with groups and are scheduling for an Arbor Day planting. They are also working with a church group that will be coming to help build fence and have receiving donations through Parks and Wildlife Foundation which are greatly appreciated.

G. Jensen said everyone loves Custer State Park and people want to help. He asked Snyder if there is a team of staff to keep the public informed and advised especially for the tourism part of it as people have a tendency to stay away after a fire.

Snyder responded the visitors services coordinator is working with media outlets on a daily basis and has met twice with the SD Department of Tourism and Black Hills tourism group as well as local chambers to gear up for the tourism season and will attend the state tourism conference next week to network with these people to continue to enhance what we are doing and to stay updated.

Phillips asked if salvage logging would provide a significant income or break even to remove damaged trees.

Snyder said it is likely we will not see the same benefit as we would if this was a regular "green" timber sale, but they hope to break even. He noted that at the end of the day it is still a benefit to the landscape.

B. Jensen stated we will not see grass until April-May and inquired how we will be feeding the buffalo

Snyder explained they should have boundary fence up soon and will move the buffalo north where there is plenty of grass.

### **Nonmeandered Waters Update**

Arden Petersen, special assistant, reminded the Commission the Goose Lake petition will be heard in conjunction with the March 1<sup>st</sup> Commission meeting.

Secretary Kelly Hepler explained that HB1001 passed in the 2017 special session requires action to be taken this legislative session. He noted the Governor's Office has introduced SB 24 to extend the sunset clause by 3 years. An overview will be presented to legislators on Thursday, January 18.

### **Public Involvement Assessment Tool**

Cindy Longmire, human dimensions specialist, explained how the department's strategic plan identified improved public involvement as a priority specifically the need to create a set of standard criteria to help staff through public participation project design. She explained that public involvement is a process in which public concerns, needs and values are identified and incorporated into decision-making and that sometimes the decision is not a choice between values, but a decision about what is more important.

Longmire explained the 10 steps for creating public involvement plan focusing on assessing public concern/interest and identifying an appropriate level of public participation. She reviewed the 11 questions used to determine the department's perceptions of the level of public involvement. She also noted the constraints in public involvement stating the requirements to operate within the constraints imposed by laws, rules and authorities.

### **Website/Mobile App Progress**

Emily Kiel, communications director, and Calley Worth, webmaster/social media manger, updated the Commission on the new GFP website launch that happened Tuesday this week.

Worth explained how input gathered this past fall was used to revise content on the new website as well as employee and public feedback and analytics. She explained the rigorous process each new website goes through prior to launch and noted they are still working on edits that were not identified through the transition process.

Worth said the new website streamlines the main navigation with clear direction to licensing, state parks and map which were identified as key resources by analytics. She said this is consistent with popular website trends and noted how maps are not only on the maps page, but also found on their respective pages making them easier for the public to find them. The new website is receiving good public feedback.

Worth said the mobile app is in final stages of testing with an anticipated launch date of February 1, 2018.

Kiel said the mobile app is designed for android system 6 and up and apple devices 10 and up.

### **Strategic Plan Implementation Progress**

Kiel briefed the Commission on strategic plan and detailed the accomplishments for 2017. Accomplishments include: developing five urban fishing opportunities, maintaining an A ranking from 80 percent of surveyed campers who visited the state parks, developing and launching a newly revised GFP website, sustaining wildlife and parks working capital at balanced levels, improving public involvement opportunities and reducing barriers, fostering 5 new partnerships to support the GFP mission, and increased joint department projects and resources. She noted 57 priorities were identified when the plan was first implemented and noted there are 39 priorities to be completed in 2018

### **PETITION FOR RULE CHANGE**

#### **Increased Minimum Length Limit for Muskellunge and Northern-muskellunge**

Taylor Anderson, petitioner, presented his reasons for increasing the statewide minimum length limit on muskellunge and northern-muskellunge. Anderson believes the fish have outgrown their current regulation and that a 40 inch fish is no longer considered a trophy fish, but the muskie has the potential to become one.

G. Jensen, move approval of the petition second by Olson.

Tony Leif, wildlife division director, explained in this situation fishing regulations have already been published in the fishing handbook at 40 inches. He said the department can post this change electronically, but noted officers would not be able to enforce the new length limit if approved as they cannot enforce a rule when they cannot cite the regulation. Leif said he believes this should be evaluated but wondered if it should be now or with other regulation updates noting this petition is a take it or leave it proposal.

G. Jensen inquired how many of these fish get harvested each year and if it is best to make it catch and release instead of a length limit.

John Lott, aquatics section chief, said they are currently managing this fish in 5 lakes. He said they can provide an estimated catch but do not have harvest info. He said 150 we caught between 2001-2012 on Linn Lake. And in 2009 the peak catch was at 150 and at that time population was not as developed.

G. Jensen asked what circumstances cause length limits to be changed to catch and release or is it a social issue

Lott said in this particular situation it would be social as we can currently maintain the population we have and we have seen improvements. There are a substantial number of muskies between 40-50 inches which has been supported by stocking.

Sharp asked what the benefit is of going to a 50 inch limit versus catch and release and how would it impact the 5 lakes

Lott responded the difference for angler harvest is the small number of fish over 50 inches and how quickly they would be repopulated over time. They would be dealing with replacing harvest fish with those that are growing if not harvesting potential for natural growth and possible mortality. Because there would be a small number of fish over 50 inches there would be little impact on food source.

G. Jensen asked if people harvest these fish for consumption or mounting.

Lott said as you move up in size you have a lower probability of harvest and these types of fish would be seen as a trophies even those not Muskie angler's a 40 inch fish is a large fish.

Hepler said he would like to further discuss with staff and the world is clearly going to replicas and trophy fisherman are not consuming these fish.

B Jensen asked if the issue is not the 50 inches, but that the regulations for this year have already been published making it difficult to enforce at this time.

G. Jensen tabled the motion until morning and recommend making it catch and release.

Leif explained the need to deny as proposed then separately have the Commission propose their own recommendation for a vote.

G. Jensen withdrew the motion.

Olson recommends taking action while petitioner is in attendance noting he supports 50 inches and or catch and release.

Motioned by G. Jensen, second by Sharp TO DENY THE PETITION. Motion carried.

Leif said staff will draft a resolution denying the petition. Then the Commission can recommend their rule change proposal.

Motioned by G. Jensen second by Olson TO PROPOSE A CHANGE FOR MUSKIE SEASON TO BE CATCH AND RELEASE. Motion carried.

Motion by G. Jensen second by Phillips TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 18-1 (Appendix A) DENYING THE PETITION. Motion carried unanimously.

## **PROPOSALS**

### **Public Water Safety Zoning**

Bob Schneider, parks and recreation assistant director, presented the proposal to modify the no wake zone at West Bend Recreation Area to include the waterfront beginning on the south east corner of the boat ramp parking lot running approximately 400 yards in a south easterly direction upstream to camping cabins. The second recommended change in water safety zoning pertains to the west boat ramp at Shadehill Reservoir. The recommendation proposes the waters beginning approximately 600 feet east of the west boat ramp and extending from the north shoreline to the south shoreline encompassing the bay where the west boat ramp is located to be a no wake zone.

He explained how this stretch of shallow waterfront is not only popular to swimmers and campers, but its shoreline is susceptible to wake generated erosion. The proposed no wake one would increase safety for beach users and protect the shoreline from erosion damage.

Schneider also explained how the recent addition of a privately owned cabin lots adjacent to the Shadehill Reservoir has made the west boat ramp more popular. The higher volume of use has led to a budgeted project to expand the boat ramp parking lot. As this encourages additional use a no wake zone surrounding the boat ramp is recommended to protect boaters and boats during launching and loading.

Motioned by G. Jensen, second by Sharp TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO PUBLIC WATER ZONING AT WEST BEND RECREATION AREA AND SHADEHILL RESERVOIR. Motion carried.

### **Public Land Safety Zoning**

Schneider presented the proposed changes to the restrictions on use of firearms to include Oakwood Lakes State Park. He explained how the park with irregularly shaped boundaries has an extensive established campground and designated day use area where hunting is prohibited per administrative rule. Over the past decade modifications to the park have changes visitor use patterns and decreased the area where rifle hunting is safe therefore recommending the change to allow hunting in the park be limited to shotguns, bows and crossbows. He noted there are still over 1,500 acres of GPA surrounding the park that provide rifle hunting.

Motioned by G. Jensen, second by Olson TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO PUBLIC LAND SAFETY ZONING AT OAKWOOD LAKES STATE PARK. Motion carried.

### **Bighorn Sheep Hunting Season**

Chad Switzer, wildlife program administrator, presented the proposal to change the administrative rules chapter from Black Hills Bighorn Sheep Hunting Season to be Bighorn Sheep Hunting Season and establish unit 3 as described as that portion of Pennington County east of the Cheyenne River and that portion of Jackson County north of the White River, excluding the Badlands National Park.

Switzer explained how staff have been working with the Badland National Park to establish a herd. He said the park currently has a research project with radio marked sheep and said some of these sheep outside the park are available for hunting. The partnership with park, tribes, and some landowners. He noted irregular boundary due to concerns of potential contact with domestic sheep allowing hunters to harvest opposed to department needing to euthanize.

Motioned by Sharp, second by G. Jensen TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE BIGHORN SHEEP HUNTING SEASON

Switzer presented the administrative action to allocate 1 bighorn sheep license in unit BHS-BH3 for the 2018-2019 hunting season.

Motioned by Olson second by Phillips TO APPROVE THE ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION TO ALLOCATE 1 BIGHORN SHEEP LICENSES FOR THE 2018 - 2019 HUNTING SEASON IN THE BHS-BH3 UNIT. Motion carried.

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

The Public Hearing began at 2:14 p.m. and concluded at 2:15 p.m. and the minutes follow these Commission meeting minutes.

### **FINALIZATIONS**

#### **Duck Hunting Season**

Kirschenmann presented the recommended changes to begin the season for the Low Plains South duck hunting to the third Saturday in October from the second

Saturday of October and increased the daily bag limit of pintails from one to two. He noted public input helped establish the current season schedule. He explained how staff reached out to waterfowl hunters and the majority of the comments were in favor of the proposed changes.

Olson asked when duck season in Nebraska starts

Rocco Murano, senior wildlife biologist, responded the Nebraska season is variable and not static like South Dakota's season.

Olson inquired if anything stops people from Nebraska from tethering their boats and docking on the South Dakota side of the river

Kirschenmann informed him they must launch on the Nebraska side of the river

Motion by G. Jensen, second by Olson TO AMEND THE FINALIZATION TO BEGIN THE FIRST SATURDAY IN NOVEMBER.

Sharp stated he is hesitant to approve as it would make the season start date November 7, 2018.

Phillips recommended moving the start date a week later than originally proposed.

Motion by G. Jensen, second by Olson changes TO AMEND THE FINALIZATION MAKING THE START DATE THE 4<sup>TH</sup> SATURDAY IN OCTOBER.

Motioned by G. Jensen, second by Olson TO APPROVE THE FINALIZATION TO THE DUCK HUNTING SEASON 41:06:16 AS AMENDED. Motion carried.

### **Early Fall Canada Goose**

Switzer presented the recommended change to adjust the daily bag limit from 15 to 8 Canada geese and adjust the possession limit from 45 to three times the daily bag limit.

Motioned by Phillips second by Sharp TO FINALIZE THE CHANGES TO THE EARLY FALL CANADA GOOSE SEASON 41:06:50. Motion carried.

### **Goose Hunting Season**

Kirschenmann presented the Commissions recommended changes to the 2018-2019 Goose Hunting Season from the previous year to modify unit 2 by adding Lawrence and Meade counties.

Phillips commented on adding Lawrence and Meade counties stating Meade County is not a big water county and residents would like to see Meade County moved back to unit 1.

Motion by Phillips, second by G Jensen TO AMEND THE RULE THE GOOSE HUNTING SEASON FINALIZATION TO MOVE MEADE COUNTY BACK TO UNIT 1. Motion carried.

Motioned by Phillips, second by G. Jensen TO FINALIZE THE CHANGES TO THE GOOSE HUNTING SEASON 41:06:16 AS AMENDED. Motion carried.

### **Bighorn Sheep Hunting License Allocation**

Kirschenmann presented the finalization of the bighorn sheep hunting licenses allocation administrative action that allocates 3 licenses for the 2018-2019 hunting season. He noted this is an administrative action for allocation of the 3 licenses as no rule is changed and one license will be for auction.

Motioned by Sharp second by Phillips TO FINALIZE THE ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION TO ALLOCATE 3 BIGHORN SHEEP LICENSES FOR THE 2018-2019 HUNTING SEASON. Motion carried. (Appendix B)

### **Enhanced Preference Point System for License Drawings**

Scott Simpson, wildlife administration chief, explained the top down structure of the preference points system noting there is no absolute solution when demand significantly outweighs supply. While this is not a solution it's a step in working to make this a better system for those with more preference points. He provided a handout model of simulations of how the system would run to provide people with more preference points a better chance of drawing you will take away opportunity for those with 3 or fewer preference points. In some cases your odds will double and in other cases increase in odds will be increased, but only by a fraction of a percentage. Some license types such as CSP firearm elk the odds of drawing a license will always be slim as there are only a few licenses allocated each year.

Hepler stated the department received public input from over 400 people. He said if we weight this to the top we will lose new hunters that we would potentially like to recruit. It is a balance.

Phillips liked this and sees it as a benefit. He says if people could see this modeling it would help explain.

Olson noted the deer stakeholder group is looking at options.

Sharp stated the model is helpful and asked what can be done by messaging standpoint to explain that this is still a lottery to further state that just because you have 30 preference points you still may not draw a license.

Simpson said the department will need to be consistent and clear with the message that while this will increase your odds it does not guarantee you receive a license.

B. Jensen inquired how long the preference point system has been in place.

Simpson responded 35 years or more at lease in the case of CSP Elk.

B. Jensen noticed that this option is not a uniform effect as it will depend on the number of applicants.

Simpson said yes it all comes back to supply and demand. There will be an impact in most deer units



B. Jensen inquired what the count of comments was support verses oppose.

Simpson explained it is difficult to tally comments as they are ranging, but more were in favor.

Motioned by Phillips second by Sharp TO FINALIZE THE ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION TO CUBE PREFERENCE POINTS FOR ALL LIMITED DRAW LICENSES. Motion carried. (Appendix C)

## **OPEN FORUM**

Chair B. Jensen opened the floor for discussion from those in attendance on matters of importance to them that may not be on the agenda.

## **DIVISION OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

### **Custer Park Resort Company Maintenance and Reserve Project Summary**

Snyder provided a handout of the FY 2017 projects with expenditures totaling \$810,258.40 as of October 31. He further detailed the projects completed at each lodge and the Coolidge general store noting which utilized emergency funds.

Ryan Flick, resort manager, provided a handout of the estimated 2018 projects with expenditures totaling \$1,008,500.00. He detailed the projects as each lodge specifically noting the jeep barn renovation and cabin renovations at legion lake.

Snyder noted the deficit will grow to \$300,000 for the jeep barn remodel but this is part of the 5 year plan and will utilize bonding and R&M needs will always be met by priority.

Phillips said he has seen the repairs to the cabins and progress through the years and wants to compliments staff for keeping them up and doing a good job.

Sharp stated he is excited to see the renovations to the old jeep barn. He feels it will be a nice addition as a usable facility.

B. Jensen inquired what the old jeep barn will be called.

Flick responded it is currently being called the event barn as the new jeep barn is being built near the seasonal dorms.

Phillips asked why it is called barn

Snyder explained that it was probably name because of its use. He said it is one of the oldest buildings and was the lumber company building then the lodge used it for carriages.

### **Custer Park Buffalo Auction Results**

Snyder provided information on the 52 buffalo that were auctioned which was livestreamed from the visitor's centers which was packed. There were 45 registered bidders 31 in person and 14 online. Three of the online bidders made purchases and 8 of the animals were sold to people in South Dakota, 2 to Nebraska and a few went to other states.

Olson asked what the criteria are to determine which animals are auctioned.

Snyder explained it depends on caring capacity which is currently at 860 and prior to fire was 950.

### **Parks Revenue and Camping Reservation Report**

Schneider provided the year to date comparison of state park system revenue, camping and visitation. He said regardless of drought, campfire restrictions, etc. parks total revenue was up 4 percent and is visitation up 1 percent. He noted gift cards are up 69 percent due to promoting/targeting the holiday season. He explained how Shadehill shows a 4 percent decrease which may be due to frustration because the park is full. They are working to develop 32 new campsites. He also said a number of camping reservations have already been made in at Custer State Park as reservations can be made a year in advance. Schneider said the first 10 days of the year is already showing an increase.

### **DIVISION OF WILDLIFE**

#### **Trapping Regulations**

Kirschenmann detailed an incident brought forward where an individual's son was hunting in a public area and a snare was placed that caught the boy's dog. The individual wants to know why snares are allowed during other hunting seasons. He said he doesn't oppose trapping and staff offered the opportunity to petition rule change which he is not interested in at this time but wants to share his story and discuss concerns. Due to the weather he is not present during open forum to bring forward his concerns. Kirschenmann said staff have been informed of another incident where a dog was caught in a snare on public hunting ground during pheasant season. Kirschenmann would like to open a discussion if adjustments should be made and what appropriate actions should be.

Keith Fisk, wildlife program administrator, provided a presentation on snaring regulations. He explained how they are constructed to trap fur bearing animals and allow other wildlife to break free. He noted changes in regulations on public lands that began in 1987 and provided information on snare regulations in surrounding states.

G. Jensen asked what the rationale is for the change in 2003 to allow trapping beginning November 13.

Emmett Keyser, wildlife regional supervisor, said it was a compromise dates with trapper associations due to the prime time for trapping there was an allowance made for early in the season.

G. Jensen inquired if it would make a significant difference if moved back in the season and what about the quality of pelts?

Fisk said most trappers prime up in early November and it would take away opportunity. He explained coyote pelts are already beginning to decline in January as land animals prime up in November where water animals prime in February.

G. Jensen asked if training on trapping and signage is different between eastern and western SD

Fisk said the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies has an educational trapper component that most states do not require but would be interested in working with the trapping community to explore options.

Kirschenmann recommends reaching out to staff we would consider being subject matter experts on options.

Olson asked if staff could look into the penalty for people who are not trappers who steal animals from traps.

Leif said there are no mandatory suspensions in statute.

Sharp asked if there are other options for trapping coyotes if we do not allow snaring on public grounds until November 1.

Fisk provided other trap options

Phillips said South Dakota would be a good candidate for two zones splitting the state east and West River while possibly applying other restrictions in pheasant hunting areas. He would also like to see additional conversation on types of traps and sizes.

### **Farm Bill Update**

Mark Norton, wildlife hunting access and farm bill coordinator, provided an update on the farm bill that expires at the end of September 2018. He provided information such as acres enrolled and funds distributed for multiple farm bill programs including the conservation reserve program, agriculture conservation easement program, environmental quality incentive program, conservation stewardship program, voluntary public access and habitat incentive program. Norton also discussed GFP farm bill efforts, priorities for 2018 and status of the farm bill as of January 4, 2018.

Phillips noted to become eligible for conservation stewardship program one can give tours of their operation. If people are interested would help assist in setting tour up.

G. Jensen recommended having the commission send a letter to congressional delegation in support of farm bill and increasing habitat protection.

Motion by G. Jensen, second by Phillips TO HAVE GFP STAFF DRAFT A LETTER FOR COMMISSION SIGNATURE IN SUPPORT OF HABITAT AS IT RELATES TO THE FARM BILL. Motion carried.

### **Bighorn Sheep Survey Results**

Chad Lehman, senior wildlife biologist, presented a powerpoint on bighorn sheep research and management. Lehman provided an overview on population surveys, licenses and transplant history. He also provided detailed research data collected from Rapid City, Badlands, Elk Mountain, Hell Canyon, Custer State Park and Deadwood herds. Lehman provided harvest recommendations based upon survey data for the identified herds. He noted in the Badlands herd most of the sheep are located in National Park Services lands and roughly 70 of them are outside the park during the hunting season.

## **Waterfowl Hunter Survey Results**

Longmire provided a powerpoint presentation on the 2017 survey of waterfowl hunters in South Dakota noting questions were in regards to participation, satisfaction, hunting attributes, policy and avidity. She provided detailed information on the duck season structure questionnaire that received 930 responses noting where they primarily hunt and their bag limits. Longmire showed information on current season structures which indicate most people take full advantage of duck hunting opportunities most years.

## **Year-end 2017 License Sales**

Scott Simpson, wildlife administration chief, provided the license sales report as of January 7, 2018 for all resident and nonresidents for all license types for the past 5 years. The report indicates furbearer licenses are up and resident combination license sales are consistent with last year.

Sharp stated he likes how the new report format includes multiple years to show trends and difference in license and revenue numbers.

Simpson provided a handout showing estimated revenue numbers. He explained how staff compiles these predictions in August 2016, a year and a half in advance, for a 2017 license year without a number of factors such as drought, nonmeandered waters, or additional factors.

Sharp said he is optimistic and reminded the group we sell the opportunity and the experience.

Hepler said staff does a good job messaging. He noted more birds are harvested in South Dakota in bad years than in surrounding states do on average and that conservation is everyone's responsibility.

## **Statewide Fisheries Plan Accomplishments**

Geno Adams, wildlife program administrator, provided an update on the statewide fisheries plan noting the priorities, fish management areas, statewide fisheries management plan for each fish management area and AIS plan. He detailed the plan priorities of access, urban fisheries, maintaining angler satisfaction at 4.5 percent, and evaluation of regulation effectiveness.

## **Employee Recognition Award**

Leif presented Tim Withers, program assistant II, with the Division of Wildlife Distinguished Achievement Award for exemplary public service.

## **WAFWA Commissioner Update**

G. Jensen provided an update from the WAFWA meeting he recently attended. He said they discussed issues facing each state noting those with similar usually were states with typical landscape. Common issues included CWD and AIS. G. Jensen presented information on nonmeandered waters and nonresident waterfowl. He said there was a lot of discussion on funding and decrease of users. Arizona suggested doing the best with what they have while Nebraska utilized habitat licenses plates to raise \$120,000. Other items discussed were recruitment of new hunters, anglers, and

park user's stressing reactivation, options like providing fishing licenses information to all who licenses boats in the state and advertising.

### **Pheasant Fest**

Kirschenmann provide a handout on the upcoming pheasant fest event noting which events would be of interest to the Commissioners such as the precision agriculture workshop and Community Access Coalition where Secretary Hepler will provide a presentation. He noted Pheasant fest is a huge trade show on habitat, hunting, fishing, cooking, dogs, training and more.

Kiel provided information on the promotional marketing front where GFP has been present at since the beginning. She said GFP is still partnering with tourism but also unveiling 100 years of pheasant hunting season and state park system to highlight hunting camping and outdoor recreating. GFP will have two booths right at the front door when folks enter to educate and inform attendees on all rules and regulations as well as promoting the website, mobile app and provide information on social media promoting small game and fishing licenses as well as park entrance licenses

### **SOLICITATION OF AGENDA ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS**

No new agenda items were requested at this time.

### **Adjourn**

Motioned by Sharp, second by Phillips TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. Motion carried unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

**Appendix A**  
**RESOLUTION 18-01**

WHEREAS, Taylor Anderson of Groton, South Dakota, submitted a Petition to the Game, Fish and Parks Commission (Commission) dated December 28, 2017, requesting that the Game, Fish and Parks Commission amend ARSD § 41:07:03:03 (Daily, possession and length limit restrictions on special management waters) – proposing to increase the minimum length limit to take muskellunge and northern-muskellunge (tiger) cross from 40 inches to 50 inches and for the reasons more fully set out in the petition (hereinafter referred to as “the Petition”); and

WHEREAS, all members of the Commission have been furnished with and have reviewed a copy of the Petition; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has been advised that a copy of the Petition has been served on all members of the Interim Rules Review Committee and Director of the Legislative Research Council as required by SDCL § 1-26-13; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has been advised that SDCL § 1-26-13 requires that within thirty (30) days of submission of a Petition, the Commission shall either “deny the petition in writing (stating its reasons for the denials) or shall initiate rule-making proceedings in accordance with SDCL 1-26-4.”; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has been advised and is of the opinion that a hearing on the Petition is neither statutorily required nor necessary; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has reviewed and carefully considered the requirements and procedures set out in SDCL §1-26-13 and the contents of the Petition, including the reasons advanced by Petitioner in support of increasing the minimum length limit to take muskellunge and northern-muskellunge; and

WHEREAS, after consulting with the Petitioner, the Commission instead took separate action to propose that harvest restrictions for muskellunge and northern-muskellunge (tiger) cross be changed from a 40-inch minimum length limit with a daily limit of one to catch-and release only.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Commission does hereby deny the Petition for the reasons hereinabove stated in this Resolution, which said Resolution as adopted by the Commission shall constitute the Commission’s written denial of the Petition and its reasons therefore.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Petition, a record of the Commission’s discussions concerning same, and this Resolution be made a part of the Minutes of the Commission meeting at which this Resolution is adopted, and further, that the Department be and it is hereby authorized and directed in compliance with SDCL §1-26-13 to serve a copy of an extract of that portion of the Commission minutes which pertain to the Commission’s discussion of the Petition and its adoption of this Resolution, including a copy of the Resolution, on all members of the Interim Rules Review Committee and Director of the Legislative Research Council with copies also to be provided to the Petitioner, Taylor Anderson of Groton, South Dakota.

Appendix B

**2018 and 2019 Bighorn Sheep Hunting Season**

Bighorn Sheep Licenses		
Unit	2018	2019
BHS-BH1	0	0
BHS-BH2	3	3

## Appendix C

### Preference Point System for Limited License Drawings

Cube preference points for all limited draw licenses. This would apply to all accumulated and purchased preference points for the following limited draw seasons:

Archery Paddlefish  
Access Permit Sioux Falls Archery Deer  
Access Permit Sage Grouse  
Good Earth/Adams Access Permit Archery Deer  
Black Hills Deer  
Black Hills Archery Elk  
Black Hills Firearm Elk  
Black Hills Bighorn Sheep  
Black Hills Mt Goat  
Custer Antlerless Elk  
Custer Bighorn Sheep  
Custer Early Archery Elk  
Custer State Park Mt. Lion Access Permit  
Custer Non-Trophy Bison  
Custer Spring Turkey  
Custer Trophy Bison  
Custer Antelope  
Custer Deer  
Custer Elk  
East River Deer  
East River Special Buck  
Muzzleloader Deer  
Nonresident Waterfowl  
Nonresident Youth Waterfowl  
Prairie Fall Turkey  
Prairie Antelope  
Prairie Elk  
Prairie Spring Turkey  
Refuge Deer  
Paddlefish Snagging Francis Case  
Resident Special Canada Goose  
Paddlefish Snagging Gavins Point  
Access Permit Archery Spring Turkey  
Tundra Swan  
West River Deer  
West River Special Buck



Public Hearing Minutes of the Game, Fish and Parks Commission  
January 11, 2018

The Public Hearing Officer Scott Simpson began the public hearing at 2:03 p.m. at RedRossa Convention Center in Pierre, South Dakota with Commissioners Barry Jensen, Gary Jensen, Russ Olson, Scott Phillips and Douglas Sharp present. Mary Anne Boyd participated via conference call. Chairman B Jensen indicated written comments were provided to the Commissioners prior to this time and will be reflected in the Public Hearing Minutes. Simpson then invited the public to come forward with oral testimony.

### **Duck Hunting Season**

Kit McCahren, Pierre, SD informed the Commission he wants low plains south duck season to start later than proposed due to the actual physical count because he says ducks do not hit big water until later in the year. He noted the worst case scenario would be the ducks will stay north of us and live in piece until the season starts. McCahren recommend the season begin the first Saturday in November corresponding with the goose season.

Mike Edwards, Webster, SD, emailed, Why start the duck season Sept 29? Most of the blue wing teal are gone by then. It happened this year! And what a joke having the season close this year Dec 12th. Everything around here had been frozen shut for a week. Minnesota finally got smart and opens their season early. Why are we going backwards?? Also, way too many nonresident licenses for this area (Day County). You should have had a traffic cop at everything rural intersection here. It was very hard to find a place to hunt!!!

Jim Blankenheim, Tomahawk, WI, emailed, "The only change that affects me is the raising the Pintail daily bag to 2 birds. We saw an abundance of Pintail this year, more than we had in the past. So much so we were scratching our heads trying to figure out why the reduction from 2 to 1. I know our group of 6 hunts a relatively small area for 4 days so we are not necessarily getting the big picture. Some days we saw more Pintails than Mallards. So we would like to see the daily bag return to 2 Pintails. Probably due to the later opening last year, we saw very few BWT. We had trouble filling the 2 bonus Blue-wings most days. Green -wings on the other hand, were present in huge flocks, some approaching triple digits. I have never seen GWT in such abundance and I've been hunting ducks for 62 years. Again, maybe a combination of drought, nesting suitability, later opening and our hunting being restricted to a relatively small area."

Frank Kern, Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, "I propose having the low plains south zone season opener on the first Saturday of November and extend the season into January. Due to climate change and farming practices the migration keeps coming later in the fall each year not leaving us much time to shoot ducks. This year the Yankton Sioux Tribe has duck season running from October 7<sup>th</sup>-February 5<sup>th</sup> 2018 and most of their property falls in the South Zone. It just doesn't make sense to me that it would be OK for a person to shoot a duck on 1 side of a barbed wire fence but literally on the other side the season is closed. Same ducks, same county and different seasons. The mallards didn't come down until December 20<sup>th</sup> this year leaving us a 6 day duck

season and the tribe has this all figured out so they made the change. This has gone on long enough now.”

Eric Ott, Logansport, IN, emailed, “My name is Eric Ott and I am a resident of Indiana who has been coming to South Dakota for the past 30 plus years to pheasant and duck hunt. I am also a South Dakota property owner (along with other family members) who has approximately \$750,000 invested in a home and property on Lake Sinai. My family and friends make multiple trips to South Dakota during the year to hunt, fish and visit many South Dakota friends. I typically make multiple trips each fall to pheasant hunt and always have a group of guys that make the trips with me each time. We would also like to hunt waterfowl as well, but are always limited to either not getting drawn in the lottery or if we are drawn are limited to a restricted amount of days to hunt. I’m contacting you to voice our opinion what changes we would like to see with your Non-Resident Waterfowl licensing process. We would like to be guaranteed we are going to be able to hunt waterfowl each year and would also like to have the opportunity to make multiple visits throughout the season to waterfowl hunt. If this policy was adopted, we realize we may need to buy multiple licenses, similar to the small game licenses which have 5 day splits. This would also allow us to make multiple trips a year to waterfowl hunt. I also know many waterfowl hunters that would like to come to South Dakota to hunt but elect to go to surrounding states because of the ease of getting licenses compared to your process in South Dakota. I strongly believe that many of your local businesses are losing sizeable revenues due to the existing process. I have heard this on numerous occasions from business owners and friends I have that live in South Dakota. Another change we would like to see considered would be to loosen the restriction for getting resident licenses when you have invested as much into property as we have and still can’t be guaranteed to be able to waterfowl hunt each year. Our property is owned by all family members and it is our intent to keep it in the family for many years to come. With the current system, there is numerous times that we would love to be there with family and friends to waterfowl hunt but can’t due to your existing process. Please consider the above information in your upcoming hearings. Also, please feel free to contact me directly if you would like to discuss further. Thanks again I look forward to your assistance !”

Mark Heck, Mitchell, SD, emailed, “I totally agree with changing the daily bag limit to 8 on the early goose season. I know the 15 limit was designed to reduce the goose local goose population, I believe that mission has been accomplished. As for changing the opening date on the low plains south zone, I don’t see any benefit. Changing the date to the same weekend as the pheasant opener will reduce hunter participation to some degree. Having the season go to the first weekend in January what is the thinking there? Unless we have an above normal winter everything will be frozen and the ducks long gone. Also by the time the end of December rolls around there is minimal water down on that part of the river. The Army Corp. starts reducing the water flow on the Friday after Thanksgiving, end of the Navigation Season. A couple weeks after that it is difficult getting around down there. When it is all said and done we are just losing a week of duck hunting. In my opinion you should leave the season the way it is.”

Tom Curran, Yankton, SD, emailed, “Dear Commissioner: I am writing concerning the Low Plains South Duck season date proposal that would change the season opening from the second Saturday in October to the third Saturday in October. I have been hunting ducks and geese in the Low Plains South unit for over 20 years, both

on the water, Missouri River, and in fields in Yankton, Bon Homme, and Charles Mix counties. The majority of the hunting opportunity in this zone is by far those hunting the waters of the Missouri River. Each year the weather is different and unpredictable. Weather, both precipitation (especially snow) and temperature (especially cold!!) has a lot to do with the timing of the migration of some species of ducks. However the majority of duck species migrate based on day length – when it's time to go, it's time to go! This is especially true of the duck species that migrate early in the fall, like blue wing teal and pintails. As the season currently sits, opening roughly the second weekend in October, opportunities for these early migrators is the best that it gets in this zone. Earlier would be better – but I'm not proposing we do that! Although, when Nebraska opens their teal only season on the Missouri river about 2 weeks earlier than our season opens, they push early ducks off the river. During the second week of October (as the season currently sits), there are consistently excellent opportunities for a variety of ducks including wood ducks, widgeon, gadwall, a few mallards and a few green wing teal. Early October provides some of the most consistent opportunity for variety and action on a wide variety of ducks. Some of my favorite and most memorable hunts have been of opening weekend on the Missouri River with a friend of mine, his son, and my son and maybe a friend or two, and harvesting limits that include 4 or 5 different kinds of ducks. And the weather isn't so cold that the kids are happy! Third or fourth week October hunts with results like this would not be possible. Most of these birds would be gone – both from the timing of the migration and also because Nebraska hunters, whose season was already open for several weeks, would have pushed the birds south. The person or group that is proposing this zone's duck season start date to move back a week (they would like it moved even later, I would guess) are only concerned with late mallard shooting in conjunction with goose hunting. This is a relatively small percentage of the people that hunt the south unit and only those that are lucky enough to have private field hunting available. Whether there are mallard opportunities for the field hunters in January is extremely variable and depends on weather again. In my 20 years of hunting the Missouri River, I have never been able to get out and hunt on the river due to ice conditions past Christmas – most years it is 1 week prior to that. What this boils down to is trading early season multi-species hunting opportunities from the majority of south unit hunters for the possibility of late season, one-species opportunity for a minority of hunters. I respectfully request that you leave the season opener for the Low Plains South duck unit as it is, the second week of October because this date provides more opportunity for more people that hunt in this zone. Whatever you decide, I will respect your decision and want to thank you for ALL that you do for our great state, wildlife, parks, and people.”

Mark Abrams, Rapid City, SD, emailed “I'm concerned why you want to keep making the duck season later. It the past it always opened the 1st weekend of Oct. and then a number of years ago you switched to the 2nd weekend and now you want to make it the 3rd weekend. Bad idea as it would now open the same time as pheasant season. We often get a cold spell sometime during the 1st and 3rd weekend of Oct. and many of the local ducks move south, especially the teal. If the season runs for 74 days a good portion of the late season will be conducted when many of the local ponds are completely frozen. Your proposal only seems to make sense if you hunt a river and there is open water.”

## **Goose Hunting Season**

No oral testimony was received.

J. Dwight Poffenberger, Jr., Cincinnati, OH, emailed, "Sirs, I support reducing the limit on geese. I do NOT support increasing the pintail limit. Please keep the pintail limit at one."

Patrick E. Pleiss, Janesville, WI, emailed, "Just curious why the proposed change from a limit of 15 to 8? My personal observation is "way too many geese in populated areas". But other than limited observation, I have not information on why the change being proposed is a good one. I think the change on the possession limit to 3 times the daily bag limit is a good one. I like the variable/sliding rule. So if the limit changes, the possession limit automatically changes as well. Keep up the great work in managing your state's resources."

Nick Tunge, Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, "I would like to start out saying thank you to everyone involved in managing wildlife in South Dakota. My comment is in regards to goose limits. I fully support the lowering of limits and feel this will increase opportunities for more hunters to have success harvesting geese. I certainly am not a great goose hunter so when I see groups with large piles of 70 or 80 geese or more am am in awe of their success, but also a little sad when I recall how 1 or 2 /day was enough. There is some loss of respect for such a creature when we now need to kill so many in a day to make it a "success". I realize these limits are based on scientific management and the need to control numbers. I would prefer any opportunity for hunters over egg addling, so please keep making the sound scientific decisions that make Canada geese so abundant, but know that there is support from myself and others for lower limits."

Leo Flynn, Rapid City, SD, emailed, "Just wanted to say strongly in favor of adding Lawrence and Mead co to unit 2 goose season."

### **Bighorn Sheep Hunting Licenses Allocation**

No oral or written testimony was received.

### **Enhanced Preference Point System for License Drawing**

Ross Swedeen, Rapid City, SD said it is important to him that this gets approved providing opportunity for opportunity by giving those with the most preference points the most opportunity. Swedeen noted elk is basically a lottery. He said with the focus on deer. He went on to explain how he drew Black Hills deer tag this year with 10 pts and a friend also did with only 5years preference. He also noted that a friend with 1 point drew when he didn't with more points.

Ron Hulzebos, Harrisburg SD, emailed, I have suggested squaring or cubing preference points in past hunter surveys and am definitely in favor of you doing so.

Randy Majeske, Aberdeen, SD emailed In regards to the preference point proposal as submitted I would be in support of the measure as that makes more sense over the current system. Where as the individual with more preference points should have more chances of getting drawn. I also realize that there are only so many licenses

for a unit/season, etc but it is discouraging to see some draw a license with only a few preference points where you have a lot more only to get turned down.

Doug Van Bockern, Renner, SD I like the proposed changes, cube my preference points

Jeff Gulbransen, Keystone, SD emailed I think the system works fine the way it is. The luck of the draw is already reduced by point purchases. My opinion is do away with preference points altogether. If you are lucky enough to draw an elk you must wait 10 years to resubmit. Everyone has the same chance. Keep it simple and keep it fair. Thank you for taking my comments.

Steve Dannen, Sioux Falls, SD emailed, I would be in favor of the proposed cubed preference point system.

Bob Koscak, Rapid City, SD, emailed, Your proposal is about the dumbest idea I ever heard. Who came up with tripling it? I'll bet that was well thought through! Hey, maybe a better idea is instead of tripling the points (multiplying points to the power of 3) multiply using the power of 3.1 instead. That makes much more sense, doesn't it? Your computer will do that, won't it? Seriously, I am somewhat opposed even to the current point system. No one with none or low preference points even has a chance against the higher point applicants. I think you should have a certain level of high-point cutoff, where no one gains any more points beyond the cut-off, maybe no higher than 5 or 10. Your system now is quite discouraging to bring in new hunters. You'll make it worse with your proposal. Of course I assume you do in fact want to bring in new hunters. Your proposal makes me wonder. Do you know of any other lottery system, for example the State's gambling ones, that gives a preference to those who have not won before? And I recommend you abandon any preference point system for the rare species; Mountain Goat and Sheep, maybe even drop it for all Custer Park applications; everyone applies on an even footing always. I wouldn't even consider applying for the rare licenses and giving you my applicant fee for what seems a million to one odds. There's my opinion, for all it's worth.

Chris Gehrman, Sioux Falls, SD emailed, I do not agree with the preference point purchase system at all. If you don't draw what you desire you should automatically get a preference point.

Andy Jackson, Rapid City, Cubing sounds like a great idea especially for those of us older folks with lots of preference points for CSP elk, for example.

Trevor Linden Hansen, Parker, SD, As a hunter I am FOR the proposed cubed preference point system. It will give me more incentive to make sure I'm buying preference points every year because one point is worth so much more.

Corey Gall, Hurley SD, I am writing in reference to the current preference point system that is being used for Big Game in South Dakota....I say "get rid of it!" At this time, I would think that since the system is called a preference system, that it would be a true preference system. Those with the most preferences in a specific drawing would get the tag in which they have applied for....if there are tags left over, it goes to the next largest number and so forth. I know of guys who have 20 yrs elk preference who are 60+ years old and are thinking about stopping applying because they are afraid the hunt

will be to physically demanding for them in the next few years and that's just not right. These very people have paid hundreds in preference points over the years, and may not ever see a tag. Please change the Big Game drawing to a true preference system, the ones with the most preferences should get the tags.

Steve Kennedy, Mitchell, SD, emailed, I agree with the proposal to help hunters with many years preference have more entries by adding a year and "cubing" the number. I'm 64 and was hoping that I would draw the CSP elk tag while I'm still able! Thank you, thank you!

Eric Leebens, Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, I just read the email release concerning the proposed preference point system change, and I think the change is a terrific idea. It presents a happy medium between the current system (which I do not like) and a true top down point system (which I don't like either). Other western states have used the cube format with significant success, and I think it will work well for South Dakota. Please, implement the proposed cubed point system. It's the fairest option regarding preference points.

Gary Harmelink, Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, I think that your ideas on the point system are great!

Bryan Hisel, Mitchell, SD, emailed, I am strongly in favor of the proposed changes to the preference point system.

Brian Young, Wentworth SD, emailed, I am completely for the proposed point system.

René and Dale Larson, Lead SD, emailed, This cube proposal would be better than the current system. I do not understand why this can't be a top down drawing. No one and I repeat no one should get a license the first year of the draw unless there are more licenses than submissions. The top down system would be a way better system and let folks actually get a license before they are too old to hunt. Thank you for your time

Kevin Stulken, Sioux Falls, SD emailed, My concern is that we have people that have more than 15 preference points and continue to have to wait for a license, where as some hunters could, by the luck of the draw, receive two licenses before the first hunter receives a license. I would like to see that any hunter with more than 10 preference points goes on a first receive basis. It's not right, in my opinion, that they should have to continue to wait, when someone with no preference points can receive a license ahead of them.

Earl Rider, Watertown, SD, emailed, I would be in favor of the new point system especially for the Elk drawings

Danny McLaughlin, Brookings SD, emailed, I think that this new Cube system would just make a more complicated system and would not achieve the desired results. The main change that should be done is that preference should go to individuals in the geographic area of which they're applying in comparison to their residence. Adding a preference point for those who are applying in their county or surrounding counties would decrease poaching and trespassing. Deer management would improve as well due to hunters who drive several hours for the one weekend they can make it. They

often shoot deer less than two years of age because they do not want to go home empty handed. Local hunters are more tied to the land and wildlife in their area. Individuals who are not familiarized with the area they applied are also more likely to spot hunt from the roads, disrupting deer movements and other hunters.

John Farstad, Hayti, SD, emailed, I don't quite understand the logic of trying to change the system to something that just complicates it. Why can't we have a true top down point system. I think it's illogical and wrong to have people drawing tags after 3-4 years when the next guy could have 20, as I've seen in past elk draws. Or when it took me 6 years to draw any deer muzzloader while my buddy gets it every 2-3 years. What would be the drawback to having a top down draw system? It has to be the most honest and easy way to do it. I can't think of one outdoorsman who doesn't feel the same way. I would really appreciate feedback on what the drawbacks would be to a true top down point system. Thank you

Bill Hoffman , Platte, SD, emailed, I would like to see the preference points squared like Nevada and Montana do it. Example: 3 preference points squared = 9 + 1 for current year for a total of 10 chances.

Gregory Hubbard, Lake Andes, SD, emailed, The current system gives applicants with points a fair advantage over those with low or no points. Multiplying "cubing" points is ridiculous and virtually eliminates the chances of a new hunter, a hunter unable to hunt the previous year or a hunter that drew the previous year getting drawn. I am an avid SD deer (East River, West River & archery) and turkey hunter. I am considering Black Hills deer and elk but would cut back on applications if the cubing is enacted!

Michael Schille, Rapid City, SD, emailed, I am not in for of this system. The problem originates at how many tags one person can get. There is absolutely no reason any holder if an elk tag needs a deer tag, not in South Dakota. We do not have the luxury of hunting land like in most western states. Stagger out the deer drawings so if you get n elk tag or a deer tag you may not apply for other deer tags. Many of us go years without even being able to hunt because some drew an elk tag and deer tag. When they fill their elk tag they have no interest in deer hunting and may others may by luck draw 3 deer tags. Kids can get a tag every year until they're 18 and then what. The drawing system needs improved.

Tom Jensen, Harrisburg, SD, emailed Absolutely agreed to implement cubing of preference points! Please log this as my feedback as requested by GFP Thank you for the proposal and agree 100%

Mike Schortzmann, Rapid City, SD, emailed, "I am in favor of the new proposed preference point system. I know people who have applied for many years and before they could get drawn got too old and had to quit applying. This system would hopefully give people with more years' preference a better opportunity to receive a tag."

Spencer Vaa, Brookings, SD, emailed, "SD GFP Commission, I like the proposal to cube preference points. It would help hunters who have been applying for many years and getting up in age, myself included."

Mark Williamson, Britton, SD, emailed, "Dear GF&Park Commissioners, I do think you are on the correct track. Would it more fair to start with squaring the preference points, as to cubing? After two years, evaluate how this is affecting the draw. If your goals are being met, so be it. If not, try cubing it.

I ran some figures comparing 1+1 chances vs. 4+1.

Current system: 1+1 has a 60% less chance to draw.

Squaring: 1+1 has a 84% less chance to draw.

Cubing: 1+1 has a 93.6% less chance to draw.

When comparing 1+1 vs. 9+1, the results are even more drastic.

Current system: 1+1 has an 80% less chance to draw.

Squaring: 1+1 has a 96% less chance to draw.

Cubing: 1+1 has a 99.2% less chance to draw.

I can see advantages and disadvantages to each system as I currently have preference points in South Dakota, Colorado, Wyoming and Montana. Each has their own wrinkles, and some states vary by species. I agree that something needs to change, it's just a matter of how drastic the change will be. Good Luck !"

Brett Andrews, Aberdeen, SD, emailed, "Hello my name is Brett Andrews and I live in Aberdeen, SD. The following is my opinion on the on the proposed "cubing" of preference points on the limited draw seasons. I feel that there is no need for cubing of a person's preference points. I would like to know what complaints have been brought to the commissions attention to cause this change, it seems very drastic. I can only assume it is Bull Elk tags and East River Buck tags but we will never know. I feel like this kind of came out of left field, all the people I talk to have zero complaints about the current system we have now. I have drawn 3 west river buck tags the last 3 years and I have applied for east river buck tags the last 2 years and was drawn once. I do not expect to draw an Elk tag for many years because I know the amount of demand for those tags! I have no complaints about the amount of times I have been successful in drawing a tag, and neither would majority of hunters. I believe this cubing of points is a smoke and mirrors type of solution. It is a direct copy of Montana and Nevada's "squared" points system and every resident and non-resident hunter I know who hunts or has hunted MT or NV is not in favor of the "squared points system." It sounds good and it sounds like your name is in the hat a lot more. But it offers little statistical advantage, and that advantage only goes to max point holders or the one with the most points because all who apply have their points increased by the same curve. If people are going to complain about being unsuccessful when applying for hard to draw, once in a lifetime, or hunts with draw odds of less than 1% then they should apply for different units. It is the same with waterfowl hunting, if we were to open it up to all non-residents then the quality of hunting would severely diminish. Same goes for if we gave everyone that applied a bull elk tag, or a buck deer or antelope tag every year. Hard to draw units are units where the quality of the animals in it are reflected by the amount of people that want to hunt them. \*The best way to increase the odds of drawing those tags is to work on measures that increase tag numbers. In other words, putting more sheep on the mountain, more elk in the hills, more deer in the fields. That is the only way to increase drawing odds.\*This cubed system would not be very favorable to young or new hunters just starting out, and hunter recruitment is the most important factor in conservation of our wildlife.I have an idea and an alternative I would like to offer to the "cubed" point system. If you go back and review the past drawing statistics on the SDGFP website you see that the majority of allotted landowner tags are never filled or even applied for.



What if we made 10% of the unfilled landowner tags available to those applying for the non-landowner limited draw seasons. Biologists analyze units and determine the amount of harvest each unit can receive and that is factored into the number of tags (both resident or non-resident and landowner or non-landowner) allotted for the unit. So the populations of deer or elk or antelope in a unit is able to withstand every tag being filled and not be subject to overharvest. That is the reason a wildlife biologist sets the tag limits according to each unit. So if only 20% of the landowner tags for a unit are issued and all the non-landowner tags are issued there is room for more animals to be harvested according to the limitations set by wildlife biologists. I am going to give an example of my thoughts behind this. Hypothetically take 2 Black Hills Elk units, let's call them unit 1 and unit 2. Say unit 1 has 110 landowner elk tags and 90 non-landowner tags for 200 total tags allowed to be issued by the wildlife biologists. Unit 1 is a large unit with lots of public land and receives a lot of applications from non-landowners because of the amount of public land. Unit 1 issues all 90 of its non-landowner tags and has no leftover non-landowner tags. On the flipside unit 1 always has left over landowner tags because there is very little private land in the unit. Unit 1 issues only 10 landowner tags and has 100 leftover landowner tags. Based on my alternative system the SDGFP would issue 10% of the remaining landowner tags which would be 10 more tags, and issue them to 10 additional non-landowners. This would result in there being a total of 110 hunters in Unit 1 instead of 200 which is the amount the unit could receive and maintain a population based on the wildlife biologist's set tag limitations. This would mean 10 more people who normally would not have received a tag and would have to try their luck again next year now receive a highly sought after tag. Now for Unit 2. Unit 2 is a small unit and the majority of the land is private. It receives a lot less applications compared to Unit 1 because of its limited public land opportunities. Unit 2 has 50 landowner tags and 50 non-landowner tags. Unit 2 due to its high amounts of private land issues 40 of its 50 landowner tags and issues all 50 of its non-landowner tags. Based on the alternative system 10% of the 10 leftover landowner tags would result in 1 leftover landowner tag being issued to a non-landowner applicant. I could go into much greater detail about this but I feel like I am getting long worded and you can get the basics of my idea. I am not for the sale of landowner tags and I am not for the cubed point systems. If you look into the response from residents and non-residents to Montana's and Nevada's squared systems you will see they are not in favor. I would rather see us come together as a state, put our heads together and come up with an out of the box way to solution to this. Or we do not make any changes to a system that majority of people find zero issues with while promoting and doing more in the ways of conservation. Which will in turn increase opportunity.

\*The best way to increase the odds of drawing those tags is to work on measures that increase tag numbers. In other words, putting more sheep on the mountain, more elk in the hills, more deer in the fields. That is the only way to increase drawing odds.\* Thanks for reading!"

Darren Timm, Brandon, SD, emailed, "In regards to the proposal to cube preference points, I don't understand the purpose. I understand you will have more chances to win a tag drawn in a lottery situation but the percentage to win remains the same. For example if there are 3 preference points and 100 apps the percentage to draw a tag is 3%. Now if you have 27 points under the cubed system but all of the applications are cubed the percentage to win remains the same. The exception would

be the people with one application. They lose a fair chance to win since 1 cubed is 1. My proposal would be to not change the system.”

Michael Barnes, Murdo, SD, emailed, “I completely disagree with this new pref point system (cubing). You may be right when you allow that it still gives people "a chance" to draw with 1 or 2 pts, but do the math, it is very little chance. I believe by not giving a person ANY hope to draw, people will quit entering the drawings or quit buying pref pts. If you feel you must change the system, why not do something simple, like doubling (if I have 5 pref pts, I would have 10 chances in the drawing). Thank you for letting me comment.”

Timothy John Ferrell, Sturgis, SD, emailed, “I am in favor of the preference point system change. I think it is a good step to get us closer to a true preference point system and will allow one to better predict and plan for future hunting seasons as well as make it a more fair system.”

Brad Bierema, Tyndall, SD, emailed, “I think that people with preference points should have a higher chance of drawing, I am in favor for this cube preference point system.”

Cody J. Timmer, Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, “First off, thank you for considering my input. I too believe a change is necessary to the current South Dakota preference point system, as it will provide hunters who have been applying year after year, a significant advantage to be awarded a license they've long sought after. With that being said, it may lean too heavily in their favor. I believe a middle-ground should be reached where preference points are squared, instead of cubed. This would still provide those with a large cache of preference points a definite advantage, while still allowing those with limited points, an opportunity to draw a tag. While I don't believe it is SDGFP's intention to discourage new residents and hunters the opportunity to get into big game hunting, the results of a cubed system may do just that. My vote is in favor of a squared preference system, so new residents, new hunters, and those hunters with limited funds can still have a shot at drawing a license each year. Thank you!”

Eric Porisch, Rapid City, SD, emailed, “I am writing in response to the request for opinions regarding the proposal to cube preference points for big game licenses. I am suspecting that whomever brought up this proposal isn't seriously hoping for a cubed number, but possibly threw that number out there hoping for a negotiated amount somewhere in the middle. I feel a cubed amount is exorbitant. Even a squared amount, I believe, is taking it too far. I believe it is important for our hunting heritage to have opportunities for the youngest generation; that they stay interested in hunting. I feel that the proposal would greatly hamstring these young hunters, and that they may fall out of hunting. I believe a possible compromise may be possible with a setup similar, if not exactly, like Custer State Park manages their elk license distribution, with tiers for 15, 10, 5, and zero years preference. This would then still allow for the hunters with many years preference, even more possibility, while not shutting out the young hunters.”

Derek Kern, Wadena, MN, emailed, “Hello SDGFP, First off, I am a non-resident hunter that appreciates SD's hunting opportunities for those that live out of state. I think the proposed cubed preference point system is a great idea and a fair way to move forward. There are many opportunities to hunt deer in SD. Hunters even have the ability

to shoot multiple deer (even bucks) on a yearly basis if they apply for certain hunts (West River, East River, Special Buck, Archery, Refuge, Custer, etc.). I am a MN resident and we are only allowed 1 buck per year. It doesn't seem right that someone can draw multiple buck tags a year while others put time into the preference point system and are turned down year after year. I feel a solution is to implement the cubed system to fix this flaw. Here is one example: I have built up 6 preference points for West River. I apply for the same unit each year. It might take me 8 or more years to get this single tag. At the same time, an applicants with 2 points can (and do each year!) draw this coveted tag and also draw 3-4 other deer tags if they apply for units that have less demand. Over my 8 year waiting period this applicant could have received 30-40 or more deer tags while I wait for this single tag. I realize this is probably not normal but a reality in the current system. I think the cubed system would allow PP builders (like myself) a greater chance of drawing that single coveted tag they are after. The "lucky" 2pt draw applicant that I mentioned before would still be able to get their other less demanded tags each year. They would even still have a chance to get this hard to draw tag (albeit a much lower chance). I hope I am lucky enough to hunt in SD this year! Thank you for hearing my voice and I hope it is used at your January meeting. I would also like to add that SD has the best online application system out of all the western states I hunt! It is lightning years ahead of other states. The amount of data (draw results, pts breakdown, etc.) is great and really helps us hunters out!"

Dan Waldman, Aberdeen, SD, emailed, "I am not in favor of changing the preference point system entirely, however some areas might need to be tweaked. I propose that some counties with higher populations going for lower tag counts could go to the cubed type system to make it more fair. But what is considered fair? Some folks will not be happy unless they get a buck tag every year while others are fine with every other or every third. I hunt antelope out west and since the populations of goats has went down I have had 2 buck tags in the last 5 years. For me that is not too long of a wait. Elk tags could be made more fair going to a cubed system. I personally know people with 20+ years of preference. East river deer using Brown county as an example, everyone with at least 1 preference point got a buck tag. 25.2% of people got a tag on the first year of applying. I personally feel that getting a tag every other year is not too long of a wait for this county.

Resident East River Deer	Licenses Available to Preference Group	Number of Applications	Licenses Issued	Remaining Licenses
Landowner with 2 or more preference points	550	2	2	548
Landowner with 1 or more preference points	548	7	7	541
Landowner	541	359	359	182
2 or more preference points	732	15	15	717

1 or more preference points	717	467	467	250
0 or more preference points	250	992	250	0
Second Choice	0	93	0	0

Now looking at Turner County as an example, this county might be a case where a cubed system would make it more fair.

Resident East River Deer	Licenses Available to Preference Group	Number of Applications	Licenses Issued	Remaining Licenses
Landowner with 2 or more preference points	50	2	2	48
Landowner with 1 or more preference points	48	28	28	20
Landowner	20	55	20	0
2 or more preference points	50	126	50	0
1 or more preference points	0	161	0	0
0 or more preference points	0	322	0	0
Second Choice	0	50	0	0

I don't think that a cubed system is a change needed for all seasons across the board. I feel that some counties and seasons should be left alone. I feel that this proposed change is trying to fix a problem that only exists for a few people that think they need a buck tag every year.”

Todd West, Florence, SD, emailed, “I think the proposed preference point system would just add more names for everybody. Why not take the most preference points down to a certain point below the number of tags available and draw from them. Example you have 25 tags for a season there is 5 people who have 10 years preference points, 5 people have 9 years, 5 people have 8 years, 5 people have 7 years, 5 people have 6 years, 5 people have 5 years, 5 people have 4 years, 5 people have 3 years, 5 people have 2 years, 5 people have 1 year and 5 people applied for the first time. Take the top 6 years of preference points and draw from them. It still gives someone that only has 5 years preference a chance but most all the people that have the most points the

better odd. Also people that are applying can be told how many points they need to draw or have a chance to draw a tag more realistically.”

Gary Breuer, Madison, SD, emailed, “as someone in my 60's who had all but given up applying with over 20 points for Custer State Park elk I would be in favor of this change.”

Mike Braskamp, Ramona, SD, emailed, “My family and I are lifetime residents and landowners of south dakota. Hunting is also a big part of our life. We apply in several different states each year so I understand how the different systems work and I think this system of cubing would be a great benefit for long term applicants. My father is 66 and has been applying for tags since he was 16 to no prevail. This system would increase his chances a little. With that being said the first year applicants still have a chance of drawing. There is no perfect answer for which system to use but this way it does give the dedicated applicant increasing odds. Thank you for considering!”

Matthew Anderson, Hartford, SD, emailed, “Dear GFP Commission, In regards to the proposed action on changing the preference point systems; Please leave the system the way it currently is. The proposed change would not a benefit the people of South Dakota. It should stay a first come first served, top down system. I don't think it is fair to let others have the chance to cut in line of those who have been applying longer for a license.”

Anthony Bradley, Deadwood, SD, emailed, “I am sending a note in reference to the proposed change to the preference point system. I believe the current system will work better then the proposed change. The system is not perfect, as is, but is better then the proposed system.”

Doug Bechen, Whitewood, SD, emailed, “I am a SD native and west river landowner at Whitewood, SD with elk on my property. I have accumulated 22 preference points for a Black Hills rifle elk season. I exemplify a DRASTIC example of the current SD preference points lottery system.It appalls me when I have had family or non-family member that has drawn on a black hills elk tag with even less than 10 preference points. Some have had 5 of less. It is unacceptable!! People should have at least 5 preference points accumulated to even be considered in the drawing. This takes out an individual that puts in for the season and ends up with a elk tag by chance. 5 years accumulation would determine that an applicant is truly vested for pursuing a Black Hills elk tag. Your proposal does not address the overall issue!! You still allow individuals with lesser time in the lottery system to actually compete against those that have accumulated many years of preference points. I would strongly advocate that those allowed in the lottery draw NOT be allowed until they have accumulated at least 5 years preference points. I would also strongly advocate that any individual with over 20+ preference points be allowed double points in the lottery system. There is no difference with your idea of allowing an individual with 3 preference points then cubing to 64 points or the person with 21 cubing to 9,261 points - the odds are still the same. Those individuals should NOT be in the drawing period if they have less than 5 years preference points! It still remains an unfair system. I appreciate your consideration on this issue as you strive to make the preference point system more equitable for the Many of us with over 20+ points.”

Terry Schutz, Eureka, SD, emailed, "I sent an e-mail earlier and suggested a system of doubling the preference points and I want to add one other comment. Preference points should only be doubled if an application is submitted but failed to win a license in the lottery system. Any purchase of a preference point without submitting an application in the current year would be limited to one preference point (not double) regardless how many preference points were accumulated in the past. Thank you for allowing me to make the suggestion!"

Justin Murphy, Crooks, SD, emailed, "Implementing a perfect preference point system doesn't seem possible. No matter what decisions are made, hunters are not going to be happy with the results. A suggested change to the elk preference point system would be to have another higher year category for individuals with 20+ years of points. It would give those with more years a better chance at a percentage of the tags available and still allow those with fewer years an opportunity of drawing a tag. A cubed system will ultimately lead to point creep. I feel by changing this system to the suggested proposal will only lead to longer waits for individuals trying to draw certain tags. It is a lottery, not a guarantee. Hunting opportunity needs to be given to all (old and new). Causing more preference points to draw tags will discourage new and youth hunters. It is frustrating not drawing an elk tag year after year (10+ years myself) but that is how the lottery system works. My personal opinion would be to leave the system the way it is. I would however eliminate landowner tags or at least consider limiting the amount of tags allocated to landowners. Landowner or not, everyone should have a level playing field to draw an any deer tag. If the landowner is truly concerned with deer population, there are antlerless tags available and ample hunters willing to assist with the issue."

Greg Peterson, Clear Lake, SD, emailed, "SD GFP, I have just a couple of thoughts on the preference point system proposed changes. My ideas are only that – ideas and not something I'm requesting to be in the public record. I think I'm generally in favor of increasing the odds for people that have applied longer, but it depends on the tag. For example, I would be fine with a cubed system (or even true top down) for tags that are typically drawn within a few years (say maybe 2-10 years). In fact, that may be the most equitable for those. On the other hand, I don't think I would support doing a cubed approach for "once in a lifetime" type tags such as CSP Elk, Big Horn Sheep and Mountain Goat for a couple of reasons. First, you will see a drop in revenue from preference point sales as it *really* discourages new applicants for these very hard to draw tags (especially those who are no longer in their youth). For example, a 50-year old person that moves to SD or maybe just started hunting will have almost no incentive to start applying. Second, it will ultimately change the demographics of the hunter as you will end up with most hunters being well advanced in age. This may not happen right away but when only a very small number of tags are issued with thousands of applicants it will eventually end up being a longevity contest. I do realize it's not a true top down approach, but someday you will end up with an applicant that has 50 preference points with his/her name in the hat times 125,000 that will have 125x the odds of drawing compared to a person with 10 preference points (1000x the odds of someone with only 5 years). In all likelihood, you will eventually end up with only elderly hunters in the future which will completely change the hunting experience. I think most people would rather have a legitimate chance to draw a tag when they are physically able to hunt the way they want to than to see their odds go up as they get too old to enjoy the experience. If someone who reads this has time to respond, I would sure like

a call or return email – especially if someone thinks these ideas are something that would be helpful to put in the public record. Hopefully my thoughts are useful. Thanks for all you do.”

Bill Roth, Aberdeen, SD, emailed, “I agree with the proposal to cube the preference points for limited draw big game seasons . I think this is especially applicable to the drawings for elk , big horn sheep , and mountain goats where it generally takes many years to be successful in the drawings . I do not know the exact data , but if a hunter begins to apply for these seasons at age 40 and it generally takes 20 plus years to be successful , many hunters are reaching an age where physically it might be more difficult to have an enjoyable hunting experience . Providing an improved chance of drawing a license for those applicants who have been in the preference system for many years would be an improvement to an already good system. Thank you for your consideration of this proposal.”

George D. King, Spearfish, SD, emailed, “I really see no value in changing the existing preference point system in the State of South Dakota. In most instances where preference points are required to draw a particular license there are a number of applicants in the pool with the same amount of preference points. Cubing the number of points is only going to make the number of points the same for those who had the same number to begin with. Elk tags are at a premium and the chances for people drawing that particular license are between slim and none for that species anyway. Is the proposal on the table really going to make any difference in drawing a coveted elk license or just make those applying feel like they have a much better chance in the draw? Wouldn't it be better in the case of the elk drawing to remove the preference point system completely and make it totally a “luck of the draw system”? Make it a once in a lifetime opportunity because it is essentially that way now. This scenario could also be applied to other species in the state with the exception that it would not be once in a lifetime. If someone successfully applies for and receives a Black Hills deer license they would not be able to reapply for perhaps three years. I recently relocated from Colorado to the Spearfish area. In Colorado many of the highest quality elk units require more preference points to draw than most hunters can ever hope to accumulate. In my case I have 17 elk preference points and it will be impossible for me to ever attain the 23 points that are currently needed by a non resident to draw that tag. Each year the number to draw also creeps upward. Colorado is also using their preference point system to generate income at the expense of the hunters. When you apply in April the money for the license is held up until the time the drawing is held in June. At that time you are either issued a license or your money is returned. Pretty innovative financial approach given that Colorado Game Fish & Parks is literally tying up people's funds for nearly three months and collecting huge amounts of interest on it. Thanks you for the opportunity to provide comment and good luck on this one.”

Gary Roth, Aberdeen, SD, emailed, “Do away with the preference system altogether! For God's sake, it's a LOTTERY! Everyone has an equal chance and you win or lose by the “luck” of the draw. One's ability to BUY preference points as purposed, rigs the lottery system. If you go to Vegas or South Dakota casinos and you are losing at the slot machines or video games, they don't invite you to “come over here to this machine because we have it set for much better winning odds”. Get off of this political correctness idea that everyone gets to be a winner. If a person doesn't like the way a game is played, then quit.”

Dennis Clemens, Frankfort, SD, emailed, "I like the Idea of cubing the preference points but would like to see the tag allotments for over 2 years and over 10 years kept intact with this system."

Dean Birkeland, Bloomington, MN, emailed, "The proposal to cube preference points for hunting license drawings is a very good proposal. This is the best system for giving those with a higher number of preference points an excellent chance to draw a tag. I participate in license drawings in numerous western states including SD and the points cubed method is the best system, much better than a straight preference point method, or a plain bonus point method."

Terry Deuter, Kadoka, SD, emailed, "I like the idea of cubing preference points for applicants; however, I think the better solution would be to "not" cube points until after an applicant has applied for at least five (5) years. I feel that it would give other "first" time applicants a better chance at drawing a tag, but after applying five times would then give them the added advantage."

Dave Timpe, Hartford, SD, emailed, "I'm VERY MUCH in favor of this proposal and ask that you consider this email as my indication of support. I've been an active supporter, applicant and user of various limited issue licenses (East River and West River deer; Black Hills, prairie and Custer State Park elk; mountain lion both in the Hills and Custer State Park; turkey; mountain goat; big horn sheep; and paddle fish snagging) over the last forty plus years. I appreciate and enjoy the outdoor opportunities in SD afforded by the Game, Fish and Parks Commission and thank you for this. I believe this proposal gives long time supporters, such as myself, an edge for license success which is somewhat of a "reward" for long term participation. I urge you to support and pass this proposal. THANKS for considering this and let me know if you have questions on any aspect of it."

Paul Van Bockern, Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, "I think the proposed update to cube the current preference point system is a good idea. Other than a true drop down based system this "cube" seems to be at least an attempt to give those with more years of applying for the limited licenses a better chance. I appreciate the consideration."

Wayne Hoellein, Chamberlain, SD, emailed, "I am Wayne Hoellein of Chamberlain, SD. I am greatly against the proposed change to the preference point system. This is but one more move to giving the hunting licenses to the people with money to spend on points. I am 70 years old and have hunted in SD all of my life. I live on retirement income and cannot afford to spend extra money on points so I have a chance of getting a license. A lot of hunters in the state are in the same position. Older hunters on fixed incomes, younger hunter starting families and homes, lower income hunters, ect. Just don't have the ability to afford extra points and will be pushed out of the ability to hunt. Yes, I know that just because a person has a lot of points does not guarantee them a license, because the licenses are random picked by computer. But if they can pay for 20 points and get 8,000 chances in the system as compared to a person who has only one chance, who do you think will get the license? Not only am I against this "new and improved" system, I am really against the points system entirely. When I started hunting, everyone was on equal footing with equal chances. One application – one chance. No one person was better than another or had any more chances than anyone else. Every hunting opportunity was strictly the luck of the draw.



But, I can go along with the system where if you didn't get a license this year you could get one extra chance next year. But only one and none were for sale. The wildlife of South Dakota is supposed to be for all of the people of South Dakota. Not just for the people that can afford to shell out extra buck to get mega chances for a license."

Paul Roghair, Kadoka South Dakota, emailed, "I have been looking over the preference point system that is proposed and wanted to comment. First of all i think it is a good and bad idea. Good for deer seasons! Would love to see also more consideration given to those who live west of the river and have to fight with so many hunters coming from east of the river for deer season but that is beside the point. I can see giving a larger advantage to those who have built up so many preference points over the years. However when it comes to very limited draw tags, Elk, Sheep, Mt Goat. it seems to be a great way to have even less of a chance to draw and thus take this currently small, but turning astronomically small chance away from those who do not have so many years in. I think it would be prudent not to write off all those with lower preference numbers and keep people applying rather than just buying points for 20 plus years until they even get a chance to draw. Possibly square the number of years in for deer and not for elk and for sure not for the sheep and mt goat (if we have seasons) the cubing really increases the odds heavily upward. In a state that is supposed to be about sportsman so much of what I see it is about rich sportsmen and a product to sell off. It used to be common to get free hunting permission from a handful of people in an area, yet now almost always it comes back to "i have pay hunters" With young boys of my own I would like to know that that have the best chance possible to get into elk hunting at a young age, or to have a chance to draw that sheep tag. If the proposed system takes effect when my son gets to be 12 and has a passion to try I will have to tell him it would be better to by lottery tickets(if he was of age) and buy a hunt out west then it would be to draw a hills elk tag. I understand that the odds are not great now but they would get so tiny with this system i fear it would crush the hopes of many young hunters. Thank you for your time"

Bruce R. Lowe, SMSgt, USAF (Ret), Long Lake, SD, emailed, "I think you should trash the current system and begin a new way of selecting recipients of big game tags that is based on fairness rather than the luck of the draw.It's the system I experienced in CO, and worked so everyone could "see the light at the end of the tunnel" as long as they were consistent in applying for a specific hunt zone. If a person wasn't drawn their first year of applying, they received a preference point that actually positioned them in relationship to all other hunters, current and future. There was no lottery nonsense; a hunter had status and knew how the drawings would go in years to come, based on the computer database that tracked the number of tags released from year to year. I would be happy to share the details of the system with any GFP official willing to listen with an open mind, and understand that bureaucrats aren't the only people with solidly good ideas."

Steve J. Nafus, Belle Fourche, SD, emailed, Dear Commissioners:I don't believe that a person should be able to buy additional preference points.I would rather that a \$5.00 non-refundable fee be part of the application process.That fee would be used for the administration of preference points.I like the idea of the added extra point and cubing the rest points for better odds on those who did not get licenses the year before.This would be fair for all unsuccessful applications no matter what your income

group you are. I don't believe you should be able to purchase preference points to increase your odds at the next drawing. Thank you for asking for comments

Bill Haase, Bismarck, ND., emailed, I am a Wildlife Biologist for the ND Game and Fish Department and we have a similar system to the one you are proposing. Please view at the link below: <https://gf.nd.gov/licensing/lotteries/general> There is no perfect system, but this is very well received by the public. This method has become increasingly important since we have fewer deer tags available for our gun season. I encourage you to change your system to the proposed method of cubing or utilizing the method that is used by the NDGFD. Keep up the good work!

Galen Roesler, Custer, SD., emailed, I previously submitted a comment, but I forgot to add one thought. Referring specifically to BH Elk: if the purpose of this proposal is to increase the odds of drawing for those who have not drawn after many years of applying, why not make BH Elk a once in a lifetime tag or increase the waiting period between successful draws to 15 or even 20 years? I personally know a person who has had 3 BH either sex elk tags and is currently legally qualified to apply again. If you were to remove those who have previously drawn, the draw odds for everyone else would increase significantly. I am not in favor of changes to the preference point system.

Chris Podoll, Columbia SD, emailed, I don't not support a change to the current preference point system. We have a very good system the way it is.

Dan Amen, Rapid City, SD, emailed, I think the proposed Preference Point System is a Good Idea.

Jason Mitzel, Crooks, SD, emailed, I am not in favor of cubed points. If you want to give them a better chance then just go from the top down in preference points. Most preference points get tags on the way down till out of tags since they paid more money in for the preference points or if it's truly a lottery then leave it as is.

William Ernst, Pierre, SD, emailed, To the GFP Commission: Please see my input below for the preference point system for big game licenses. I appreciate the attempt to revise the preference point system so that it distributes licenses in a more equitable manner. While the proposed method of "cubing" points does not make the system less confusing, I do believe it gives hunters with more preference points a better chance at obtaining a license. Here are my suggestions for simplifying the license systems: Deer: Eliminate preference points for all licenses, and refund previous payments for preference points. Implement an antler-point restriction for "any deer" licenses in "high demand" counties. Reduce the price of "antlerless" licenses. Elk: Discontinue "landowner" licenses. Cube an applicant's preference points as proposed. Create more tiers for licenses available to preference groups. Big Horn and Mountain Goat: Eliminate preference points and create a true lottery system. One application per hunter only. Antelope: Maintain system Turkey: Maintain system Thank you for your time.

Galen Roesler, Custer, SD, emailed, I am opposed to the proposed change to the SD preference point system. I believe it would effectively eliminate the possibility for young hunters or others who have a limited number of preference points from drawing the most coveted tags such as BH elk. In my personal case, I have been a SD resident for much of my life, but left SD in 2002 due to an employment transfer. At that time I

believe I had around 15 preference points and had never drawn a BH elk tag. Upon leaving the state, I lost those preference points. In 2015, after retiring, I returned to SD and again started to apply for BH elk. At age 67, under the current system, I have little chance of ever hunting elk in SD.....under the proposed system, my odds would be about the same as winning the lotto. Is it possible to get my previous preference points restored? One key piece of information is missing from your GFP mailing concerning this proposal. What percent of the tags if any, would not be subject to draw by preference? Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Buck Cogle, Redding, CA, emailed, SDGF, I would like to see the current preference point system remain unchanged. I like the current system the way it is.

Derrick Larson, Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, Going from the current system to a cubed system is way too drastic in my opinion. I wish I would have started a lot earlier but I didn't start applying for tags or preference points for archery and rifle elk, bighorn etc until a few years back when I was around 41. Under the current rules I intend to continue to apply for and pay \$150/year or so for an annual chances at these tags (for my boy and I). At X2 I would apply for BH archery elk but that would be it going forward. Would keep applying for my boy at X2. Any more, I will quit applying for both of us due to the low probability of receiving a single tag over the next 10 years. My money will go to the states where I have a chance of drawing a tag each year.

Willie Werdel, Hurley, SD, emailed, Hello, I think the cubed preference point system is a great idea. It will allow those who have accumulated their preference points a better chance of drawing a tag and also allow the new applicants a chance. I feel the current system does not allow those with accumulated preference points enough of an advantage.

Ron Lauritsen, Custer, SD, emailed, I think this is a great idea. Thanks for the information.

Clay Cline, Rapid City, SD, emailed, I agree with this recommendation. I continue to see applicants with one or two preference points being awarded tags while others with three, five, ten and yes even fifteen years of preference points get passed by . When hunters have to wait this long for a tag, I'm sure, in some cases, we are losing them from the sport we are trying to preserve.

Jon Betten, Redfield SD, emailed, I am in favor of the proposed new preference point system. There are a lot of older folks out there that have been applying for many years and have not drawn. I think it is only right that the people that have put in there time should have a better shot at drawing that coveted tag they have been waiting for while they are still able to hunt... Also, I think it would take a lot of those 20 plus year guys off the top end every year making it better all around....

Bruce Langhoff, Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, I am 65 years old and have 28 years preference for Custer Park elk.....and there are a whole bunch of people who are even worse off! I think the proposal is worth a shot. The current system is a joke.

Mark Scott, Hartford, SD, emailed, It appears to me that you're on the right track increasing the amount of chances you have to draw a tag based on years of preference

on any big game species. I would specifically like to address the **elk seasons** and preference points: There are multiple applicants that have well over 20 years of preference for Hills elk and Custer elk. Applicant pool for elk seems to increase every year which proves its popularity. It appears to me that there are probably some applicants that will never see an elk tag even though they have 30 years of preference or more! I would like to see new applicants apply for a **preference point only for the first 3-5 years for any of the elk seasons**. Applicant should not expect to be drawn in the first three to five years. This would help those that have been applying for numerous years to have a better chance of getting drawn before they are no longer able to hunt elk! New applicants for any of the elk seasons would know before applying that it would be preference only. They need to earn it and not expect to be drawn the first few years! This would also apply to applicants who have had an elk tag 9 years earlier. They would also have to apply for preference in the first 3-5 years before being eligible to draw an elk tag. The applicant that has numerous years in should be drawing an elk tag before someone that has just applied for a year or two! This system would only apply to the elk seasons. Deer seasons should work the way you have the new preference point systems worked out. I realize my comments were not what you were asking for but wanted to add for future discussion!

Gordon Bradley, Rapid City, SD emailed, I think that the the idea of a "cubed" system for the special drawing is an incredible idea.

Dan Buehner, Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, I am writing in opposition to the proposed change to the preference point system. There are two reasons for my objection: 1) Assigning points by factoring (cubing) them seems very confusing and 2) The proposed changes would all but eliminate any chance when an applicant has none or only one preference point in a draw. The current system has worked and is easy to understand. Please leave the preference point system the way it is.

Jerry Jordan, Rapid City, SD, emailed, What happens to the new hunters? How do we get kids interested in the outdoors if they don't have a chance of drawing tags.

Gene Addink, Rapid City, SD, emailed, I read your email of December 21 concerning the Cube Lottery preference point system. I want to give you my input into the lottery system for the meeting coming up on January 11 & 12, 2018. I am in favor of the proposal you are suggesting. My belief is that whatever can be done to improve the odds for a person with preference points should be done. The cube system suggested goes a long way to accomplishing that. I have one other suggestion for consideration. At some point, a person who has accumulated preference points for many years should be first in line to get a license instead of needing to enter the lottery. This should work for all seasons with the possible exception of Bighorn Sheep and Mountain Goat. Those may be the exception since so few licenses are issued. Each unit may have a different level before a person is automatically issue a license. For example, Elk in the Park may take 20 years or 25 years before you get the first licenses available. For a west river deer unit, it may be 5 years. Thanks for your consideration.

Daniel Zach, Rosholt, SD, emailed, Sirs, I think the proposal of cubing a hunter's preference points is a good idea. I've been applying for an CSP elk tag for over 20 years and at 65 years old, I'll probably never draw a tag. So yes, I would be in favor of the proposal. Thank you

Paul Brian Ideker, Hartford SD, emailed, I think this is an excellent idea, we need to get the older generation/highest number of preference points the best chance to draw a tag as possible. I'm looking at it from the elk viewpoint more than anything. To many SD residences give up on getting an elk tag either because they get so frustrated or just plain to old. That's a sad thing as we have a great State to hunt elk in and to many miss out because they get to old to enjoy it. I'm hoping that by going to this version it will eventually get us to a more consistant number of years it will take to draw an elk tag.

Scott Guffey, Rapid City, SD, emailed, SDGFP Commission,I would support adjusting the SDFGP proposal to cube preference points for all limited draw seasons to give better odds to individuals with accumulated preference points.

Sharon Frohme , Hill City, SD , emailed, As a hunter who lived in the Black Hills I see some people who have up to 20 + preference points and still can not draw a tag.I am all for the proposal but think it should not be applied until they reach say 5 points.One other way to cut down on the harvesting of deer, instead of a draw, go back like it was before and cut the season down to two weeks.

Kent W. Miles, Leola,SD, emailed, Scrap the entire system. If you want to exclude working people from big game hunting just raise the cost of a license every year until you price enough of us out of it to suit you. Don't play silly games. We are poor not stupid. One application. One fee. One chance. Simple.

Todd Wiebenga, Dell Rapids, SD, emailed, GF&P,I would be very much in favor of the modification of the preference point system. I happen to be one of those who have 20 preference points for CSP Elk rifle and 18 preference points for CSP Elk archery. I also have multiple preference points for other CSP Elk licenses and Prairie Elk. The idea of cubing the number of preference points seems like a reasonable way to increase the odds for those with double digit points without eliminating the the hunters with single digit points. Big Thanks to all those at the GF&P for all they do for SD wildlife!!!

E.C. Maisonet, Rapid City SD, emailed, Good afternoon and Merry Christmas. I am a new resident to South Dakota as my wife and I have now retired and decided to relocate to Rapid City. Two years prior to our retirement we purchased our home and property in the Black Hills just outside of Rapid, however I was not allowed to hunt or gather points since we were still living out of the state. I enjoy both hunting and fishing and conserving our resources. I was a bit concerned and misunderstood the Preference point system. This year, I finally had the opportunity to purchase a few to enhance my opportunity to possibly hunt the Black Hills. With that said, I believe this proposal will give folks like me a chance on getting selected on a permit to hunt hear my home here in the Black Hills. I will be 70 years old by next August and hope that this proposal will help increase my opportunities. My wife and I love the state of South Dakota and plan to live here to our final days. I just like a good place to hunt near me, so I don't have to travel a long distance for the opportunity of a good hunt.

James. J. Vis, Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, What we need is for those with the most preference points to be drawn first every time. It is unfair that some people will get

drawn for elk in year one, while others have to wait decades. Those with the most preference should get the tags automatically.

Rob Powell, Rapid City, SD, emailed, Dear Commissioners I fully support the proposed changes to our non existent preference point system, This change would be more fair for our long term older hunters who have accumulated decades of point totals only to see those with much fewer be awarded the tags. Please update this system to the proposed change.

John Grenz, Rapid City, SD, emailed, Long overdue for a change. I started applying for park elk in my 20's and now age 62 with bad knees and back. Lost seven years of preference in the 80's because I could not get any time off work for a hunt and buying a preference point only was not an option. If you skipped a year of applying you lost all points. Got it back up to 28 preference points now. Which doesn't mean much with the current system. Its hard to convince myself each year to keep applying when I know that the fall before had guys hunting who weren't born yet when I started applying. Please change the system.

Ted Ruffledt Jr., Rapid City, SD, emailed, If everyone with preference points gets their points cubed doesnt it really result in the same percentage chance as a non-cubed drawing? Not sure I understand how this truly will help. Why doesnt the GFP just go to a top down drawing system for all preference point drawings and be done with it. That is what all hunters want.

Steve Greenfield , Watertown SD, emailed, I feel the proposed change to the preference point system would be a good improvement. Ideally a top down system would be implemented, but this is a good step in the right direction. Waiting 3 years to draw a tag seems unfair when some hunters are drawing back to back tags in the same county.

Eugene F. Hornstra, Yankton, SD, emailed, This GFP proposal including cubing is a much fairer & indeed a preferred system & I personally endorse implementation before next season.

Mervin Guthmiller, Rapid City, SD, emailed, Gentlemen, My thoughts regarding cubing the preference points. It would help those of us that have been hunting in SD for a long time, are getting to the age whereby we may not many years remaining to hunt, and have accumulated a high number of preference points. There probably are many in this group that have applying for an elk license for several years. I would like to see the cubing of preference points implemented.

Jason Adam Schuldt, Spearfish, SD, emailed, Dear Game & Fish Department - I am pleased to see that you are discussing making it more likely for applicants with more points to draw a tag. The proposed cubing of points is an excellent idea, and is fair to those with the most points, while still allowing hope for someone who has less points to draw. If the commission decides that the cubing idea is not for them, I would like to suggest a squaring of the points as an acceptable alternative. Squaring the points would also increase the odds for those with many points while allowing those with less points a little better chance. Thanks for all you do, and thanks for looking out for those with the most points.

Max Pravecek, Freeman, SD, emailed, Dear Sir:How can it even be legal to not enter a persons name into the lottery when he has applied for a license. An application submitted for a particular season is not an application for a preference point it is an application to obtain a license to hunt that particular animal. I noticed this a couple of years ago when I applied for Hills elk and they did not have any licenses set aside for the first time applicant. This is unfair. everyone should have a chance at obtain a license. Maybe some have more chances, that is fine but if you send in an application you should have a chance to get the license. I am one of those people that has or maybe had 20 preference points for Custer park elk. I have quit applying for Custer park elk because the odds of obtaining a license is worse than the Powerball lotto over 3000 people have 20 or more preference points now. I was told when I started to apply by a game warden in the Black Hills that I could expect to draw a license when I got to 18 preference points. Well now that only 10 any elk licenses are given for Custer park elk and it costs 5 dollars to get a preference point with little chance of getting a license you can count me out. I feel that you are just asking for a donation. I also feel that charging \$5 for a preference point is just a way to raise more money with out having to go thru the legislature to raise the price of a license. Who screwed up the elk hunt in the park? Where did they go? I dont care if you cube the preference points or not it really doesn't increase your chances as everyone else will have their preference points cubed also. it just makes you feel better when you see an enormous amount of points but doesn't help if you have 30 or 30000if everyone else does to. So to sum up keep the preference point system, quit charging for the points and make it fair to ALL who apply to have a chance to get the permit include first timers.

William F Kortemeyer, Canton, SD, emailed, I like the proposed changes to the current system. It would decrease the chance of never drawing a tag, for Any Elk, before being too old or otherwise unable to hunt. I will have 15 preference points next year, which would turn into 3375 entries in the drawing. I like that. I am 76 years old and hope to draw an Any Elk tag while still able to hunt. From the GF&P website one can see that there are a fair number of applicants, with as many as 24 preference points, who were not fortunate enough to draw a tag in 2017. The proposed changes should help them. However one also wonders how many applicants quit applying after many years, because they were no longer able to hunt. Thinking of them, what is the possibility of having a "Top Down" system for a certain percentage of available tags, and then follow up with the proposed changes? Thank you, GFP Commission and staff, for the opportunity to comment, for your consideration of my comments, and for all you do.

David A. Bechard, Pierre, SD, emailed, The point system to me is a total joke and mainly used by GFP to make money. It needs to be done away with totally. The luck of the draw is the luck of the draw period. The point system basically boils down to who pays the most gets a tag. For those who can read between the lines it is very plain to see the scam. Pay to play just like Hillary.

Dennis R, Gerjets, Brookings, SD, emailed, I am in favor of said proposal

Jerry L. Jordon , Shirley, Indiana, emailed, I think its a good idea and would encourage me to keep applying.

William Fettes, Sioux Falls, SD, emailed, Cubed preference points is too excessive. Try squared at first to get reaction to the increases.

Rickie Loterbauer, Box Elder, SD, emailed, It almost seem like a waste of time with this. I feel all it is going to do is make it look like everyone has a lot of points. And the people entitled to the license will receive them.

Larry Keller, emailed "Regarding preference points I think this proposal is a very good idea and would like to see it put into place."

Ralph Carlson, Hot Springs, SD, mailed "Finally some hope of possibly drawing an elk tag in SD! I'm now 67 years old and getting more immobile each year and have almost given up hope of ever drawing an elk tag. To date, I have contributed approximately \$350 in elk application fees alone with nothing to show for it. I now have a combined total of 60 preference points in 5 different elk drawings (2 drawings with 16 preference points each) Maybe with this new drawing system I will draw a tag prior to landing in a wheelchair. Please adopt it effective for the 2018 elk season! Otherwise I will likely stop applying all together."

Larry Kellogg, Watertown, SD, mailed "Regarding the suggested changes to cube preference points, it is obvious that the intent is to give those who have waited the longest (those with the most points) priority over others. This makes sense so why not give the licenses in order of the preference points now accumulated with the only drawing to be between those with the same number of preference points. For example, if you have four elk licenses available and you have three people with the most preferences (let's say 20), they would each get a license and those with 19 would go into the hat to draw for the fourth one,. If you have 25 people with 20 preference points, then those 25 would qualify for a drawing for the four licenses. It would seem to me that this would accomplish the objective without have to deal with thousands of preference points."

Wayne Tuschen, Madison, SD, mailed "I think preference points should change. I have 20 years in points for Black Hills elk. I knew of some who have had 2 license in that time. Would be more fair with more chances.

Rik Bartels, Belle Fourche, SD, mailed, "We think trying a new preference system (cubing preference points system) is an interesting system but we are not sure it fixes anything and we need to be careful so that new systems doesn't create more problems than any anticipated fix. This new system should be used only for select drawings such as bighorn sheep, mountain goat, CSP elk and other CSP licenses, and elk in general. Another thing that will help get rid of the top applications in these drawings is to have less years per bracket in the upper brackets and a greater percentage of the licenses in those brackets. The other one would be that you starting now you have to attain a certain number of preference points before you can even apply for certain licenses like some other states do. We are against this system being used for any drawing that non-residents are involved. We do not this system used on deer, antelope, turkey etc. the current system is adequate for these drawings. Maybe going back to the no preference system for these seasons would be better. I thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal."



Adam Karst, Watertown, SD, emailed, "I would be for the cubing of the preference points if done in conjunction with getting rid of the 10 year waiting period to apply for an elk tag after successfully drawing. Maybe you could structure it they couldn't hunt another elk in 5 or 10 years but still be able to apply for preference points. I think it would be a win win for hunters and the state. The cubing of the points would make it easier for the higher preference points applicants to draw. People who are interested in hunting elk again would have a halfway decent shot after the 10 year waiting period with 10 years of preference points vs starting from 0. The SD game and fish could use the extra revenue from the additional preference point sales each year"

Gary Lipp, Custer, SD, emailed "Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed preference point system. My name is Gary Lipp, I'm 66 years of age, a life time resident of South Dakota and I live at 49 N 1st Street, Custer SD 57730, my telephone number is 605-673-4626. I first took my South Dakota NRA Hunter Safety Course in September of 1963 and my Bow hunter Education Course in August of 1996. I have hunted every year for the last 54 years. I do enjoy every hunting opportunity that I have been granted. I do support the proposed changes to the preference point system very strongly. I first applied for the Custer State Park Elk license in 1967 when I was still in High School and I have applied every year up to this time. My records indicate that I have a total of 37 years of preference points and have applied for a total of 50 years. I sure hope my turn will come in the near future. One suggestion I would like to make regarding the Once in a Life Time license, is a waiting period of 3 to 5 years be implemented before they would be eligible to earn any preference points. Thank You for your time"

David Herrboldt, Menno, SD, emailed, "I think this is a good idea for those who have a number of preference points."

Scott Stroman, Sioux Fall, SD, emailed, "Thank you for the opportunity to provide input to the discussion on the preference point system. This is a matter of great interest to me. I haven't been able to draw a muzzle loader tag for several years, preference points notwithstanding. I did draw an East River rifle tag a couple years back but my wife needed surgery on her knee so I was home "playing nurse". I think the cubing of preference points will make the system far more complicated than it needs to be. The preference point system should only be available to South Dakota residents. Period. The point system should also be designed to help those residents who have applied and have been unsuccessful in the draw, rather than those with the fattest check books. My suggestion for a point system is as follows. First, design one where preference points can be tallied without a scientific calculator. Set the limit for accrued points at 10. Residents will be awarded one preference point for each year they fail to draw a limited license. Each year they may also purchase one preference point. This would provide for a system where a resident would wait a maximum of 5 years to draw his/her limited license. Once all applications have been received the preference points would be added up and applicants would be grouped by number of points held. Those with 10 points would have priority and should be guaranteed a tag. Next would come those with 9 points, then those with 8, and so on. Based on the number of tags historically available, even those hunters with one purchased point should be able to have a fair chance in the draw. "Hot spot" counties may fill up quickly but there should be places

left for the lottery. This system would be fair for hunters applying for “any deer” tags for white tail and mule deer, and for muzzle loader hunts. (By the way, we need to discuss combining seasons for archery and iron sight muzzle loaders, but that’s for another day.) I understand that your proposal will not create a “top-down” draw. I see that as the biggest flaw in the concept. Hunters who have patiently “stood in line” to get a good tag SHOULD get first priority. Please keep the discussion open and consider other options. And thanks again for the chance to put in my thoughts. Now if I could just draw that tag while I’m still young enough to hunt!”

Jason Taylor, Fort Pierre, SD, emailed “I am in favor of leaving preference point system the way it currently is. At least the current system gives hunters with only a couple of points a chance of drawing a tag. The proposed system is basically a waste of time for those hunters with zero or only a couple of preference points. If you happen to draw a tag with only a couple of points, then those hunters are lucky. That is why it is a lottery system, at least everyone has a chance at drawing a tag.”

Austin Schmitz, Pierre, SD emailed “Dear Commissioners, I am writing you to oppose the preference points going to a cube system. I feel that by going to a cube system it will deter young and new hunter from even applying. I do not see any benefits to changing the current system. The current system already allows for people who have built up preference points to have a large advantage over people with fewer points. I have 3 young kids that are very interested in hunting and the outdoors. My daughter has been involved in the mentor deer hunt for 3 years. She was very excited to be able to hunt in the regular rifle season and to shoot a buck. She did not draw a tag for this year’s season, so she did get her mentor tag again. If the system is changed, it will reduce her chance to take part in hunting and she will most likely quit hunting because of it. My two boys 8 and 10 will also fall further behind because they will not be able to compete against an older generation that has 20+ years of points. As for myself I am just getting to a place where I can hunt more and take more trips. My kids are to the age that allows me to travel and spend more time hunting. If my chances of being drawn for a license are greatly reduced, I most likely will not apply for the limited draw tags. In conclusion I feel that going to a cube system will only harm a future generation of hunters. The younger generation of hunters is already in decline and I feel that making it harder for them to draw a license will do nothing but speed up the decline. I believe this idea is being pushed by a few people that don’t want to play by the current rules and feel that they deserve a tag more than a young hunter. I do believe we have a great system now that has been working great for a long time.”

Harry Globstad, Rapid City, SD, emailed, “I am very much in favor of the proposed cubing of the big game point system. Of the numerous ideas proposed i believe this is the most fair.” Preference Point System - A couple years back when GFP decided to start charging for preference points it immediately looked like a financial boost to GFP for doing so. These days \$5 doesn’t go far, but it still has the look that money gets people places. This shouldn’t be the case. Go back to the old system of apply one year and get a point if you get turned down. Get turned down a second year and get two points the next. Why Charge \$5 for a point? Makes no sense.

John Lohr, Brandon, SD, emailed, I haven’t had an ER deer tag since 2015 presumably because I wasn’t going to purchase preference points out of principle. Now two years later having not hunted deer for two straight years I had to buy one for 2018

fearing I would go without a tag yet another year. Frustration mounts when I see landowners getting double tags (any deer plus one antlerless deer - these deer move between public and private land), archery hunters being allowed more than one tag per season, out of state rifle tags while some residents don't get tags, etc. Do something to ensure that everybody resident gets some kind of tag before offering multiples to residents or any to non-residents. The Youth Antlerless Season – One of the greatest things SDGFP has ever done. Keep it up and make sure that juveniles are the ones killing them. My son has truly loved and benefited from this season. It makes kids better hunters before they are exposed to trophy animals. Thank you for listening.”

Ed Hiller, Arlington, SD, emailed. “Why are you trying to make this so complicated? Just make it a top down draw. That is the fairest. For example Elk Landowner preference 1<sup>st</sup> 10+ years 2<sup>nd</sup> 5+ 3<sup>rd</sup> Etc...”

Douglas Symonds, Spearfish, emailed: My thoughts on the use of a cube preference points are this system will not meet any of your goals and only complicate the drawing process . The outcome will discourage new and younger hunters from applying and hunters with less points form taking part in the process. I feel the present process used in the drawing or going back to no preference points are fair way of dealing with the problem. Thank you!

Virgil Andersen, Sioux Falls, emailed: I have hunted deer, antelope and turkeys since 1965, and believe the preference point system used in the past worked well. I did not always get the license I first applied for, but usually got my second choice, and occasionally neither. If I repeated the next year, using the same application, I had two chances to be drawn. If that failed, the next year I had three, etc. The current system allows me to purchase points to increase my chance of being drawn. I really don't care for that program, but some hunters must believe it is acceptable. In any case, it generates more revenue for SDGFP, whether it adds value to the hunting experience. When I started hunting at age 12, young people could find a place to hunt waterfowl, upland game and big game without paying a fee, as long as they got landowner permission. I remember carefully saving my money to buy the license, duck stamp and some shells to shoot in a shotgun borrowed from a family member or friend. Dad told stories of the past, when wealthy out of state interests bought or leased most of the better sloughs and lakes, barring them from resident use. The Legislature responded to voter pressure, and banned non-resident waterfowl hunting for many years. We have now seen the proliferation of the "hunting preserves" that offer a pay-to-shoot opportunity for those who can afford it. It's no wonder that farmers are lured into programs to lease their land to "hunt clubs" that use it for paid hunts. I can only say that I'm very sad to see the way we are chasing the dollar at the expense of our wildlife. By allowing preference points to be purchased, then multiplied by a power, be it squared, cubed or any higher number, I'm afraid we're opening up the lottery system for abuse to the point that only the wealthy hunters will be hunting. They could conceivably purchase (pick a number) points for that prized license draw that mathematically nearly insures that they will win. The less financially able hunter might not be able to compete. The whole process proposed has a rather rotten stench! It has the appearance of just another way to increase funding for GFP, not to enhance the outdoor experience for South Dakota hunters. I suggest you defeat the idea of mathematical enhancement of

preference points, and return to one that provides only one point per application per year. Thanks for your offer to comment on this matter.

Craig Fonder, Wessington Springs, emailed: I do not like the “cube” proposal at all. In fact, I don’t like the idea of preference points, especially those that can be bought. I feel that state drawings for deer tags should be a fair proposition for all applicants. That means that each applicant has his or her name in the drawing ONE time. When one can buy preference points and then have them cubed, how is that different from selling a license to the highest bidder? The right to shoot a state-owned animal, in my opinion, should not be determined by who has the most money. I would like the GFP commission to consider a far different idea. If preference is such a big issue, I believe preference should be given to those who reside in a particular county. I live in Jerauld County. When applying for deer tags, I think the time has come to take care of the people who live in, pay taxes in, and support a particular county all year. All deer applications from residents who reside in a county should be filled first. Whatever tags are left could then be drawn from the remaining applicants. Many hunters, especially non-landowners, have chosen to live in smaller counties for the outdoor opportunities they offer. It is disheartening for us to see opportunities to utilize the resources in our county given to residents of other counties each year. If you’re wondering, I have hunted deer and antelope in the west river counties on a number of occasions. I would not see it as unfair if the residents of those counties had their applications filled before others or mine were put in a drawing for what tags were left. Thank you for inviting input from our state’s sportsmen and women.

Jason Runestad, Highmore, emailed: To the GFP Commission, The proposed cubed preference point system is an interesting thought, and one that I generally support the idea behind. Namely, greatly increasing your chance of drawing a coveted tag as you have unsuccessful years, with your perseverance paying off in much bigger mathematical advantage. Some very nice people and great sportsmen I know just have awful luck in drawings and need all the help they can get. I do, however, have a couple of concerns. First, while the explanation in the email was clear on how the potential new system would affect 2018 and the carryover of the old system into the new one, it wasn't entirely clear on how it would work over time after new system is in place. Does it just cube the number of draws per preference point, or the number of preference points themselves? For example, if a person has 2 (1+1) preference points for 2018, you would get entered 8 times for the draw. That much is clear. What I'm unsure about is 2019 if I'm unsuccessful in 2018. Do you have 3 preference points (2+1) for a total of 27 draw entries in 2019 and if unsuccessful, 64 entries in 2020, or do I have 9 points (8+1) for a total of 729 entries in 2019 and if unsuccessful, 389,017,000 entries in 2020? In certain, competitive season units it would be possible or even likely for many, many more applicants than there are licenses available for to be in the exact same boat. By 2021 GFP will need to be holding refresher seminars on scientific notation just to inform people how many draw entries they have. I feel quite confident that this proposal was well thought out enough that it's the former, but I'm sure you can see in my example why a person would want to be certain of the specific wording when it comes to exponential increases. The second involves land owner/operator preference, which I personally qualify for. I don't live in what is traditionally a particularly competitive unit, so I have never had a problem getting tags provided I don't forget the deadline for application. However, things like that can change over time and there are plenty of qualifying land owner/operators in South Dakota who live in competitive units. To be

honest, since getting my desired tags for my home unit has never been a problem, I've never seen the need to look into the legal mechanics of how landowner preference works, though I do use it. I also don't know what other changes to it might be in this proposal. Would the new system increase the potential for qualifying land owners to be unsuccessful when applying to hunt the unit their own land is in? I think in South Dakota we have enough issues with conflicts of interest between landowners and other sportsmen without adding that sort of fuel to that fire. The argument can be made that the current special landowner tags are the answer to that concern. Well... sort of. It is true that as a landowner you are guaranteed access to a tag to hunt your own property. The problem is, many of us landowners hunt together with our friends and neighbors on each other's property. Along with being a hunt, it's a social activity. I have, in the past, been busy with ranch work during deer application time and simply forgotten to apply and gotten a landowner's tag instead. This was entirely my own mistake and that experience has made me very careful not to repeat it. Quite frankly, the inability to go with my friends to hunt, on their land as well as my own, completely ruined the usual fun for me that year. When my friends decided to go check the likely spots on some of their property, I had the choice to either continue hunting my own land and be excluded from the social aspect or go with them and be excluded from the hunting aspect. All in all, it was not a very good hunt for me that year and I'm not sure I'd bother doing it again if I missed the deadline. As I said, that was entirely my fault for not getting my application in on time. My reaction was essentially, "Jason, don't do that again, you fool." However, if I did apply before the deadline and didn't get a tag due to a change in how preference works, my reaction would be very different. I'd be pretty angry about being forced out of my normal hunt with friends do to no fault of my own. If landowners would still be basically guaranteed a normal, unit wide tag when they apply under the new system this shouldn't be a problem. Changing the landowner tags to unit wide instead of only on your own property would also work as far as I'm concerned. On the other hand, if it starts breaking apart groups neighbors who hunt together because one or more of them couldn't draw a tag this year (or many consecutive years) even with landowner preference, it's only going to anger them (justifiably in my opinion) and unnecessarily add a new potential point of contention when trying to balance landowner rights and the concerns of other sportsmen. This is a subject that can already be contentious enough.

Mike W. Lang, Rapid City, emailed: Sir/Madam, Please do pass the cubing system which is being proposed for the elk tags. It would improve the current system and make it quite a bit more fair to the hunters who have the most preference points, which is certainly the right thing to do in my humble opinion. On this same general topic, I greatly support the change that was made a few years ago in which the hunters with 10 or more preference points for BH elk are put in a drawing by themselves for about half the tags. And the Hills deer tags (any whitetail) are even more fair to the 2-year preference point holders by putting them in the drawing for all the available tags, then people with 1 preference point are in the drawing next for the remaining tags, then the people with zero preference points are last. This is a really good system. Thank you for implementing this some years ago.

Joe Spilde, Arlington, emailed: I am in favor of changing to the proposed system

Brock Hoagland, Custer, emailed: I am in favor of the proposed change to the lottery drawings whereby an applicant's preference points would be cubed to determine the number of times his or her name is entered. I only have 4 points myself for the

licenses I want, but I think it only fair that those with high points, some of whom are no doubt getting on in years, should have an increased chance to be drawn. And in a few more years I'll be one greatly benefited by the proposed change so I would like to see it come to pass.

Scott Jamison, Wentworth, emailed: Hi, I certainly agree with any change to increase drawing odds for elk applicants with more preference points. I happen to be one of the people with 20 preference points, and am applying for my first elk tag in the Hills. Considering my age I probably will never get a second one. I am relatively healthy and fit so I'm pretty confident I would eventually draw a tag in H2 and be able to hunt. But I also feel the current system can result in hunters never drawing until they are so advanced in age that they can't physically hunt, at least without a vehicle. This is particularly an issue for hunters applying for their first tag. I haven't done the math but if the cubing concept will help increase the odds, good idea. Thanks.

David Peck, Cherokee, IA, emailed: SDGFP, In relation to the proposed preference point changes, it seems a little extreme. It would make it virtually a "pure" preference point system. Especially as it relates to us NR, there are so few with so few points it seems likely unnecessary. I apply in all the western states and the most extreme point manipulation systems square the points. Thank you for your time.

Mavrick Hill, Dante, SD emailed: It's an interesting idea to cube the preference points, but I don't see that the current way needs to be corrected. I typically wait 3-4 years for an antelope, east river deer, and paddlefish tag and I'm fine with allowing those with more preference points to draw their tag first. I don't see that a first year applicant needs to have a chance at drawing a tag right away or that someone who just had one has a chance to get another in back to back years. That might make someone who has 5 years preference and no luck, even with more chances say forget it! I think you will get less applications in the long run and see your preference points purchased decrease. I believe your elk preference points are grouped up with so many tags available for those with so many preference points (Great Idea)!! What could happen is one year you might have most tags being drawn by preference points of 5 years and less. Now you will have those with 10+ be upset (might stop applying) and you will also have those who have applied for the short time be done applying for all the years to come. Now you just lost out on future conservation income in preference points. I believe I have 8 or so years on my elk preference and if I don't draw one for another 5 years or so that's fine. Those elk tags should be looked at as a life-long achievement. These are my opinions on the proposed change. Thanks!

Sam Kezar, Lennox, emailed: Commission Members - I am writing to express my concerns with the proposed changes to cube the preference point system for the limited entry draw seasons in South Dakota. While I understand that there are people in the draw system with very high point numbers in certain draws that are frustrated when they will draw their tag, I don't feel that cubing points in the way the system is currently set up will change the system for the better, especially long term. My position is that drawing a hunting tag in this state is a privilege, not a right. Additionally, just because I or someone else has been applying for years (maybe even decades) does not guarantee a tag. As it is stated on the GF&P website with the YouTube on the elk tag draw, the system currently set up is a lottery. By not changing the draw groups and just cubing points I fear that we are just pandering to those who have been applying for a

long time in an almost conciliatory way. I have the additional following concerns in regards to certain tags and/or groups of tags: Special species and Custer State Park Tags: What also concerns me about this proposed change is for those very limited opportunities for bighorn sheep, mountain goat, and the Custer State park tags. If this is implemented, a large number of residents who are later in the game of applying will almost be shut out on a chance to draw any of those tag in their lifetime (especially if they started applying later in life). I feel it would be best for those 'special' tags that the point system be eliminated all together and that it be a equal chance draw every year. Then if someone draws the tag they are ineligible for the rest of their life. Make them a once in a lifetime chance since the tag numbers are so low and demand is so high. Otherwise, I fear, we will just get deeper and deeper into a point creep or point distribution problem. Elk: As I have stated earlier, I feel that making this change to cube points will only kick the can down the road in the elk draw situation. Based on my understanding, if implemented, those that have higher point numbers in the elk draw will have a far greater likelihood of drawing those tags. This would in turn make those with less points have a harder time to draw tags and thus have to wait until they get higher point numbers. This would essentially change the wait time for most people in the tag pool a longer draw average. So for example if it took on average 10 years for most people to draw, not it might creep up to 15 years. But then what happens to all those down in the pool once they reach that 15 year mark (in the example)? I would think we would be back to the same problem we are in now. Unless tag applications in the lower point numbers have decreased over the years and created a "baby boom" type of situation, I don't see the cubing of points to actually fix the issue long term. It is my understanding that demand for elk tags is going up, not down. If this is the case, I would prefer again to see the preference points disappear, the wait time extended for re-application, a breakup of the draw pools so those with higher than say 15 points get a chance to draw a higher percentage of the tags first, or any combination of those options. You could even not have any tags available for a chance to draw for the people with 0-5 points. But again, do not punish those who have drawn or have less years in the game because we feel bad for those who have waited longer and not drawn. That is not fair. Deer: The Black Hills any deer tag is a mess, but again, cubing points will only kick the can down the road as I already stated with elk. As for the other few limited entry deer unit tags and the muzzleloader tags, since demand is increasing but tag numbers are remaining the same, I would prefer to see no change or a equal draw for all. I have 5 years preference for west river deer and 5 for muzzleloader. I'm waiting for my chance, but I'm not angry that others have won the lottery with less tickets, its just the way it is. I feel a more important change to the number of archery hunters and non-resident archery hunters in these limited entry units is a more important issue. I have gone out to archery hunt some of the limited entry units and the number both non-residents and residents out there in these limited areas is crazy. I would prefer the non-resident archery tags be a limited draw statewide, and the archery tags for the limited entry deer units be a draw. That draw (since its new) could be set up as an equal draw (no points accrued) but if you draw there is a waiting period to re-apply (2-5 years or something like that). I appreciate the opportunity to express my concerns and I hope that I am understanding the situation clearly enough to make some valid points for you to consider. I would gladly be willing to discuss any of my points further over the phone or in person if that is warranted or if you have questions on my stated opinions. I love hunting in South Dakota and I strongly feel the Commission and the GF&P do a wonderful job in managing our wildlife and outdoor activities and opportunities.

Delwyn Newman, Lemmon, emailed: I would want the point system to stay the same as it is. If there has to be a change I would suggest no point system at all (for example like Idaho, and after a license has been received have a waiting period to reapply). Thank you.

Everett N Quam, Aberdeen, emailed: My name is Everett Quam , I am 81 years old - I live in Aberdeen SD. I have about 20 preference points for Custer Park Elk. I would like to see the cube system adopted while I can still get around.

Evan Leebens, Dell Rapids, SD, emailed: I fully support the move to cube preference points for all limited draw seasons. Many other states have proven this method works without providing an unfair advantage to those with a significant number of points.

Richard Payter , Southfield, MI, emailed: I am in favor of the change. Thank you.

Vic Utech, Pierre, emailed: I would prefer a true top down preference point system. This way seems to make the most sense and certainly the most fair option and most simple.

Lee Kleinsasser, Miller, emailed: Why does the GF&P think they have to charge for everything ?? I dont agree with charging for points at all . If the GF&P thinks they own the wildlife why dont they pay for the damage they do when they hit my vehical ?? I have been a SD resident all of my 59 yrs , if u need more money charge the out of state hunters more , maybe some of them wood stay home more and not over fish are waters or dont let them come in till the spawn is over !!!

Thomas J. Dice, Mitchell, emailed: I am very much in favor of this change. As I am nearing the time when I may be physically unable to endure the rigors of some of the archery seasons for which I apply having my chances increased gives me a better chance for one more try for an elk.

Jim Gerold, New Prague, MN, emailed: Commission, As a nonresident I realize that my opinion does not carry the weight of a resident of your state, but I wanted to warn you about the trap of squaring or cubing preference (bonus) points for big game drawings. The problem with this system is that it is very unfair to new applicants and young hunters, while minimally increasing the chances of drawing of those with high preference points. See the example below, where hunter #1 has 20 points and hunter #2 has 2 points. Year 1 Hunter #1 has 20 points or 8,000 chances to draw Hunter #2 has 2 points or 8 chances to draw You'll see that Hunter #1 has 7,992 more chances to draw Year 2 Hunter #1 has 21 points or 9,261 chances to draw Hunter #2 has 3 points or 27 chances to draw Hunter #1 has 9,234 more chances to draw Year 3 Hunter #1 has 22 points or 10,648 chances to draw Hunter #2 has 4 points or 64 chances to draw Hunter #1 has 10,584 more chances to draw As you can see, each year Hunter #2's chances of drawing actually go down even though they are gaining points. Meanwhile, Hunter#1 is still competing equally with all of the other hunters at the same point level, so their chances only go up minimally. A point system, as proposed, is incredibly discriminatory toward those who, at no fault of their own, were born years after the point system was implemented. Right now we need to be encouraging new hunters and a cubed system does the opposite of that. It will also be very discouraging to new adult hunters. If someone starts hunting when they are 30 in the proposed system, the



chances of them ever drawing a tag in their life are incredibly slim. Please consider the negatives of a system like this from a nonbiased outsider's point of view. I have nothing to gain or lose from this change, but I see it as a major detriment to the future of hunting. My guess is this law is being pushed by some older gentlemen who are in a sour mood because they see a few lucky kids "stealing" their tags. Please take some time to read through this story. <http://forums2.bowsite.com/forums/thread.cfm?threadid=466365&messages=9&forum=5> If this rule change takes place, you can pretty much guarantee that stories like this will be a thing of the past, and that would be a sad day. Thank you for your time, from a concerned nonresident.

Mike Larson, Mitchell, emailed: Dear Sir/Ma'am, Regarding the modification to the current Preference Point System, SPECIFICALLY EXCLUDING PURCHASED POINTS, I would generally support the change as it would skew the likelihood of drawing a license to those who have been attempting to get one over a longer period of time. Again, I would vehemently oppose this rule for purchased points as allowing the cubing of purchased points would skew the drawings to those with the disposable income to effectively simply "buy" a license.

Orie Bramblee, Hayes, emailed: I believe the point systems is working just fine the way it is. It has worked for years, why change it the way that is proposes seems very confusing and what purpose does it serve.

Tom Jensen, Harrisburg, emailed: Please add to my comment below – I would want the current tier system to remain in place. The ONLY change would be to cube the points but they still have their set tier groups and allocations to the groups etc as it is today. Thanks! Absolutely agreed to implement cubing of preference points! Please log this as my feedback as requested by GFP Thank you for the proposal and agree 100%

Jerry Holbrook, Dakota Dunes, emailed: I support the proposed changes to the preference point system.

Mike Richardson, Fort Pierre, emailed: This is a great proposal. I know several people who have died while having greater than 30 years preference for certain elk tags such as Custer Park. This would probably allow everyone in the state to get an elk tag at least once in their lifetime in the Black Hills or Custer Park. I would also like this to apply to the nonresident waterfowl tags. I think it is important so that a nonresident waterfowler doesn't get a tag year after year while someone else might go several years without a tag. This would cut down on the number of nonresidents trying to lease up land for waterfowling which is happening more and more. I have seen this first hand in Day county. Several private places that used to give us permission now cater to Minnesota and Wisconsin hunters that show up every year. Maybe a better way is to structure the drawing like the Lake Sharpe paddlefish tags. Someone with no preference points doesn't have a chance at a tag because the tags are gone after the first drawing. Those tags are reserved for people with 1 or more preference points in the first drawing.

Ron Reuter, Hartford, emailed: I think this is a very good idea and would reward those who have tried faithfully for some of the harder to get tags. You should have a better chance of drawing a license if you have 14 points than some one else has 10 . The only complaint I have with the drawing system is the 160 acre landowner/operator rule. It should be less say 80 or 100 acres. I have 134 acres of land half of which is

farmed and half CRP and I don't qualify for landowner preference, but the farmer whom farms land can go buy a buck tag without applying plus a doe tag plus all of his immediate family can also get a license. On this basis I am lucky to get a license every 3rd year. which doesn't seem right when we are have CRP that is supposedly enhancing wildlife and the payment for this is quite a bit less that if I would choose to farm it.

Harry Stearns, Gorham NH, emailed: I was a resident of South Dakota from 1999 to 2005, and then moved to New Hampshire. Since the antelope herd got decimated by the weather and the number of tags plummeted, I have not been successful in recent drawings. I enjoy antelope hunting with my old friends in Spearfish. I am all for anything that would increase my chances of being successful for a non-resident antelope tag.

Ray Gukeisen, Lead, emailed: This sounds like a better system than the current one. 13 points at least and I've never drawn a BH elk license. It will be nice to get a bit of a boost. I am in favor of the proposed change.

John McGrath, Brandon, emailed: I'm writing to express my support for the proposal increasing the odds of someone with a higher number of preference points a greater chance of drawing a limited license. Thank you for your consideration of this proposal.

Arnold Veen, Milbank, emailed: Hi, In looking at your cubed license applications why start another system when you have a current system in place. I am in reference of your system of the new deer license application example; Take the number of licenses provided and start with the applicants that have the most points, give them the first chance at tags available. If there are tags left give them to the next highest preference point holders and so on down the line. Chances are the highest preference holders are the oldest hunters who would have a limited time left in their life. Lets give them a chance to get their once in a life time license before their time on Earth runs out. Lets give back to these older hunter for supporting our hunting experience all their life. The younger hunters have more time to wait for these opportunities. And yes I am one of those older hunters but I will not fit in the category of having the highest number of preference points for a few years if I buy the grace of God live long enough. I will now get off my soap box and Thank the GFP dept for the opportunities I've had.

Lonnie Lee Tutsch, New Underwood, emailed: I am 100% in favor of the "cubing" proposal especially in regards to elk, bighorn sheep, etc..... I'm getting close to 60 yrs old and having this proposal would increase my chances (but not guarantee) a successful drawing for me before I get to old to hunt.

Sean P. Burns, Edgemont, emailed: I believe this is a great idea. I have completely given up on certain drawings because of the current system. This proposal would make a difference in my decision on continuing to draw for tougher licenses such as black hills any deer. I am absolutely for this proposed change.

Dana R. Rogers, Hill City, emailed: GFP, I am e-mailing in support of the new PP system that is being proposed to 'cube' each applicants PPs. Squared would probably work but cubed certainly weights it heavier to those with the most points. I applaud your

willingness to listen to all public comment and make changes and adjustments to improve seasons and drawing odds.

Terry Augspurgen, Miller, emailed: Commission members. Thank you for allowing public input on this issue. I feel the present system works well and is not broken. Therefore, I would not change it.

Mark Ideker, Humboldt, emailed: Hi my name is Mark Ideker from Humboldt, SD. I would still like to see a top down preference point system but I do really like the idea you have going. Thank you for working towards helping those with the most points. I would definitely like to see this idea implemented. Thanks again.

Ronald D Tobin, Gettysburg, emailed: The current system is very unfair anything to improve the drawing would be expectable. Also paying \$5.00 for a point is not popular with the public it's just another way of getting more money out of hunters. BAD

Steve Marcus, Huron, emailed: Being a S.D. resident with over 20 years of preference points. I think it is a great idea. I am afraid by the time I draw a license I will be physically unable to hunt.

Reggie Hubbartt, Coon Rapids, MN, emailed: Without an explanation of the math/software programming that the draw system uses my thinking is that the draw odds are the same since everyone is cubed adjusted (exponentially) as long as a person applies. I've never, ever seen proof that the software programming in a draw system actually looks beyond a count of "one". So I'm not in favor of this weighted change without proof that this software/program change will actually work.

Jerry Opbroek, Mitchell, emailed: I just today read the proposal to change the lottery system for applications. Unfortunately, I am too late to submit my comments for the meeting. However, I think the following information is worth mentioning: In 2017, 447 people with from 25 to 25 years preference applied for a Custer State Park elk tag. Two of them were successful. Of those 447 people who have been applying over the 25-25 year period, they have 9890 years of applications. I realize that the person who received a license with 12 years preference was very happy, but think it is time to pay attention to those people who have paid the price for, in many cases, the better part of their life. received email concerning drawing success and increased odd.. forget it..... why always complicate the issue

jim gruber, Estelline, emailed: if you want to improve an opportunity do it one simple way... get rid of the land owner tags... will someone please explain to me why any land owner and every member of his or her family qualify for up to one half of all licenses... i can understand one per family, but every member is hard to swallow.. make them earn that tag by proving they provide for wildlife either by food plots, crp cover or other projects benefiting wildlife.. not farming line to line.... as a land owner myself i find the whole thing over the top

Martin D. Hunt, Hill City, emailed: I grew-up in western SD, graduated from SD School of Mines then was gone for 38 yrs before retiring and moving back to the Hill City area. During the years I was away with a career I never missed a chance to return to the Black Hills for visits and never lost my passion to live in the area. I would like to say in the 38 yrs it is amazing the difference in the quantity and quality of the wildlife.

The SD GF&Parks has done an outstanding job over the years. I can remember hunting the Black Hills in the 70's and to see a 4X4 Buck was a rarity. Even more rare was to see a mule deer in the hills and there were really no Elk. Now retired I hike the Hills daily and it is nothing to see 4 or 5 outstanding whitetails, & muleys. Also having lived in MT, ID, & WY some of the trophy Bull elk in the Hills would rival anything in the other Rocky Mt states. So again I have nothing but the utmost respect for what the SDGF have done for the state of South Dakota's wildlife. I am sure the Preference Point System was a major improvement in the management of wildlife compared to the over-the-counter purchase of tags. The proposal of cubing the number of preference points does sound like a fair system as your chances of drawing grows almost exponentially with each added point rather than just gaining one more chance each year. A few other suggestions. Have you thought about some type of age factor in the point system? Especially for elk. Possibly a point bonus system upon reaching age 60. Using myself as an example (and I realize I was gone from the state a number of years) being from SD and coming back, by the time I have enough preference points to draw a bull elk tag I would be too old to hunt elk. (Probably not a lot of people in their 80's hunting elk). It is my understanding half of the elk tags are for landowners. I am not trying to downplay what landowners do for wildlife and with the price of BH land it is a major investment but could it go to an ever other year system. I am just not sure how fair it is that someone with the financial means can buy enough land to qualify for an elk tag and does not have to hunt on their own land. Just some thoughts. Thanks again for the great job you are doing!!!!!!

Virginia Doyen, Spearfish, emailed: Stop charging so much to get to have a license by now charging for points. It's all about money anymore and I just need the meat. Sell licenses they cost enough and not all of us can afford the extra cost. I can't even buy a license from you anymore. You won't sell me one.

Bob Winter, Yankton, emailed: Staff: I prefer the present point system. Doing a math Cube system could lead to other issues.

Dan Doyle, Colman, emailed: Just wanted to say that I think it's a great proposal on changing the preference system. Nothing has to be permanent, give it a try for a couple years and if it doesn't work, amend it. It's great that the gfp looks for input on these issues. Thanks and keep up the good work

Sara Heil, Hill City, emailed: It would be an excellent idea to cube preference points. The wait time after getting an elk tag, plus knowing that it will most likely be 15 plus years before another chance to draw a tag is disheartening. South Dakota residents have to go out of state to have an opportunity to hunt elk if they don't want to wait 20 plus years to get another tag. It is true there are leftover tags available, but that is no better-so many people try for those tags as well. Cube the preference points.

Craig Slowey, Lead, emailed: I would like to be given a greater number of chances to draw a license ie."cubed".

Ralph Stieben, Garretson, emailed:I guess I must be getting old, I do not understand this preference point system. I do not understand this cubing thing.. It appears that the more preference points you buy, the greater chance of getting a license? Money gives you better chance? The last two times I applied for deer

licenses, I didn't not receive one, discourage, I have not applied since.. Is this because I did not spend enough money to get one? I guess I need to read up on this preference point procedure? Please advise. My daughter, her husband and I used to hunt together but these last few years the licenses are hard to get and the we don't all get licenses.... I guess we need to buy our way into this system?

Terry Lynde, Mitchell, emailed: I think the proposal for limited draw licence with the cubed preference point system is a great idea for the elk licenses, and the Black hills deer licenses but not sure about the rest...

Kevin Hansen, Zell, emailed: Dear GF&P Commission: I totally approve of your efforts to increase the chances of those who have been trying for decades to draw certain tags. I am wondering if, in order to give even more "preference" to those who have applied for a long time, how would it work to wait and not start the cubing process until a hunter has received say 10 preference points for a particular season? It seems to me that if everyone is cubed from preference point one the pot just gets bigger and bigger without adequately giving preference to those who have applied for the longest time. Waiting until 10 (or whatever number is deemed best) preference points to begin the cubing process rewards even more so those who have applied the longest. Thank you for considering my recommendation.

Bill Hearne, Rapid City, emailed: I would be in favor of the cubed preference point system.

Kevin Bjordahl, Milbank, emailed: I support the proposed change to the preference point system. It is a reasonable way to increase chance of drawing for the hunters with a larger number of preference points. Seems only fair.

Dean Ideker, Sturgis, emailed: I feel this is an amazing idea and I totally support it! Thank you for considering it!

Brad Richardson, Hot Springs, emailed: Dear GFP, I'm writing in support of the proposal to cube preference points. Thank you for considering my input. I'm in favor of the suggested change in the preference point system.

Nathan Schaub, Mitchell, emailed: I have had friends draw successfully twice for muzzleloader any deer tags during the same time frame of which I have put in for and I'm going on 8 preference points currently. Something needs to change and this is a step in the right direction I believe.

Justin Broughton, Sioux Falls, emailed: Thank you for reviewing our current preference point system. I like the idea of cubing the points but feel a tiered program would better accomplish our goal of giving hunters with more preference points the opportunity to draw their tag. Please leave those with 1-2 preference points at a single point, square the points in years 3-9, and then cube the points once the applicant reaches 10+ preference points. This would accomplish the same goal but magnify the benefit of having 10+ preference points and reward those who have put in their time waiting for their chance to draw. Thanks!

Jerry R. Awe, Sioux Falls, emailed: I support the new approach to a cubed system, agree with its potential for our resident hunters

Dave Withee, Rapid City, emailed: My comment is that I guess I am in favor of a true top down system. I'm not sure why we don't do this and it seems fairer to me for those that have so many preference points. Thanks.

T. H. Loomis, Martin, emailed: I think the points system proposed sounds fine and would be for it becoming law. However, there is a big hole in GFP when it comes to goose hunting in Bennett County and surrounding areas. If you want to attract out-of-state hunters and increase to a MUCH GREATER DEGREE, the income for out-of-state hunting licences, restaurant sales, motel sales, hunting supplies and a multitude of other income producing transactions, you should open up the limit to two geese per day, REGARDLESS OF THE GOOSE SPECIES! Also, the requirement should be the hunter needs to have a waterfowl or duck stamp and eliminate the species from any drawing! Almost every out of state pheasant hunter we talk to has said they would be back for some goose hunting if there was a two bird a day limit and they didn't have to rely on a drawing. We are overrun with geese and this is just common sense. Thank you for entertaining the above request and hope to hear from you with a positive outcome.

Tom Tunge, Sioux Falls, emailed: I am in total agreement with your plan except I believe that the cube should not start until the 3rd year. This Will help insure that the hunters are sincere about hunting the area and the species. Thank you for your time

Doug Boer, Madison, emailed: Sounds like a great idea! Too many old timers with multiple points die or get crippled before they draw now.

Daniel D. Assid, Sioux Falls, emailed: I believe the new process would be more fair and should be put in place. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Martin Luebke, Garretson, emailed: I would support the concept of 'cubing' preference points on the SD Draw system. Many older folks will likely never draw before they die or can no longer actively participate in their hunt. If you require any additional information for this to be considered, please let me know.

Doug Barnes, Sioux Falls, emailed: As I understand the current system, a person has to BUY the preference points. In years past, if an applicant did not receive a license, that person would receive a preference point. Instead it is necessary to purchase it. I find THAT to be less than fair. It seems to be a way for the GFP to get more cash for nothing. I would like to see things go back to the fair way it was before. There is no need to "cube" points.

Emmet Hegwood, Spearfish, emailed: Dear Sir's,I feel preference points should be part of your application when you apply for a licence. The points should produce an event where a person can get drawn within a reasonable time. This would be more fair and allow different hunters to be able to get drawn where as of now it can take forever (If you ever do get drawn). If you get points for first year,and you apply the second year your point value should increase accordingly this would help the above statement.

Robert Weisbeck, Herreid, emailed: I believe curbing the preference points would be a good way to insure that the people with the most years of applying have a better chance of drawing a tag, I also believe that there should be more tiers or at least more licenses for the top tier in the custer state park drawings as well as black hills drawings,

as I personally know people that have been applying for 40+ years and still can't draw a tag. Thank you for taking the time to read my thoughts on this matter.

Thomas Reeve, Piedmont, emailed: The proposal to cube the accumulated preference points is statistically a guarantee for applications exceeding several years. It would essentially eliminate the probability of a first year draw on highly limited licenses. Do NOT adopt this change!!!!!!

Heith Waddell, Sundance, emailed: In reference to proposed changes to the preference point system, this seems like system that needs reconsideration. To cube the preference point values, but with such limited information it is difficult to make an informed decision and/or argument. Unfortunately the proposed system does not explain why a preference point would be added to the application year nor is there any justification mathematically to cube the results. In other words why would the results not be squared or taken to the fourth or fifth power? Though this justification does lend to more tags for hunters with higher preference point numbers, it also establishes a system where upon those with a higher number of preference points will more frequently get drawn. The disadvantage to this is presumably to get that many preference points you may be older in age or have been hunting in SD for a longer time. This would not necessarily promote hunting opportunities to younger or less experienced hunters who may have not started hunting until later in life. This may be a disincentive to new hunters. Another consideration is that if tags are going to older hunters, not all of those individuals are as likely to hunt as hard as a younger cohort. This may impact the areas hunted or the animals taken. The complexities of creating a fair draw system in hunting has so many variables that even minor changes may have substantial downstream effects. I would encourage a more detailed report to the proposed changes.

Phillip George, Lake City, emailed: I am against cubing preference points for the limited draw licenses.

Todd Dathe, Brandon, emailed: First of all, this new system of purchasing preference points is beyond reprehensible. Our state has always been a state of opportunity for all and this new system favors the more affluent people over those that cannot afford to buy preference points. Whoever came up with that idea should be fired!! Secondly, cubing the points for a statistically better chance in the drawings simply compounds the injustice that is already being served upon the poorer residents of this state that may need the meat from the hunt to feed their families but cannot afford to buy the points. The whole system is a travesty and should be changed back to the way it was, if you apply and are not successful you get 1 preference point for the next drawing period. I will end this by saying I don't feel this way because I can't afford to buy preference, I certainly can, but I know people who can't and it saddens me to think that our state has come to this. Hunting should not be a "pay to play" system. Shame on you GF&P!! Comments: I believe that the impact of this point system adjustment will impact the more limited licenses such as Elk, Mountain Goat, and Bighorn Sheep more than any other licenses. I am in favor of the proposal as presented. In addition, I think a bigger impact would be made on the availability of Elk licenses if we were to adjust the current preference that is given to landowners. The current system favors landowners to a great extent. They get up to half the available licenses and are eligible every year. Under current statistics it would take the average person at least 30 years to draw 2 bull elk tags. A landowner by comparison would likely need no more than 3 years to draw

the same number of tags and I have met landowners who claim they draw a tag every year. If we are going to give preference to the landowner, can we at least consider limiting the eligibility to the same rules as the rest of the public. If a non landowner draws their first choice elk, they are not eligible to apply for 10 years. This should be the same for landowners as well. I would propose this rule would have far more positive impact than the proposed squaring rule. The current policy favors the wealthy in a significantly disproportionate way. Elk in SD reside primarily on public land and should be treated as a public resource. Thank you for your consideration.

Terry VanDam, Murdo, emailed: I would be in favor of the new preference point system currently being proposed by the GFP Commission. It appears to reward the person with the higher number of preference points with a better chance at a successful draw. Exactly the way it should be.

Terry Schutz, Eureka, emailed: Recommendation for awarding preference points for all limited license drawings: Use only one drawing "bucket" and eliminate all others. Double every unsuccessful applicant's preference each time a new application is submitted. Charge a flat fee every year regardless of the number of preference points awarded. EXAMPLE:

Year 1 = App (1) + (0) PP = 1 chance in drawing

2= App (1) + (1) PP = 2 chances

3= App (1) + (2) PP = 3 chances

4= App (1) + (4) PP = 5 chances

5= App (1) + (8) PP = 9 chances

6= App (1) + (16) PP = 17 chances

7= App (1) + (32) PP = 33 chances

8= App (1) + (64) PP = 65 chances

ETC. This example shows that there would be little or no change for the first three years but your odds improve as the number of years increase. However by offering only one drawing everyone would have a chance at a license. The 1 year applicant with one chance could get lucky and outdraw the 8 year applicant that has 65 chances. But the odds are that the applicants that have been submitting applications for many years would have a better and more reasonable chance to be successful than with the current system.

Chuck Jensen, Spearfish, emailed: I believe this is a very good idea in which to give hunters with more preference points a better chance of drawing a tag. However with household with numerous hunters, like mine, can you consider being able to deny a tag if drawn and not lose your preference points? my concern is like for my family, we have 4 hunters that have 16,16,16 and 11 preference points for black hills elk. Under the situation that we would all happen to draw a tag the same year, I could not afford the price for all the tags and processing of 4 elk at once.

Craig Pickart, Mount Vernon, emailed: Yes!!! Please proceed with the new preference points idea. It is way more fair!

Larry Livingston, Fairburn, emailed: YES I think that would be a great idea to cube preference points.



Jack Young, Black Hawk, emailed: I agree with the proposal. I have 15 years in for Black Hills Elk and I'm getting older every year. There are also a lot of people with more points than me and still waiting also. I would actually like it more if you only drew from the people who have at least 10 years preference in. Its crazy to think someone has 20+ years in and someone else has a chance to draw with only 3 years in.

Rich Galbraith, Aberdeen, emailed: Dear GFP Commission, I'm in favor of the proposed adjustment to cube the preference points for the upcoming hunting seasons. As proposed this will give those applicants with more years of preference to have a greater chance to get their license of a lifetime. Thank you for proposing this much wanted change to the preference system.

Vernon Tarbox, Clark, emailed: i do believe something should be done on the preference point system. it is frustrating when one hears about someone getting one of the blackhills elk tags with only a couple years preference where the one with 15 years is still waiting. the cube system should help with that or put a waiting period of at least a few years before one is eligible to start in the draw.

Ron Waterfall, Milbank, emailed: I support the proposed change.

Scott Pretzer, Fort Pierre, emailed: I offer the following comment on the GFP proposal considering cube preference points for all limited draw seasons: While I prefer a true top down preference point system, the cube preference points proposal is a step in the right direction to reward those applicants with more preference points. I support and encourage the GFP Commission to implement the cube preference points proposal into future limited draw guidelines.

The public Hearing concluded at 2:11 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kelly R Hepler". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Kelly R. Hepler, Department Secretary