

Minutes of the Game, Fish, and Parks Commission
June 8-9, 2017

Chairperson Peterson called the meeting to order at 1:18 p.m. CT at Cedar Shore Resort in Oacoma, South Dakota. Commissioners Cathy Peterson, Barry Jensen, Mary Anne Boyd, H. Paul Dennert, Gary Jensen, W. Scott Phillips and Douglas Sharp were present. Approximately 40 public, staff, and media were present.

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION

Conflict of Interest Disclosure

Chairperson Peterson called for conflicts of interest to be disclosed. None were presented.

Approval of Minutes

Chairperson Peterson called for any additions or corrections to the May 4-5, 2017, minutes or a motion for approval.

Motion by Sharp by G. Jensen TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 4-5, 2017 MEETING. Motion carried unanimously.

Additional Commissioner Salary Days

Commissioner G. Jensen requested one additional salary day for waterfowl meetings.

Motion by Phillips with second by Dennert TO APPROVE THE ADDITIONAL SALARY DAY AS REQUESTED. Motion carried unanimously.

FY18 Budget

Chris Petersen provided an overview of the FY18 budget for the Department indicating it totals 90.9 Million with increase of 2.3 million. Petersen presented the Division of Administration budget at \$4,237,361; Division of Parks and Recreation Operations Budget at \$24,572,816; Parks Capitol Development Budget at \$9,204,500; the Division of Wildlife Budget at \$48,463,900; Wildlife Capitol Development Budget of \$3,032,135; and the Snowmobile Trails Budget of \$1,329,199.

Director Petersen indicated the Division of Wildlife Operations Budget and Capitol Development Budget along with the Snowmobile Trails Budget require Commission action and requested approval of the three budgets as presented that will be implemented July 1, 2017.

Motion by B. Jensen with second by Boyd TO APPROVE THE DIVISION OF WILDLIFE OPERATIONS BUDGET OF \$48,463,900; THE DIVISION OF WILDLIFE CAPITOL DEVELOPMENT BUDGET OF \$3,032,135; AND THE SNOWMOBILE TRAILS BUDGET OF \$1,329,199 AS PRESENTED. Motion carried unanimously.

Petersen also provided an update on the status of code of conduct that will be brought before the Commission for adoption as an upcoming meeting. He indicated that that Governor's Office staff and other state attorneys are currently working to develop code of conduct for state boards to adopt. He stated this same group is also

reexamining the conflict of interest policy utilizing HB 1170 which provides clarity and hopefully streamlines the process.

Website/Mobile App Progress Report

Calley Worth, digital strategist, was present with Mark Smithers, Vice President for Migrate Outdoor a Sioux Falls based marketing and development company to provide an update on the progress being made and the services being provided to develop the new GFP website and mobile app redevelopment. Worth indicated Migrate Outdoors is focused on serving the outdoor industry and is conducting four research projects with the goal to improve the overall user experience with a launch date of December 1, 2017

Smithers provided a powerpoint outlining all 6 phases of the process. He noted they provided customer feedback through 5 focus groups across the state as well as an out of state survey at pheasant fest, and an online survey to outdoor enthusiasts ages 18 to 34 and focus group interview with outdoor enthusiasts. He noted hunters are most active users of the website requesting multiple types of information, anglers only requested a few items and campers wanted more information to allow them to make better informed decision especially as cross activity users and a better reservation system and process. He said it was also requested by those surveyed to have more user friendly apps and for discontinued use of pocket ranger and tweets on app.

Worth said they are working with an internal content team composed of subject matter experts who are working on editing content and writing to the correct audience.

Smithers stated they are currently in phases 3 and 4, with testing in the fall to meet the launch date deadline.

Commission Sharp asked if it would be possible to link the management plan for areas to a map that consumers could view by scrolling over a map. This would allow people understand why land is being used a specific way.

Strategic Plan Implementation Quarterly Update

Emily Kiel, communications director, provide a status update on the strategic planning walking thought the process noted the progress to date. There was a quarterly review session as the end of March that indicated 30 strategies are on track with 15 initiated, 10 with no progress and 5 completed.

Kiel stated the process is working and that a more detailed update will be presented in the fall that will detail year to date success, challenges, solutions, budget alignment with priorities

NonMeandered Waters Update

Secretary Hepler provided an overview on the status of the nonmeandered waters via powerpoint as well as a review of the draft legislation. He detailed what the open waters compromise as well as the timeline of action beginning with the supreme court decision.

Commissioner B. Jensen stated that per draft legislation it appears private property owners are given the opportunity to mark their property.

Hepler stated major agricultural groups support compromise with the exception of the Stockgrowers. He noted we will need work with landowners and create a buoy system.

Commissioner B. Jensen recommended starting off by meeting with landowners.

Commissioner Dennert inquired on section 11 of the draft legislation in regards to liability and asked for rough update on changes in new draft of the bill. He thinks a lot of problems started with lack of respect.

Helper responded that the portion he was inquiring about was likely a drafting error.

Commissioner Sharp thanked GFP staff and Kelly on the work done thus far and how fast this has come.

Commissioner Peterson also thanked the Department for reaching out to landowners and thanks to legislative group for working so fast.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Public Hearing began at 2:00 p.m. and concluded at 3:30 p.m. Minutes of the Public Hearing will follow the regular commission minutes.

PROPOSALS

Antelope Hunting Season

Chad Switzer, wildlife program manager, presented the proposed changes to the antelope hunting season noting the only recommended change from the previous year is to 1. Adjust the number of resident licenses from no more than 2,945 one-tag any antelope licenses to no more than 3,265 one-tag antelope licenses.

Motioned by Phillips with second by Sharp TO APPROVE THE ADJUSTMENT OF RESIDENT LICENSES AS PROPOSED. Motion carried unanimously.

Archery Antelope Hunting Season

Switzer presented the proposed archery antelope hunting season no recommended changes from the previous year.

Motioned by Boyd with second by Sharp TO APPROVE THE ARCHERY ANTELOPE HUNTING SEASON AS PROPOSED. Motion carried unanimously.

Custer State Park Antelope Hunting Season

Switzer presented the proposed changes to the Custer State Park antelope hunting season indicating the only recommended change from the previous year is to Adjust the number of resident licenses from no more than 3 one-tag any antelope licenses to zero one-tag antelope licenses; close the season.

Motioned by Dennert with second by Phillips TO APPROVE THE CUSTER STATE PARK ANTELOPE HUNTING SEASON AS PROPOSED. Motion carried unanimously.

Switzer presented the administrative action for the antelope hunting season unit licenses and access permit allocations for the 2017 – 2018 seasons.

Motioned by Boyd with second by Phillips TO APPROVE THE ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION TO ALLOCATE LICENSES AND ACCESS PERMITS AS PROPOSED. Motion carried unanimously. (appendix B)

Sage Grouse Hunting Season

Switzer presented the recommendation to close the sage grouse hunting season based on recommendations found within the 2014 – 2018 management plan and 2017 lek survey indicating low numbers.

Motioned by Sharp with second by Boyd TO CLOSE THE SAGE GROUSE HUNTING SEASON AS PROPOSED. Motion carried unanimously.

Custer State Park Coyote Hunting Season

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the Custer State Park coyote hunting season noting it is a two year recommendation.

1. Open season and allow residents to hunt coyotes with any valid hunting license. No Custer State Park coyote license will be issued.
2. All hunters must obtain a free access permit issued by the Department.
3. Amend the 200 yard hunting restriction near roads and buildings within Custer State Park to include coyotes.

Motioned by Dennert with second by Phillips TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE CUSTER STATE PARK COYOTE HUNTING SEASON. Motion carried unanimously

FINALIZATIONS

Good Earth State Park Rental Fees

Bob Schneider, parks and recreation assistant director, presented the finalization for the fees for meeting space rental at the Visitor Center and associated special events held on the nearby park grounds at Good Earth State Park.

Motioned by Boyd with second by B. Jensen TO APPROVE THE FINALIZATION FOR 41:03:04 PARK FACILITY USE FEES AT GOOD EARTH STATE PARK. Motion carried unanimously.

Custer State Park Non-Trophy Bison Harvest Season

Matt Hendrix, parks and recreation division staff specialist, presented the recommendation to change the season dates from 47 days beginning the 2nd Monday in January 2018 to begin the last Monday in October 2017 and reduce the number of cow licenses from five to zero

Motioned by Phillips with second by Olson TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO 41:06:60 THE SEASON DATES AND ELIMINATING THE COW LICENSES. Motion carried unanimously.

Custer State Park Trophy and Non-Trophy Bison Harvest Fees

Hendrix presented the recommended changes to adjust license fee from \$5000 to \$6,500 for trophy bull permits and \$2250 to \$3250 for non-trophy bull permits to be comparable to the average price nationwide.

Motioned by Olson with second by G. Jensen TO APPROVE THE INCREASE OF THE FEES FOR TROPHY AND NONTROPHY BISON HARVESTS IN CUSTER STATE PARK 41:06:02. Motion carried unanimously

Authorization for Terminally Ill to Hunt

Tom Kirschenmann, assistant wildlife director, presented the requested amendment to the rules governing the issuance of permits allowing terminally ill residents to make application for a permit to take one antelope, turkey and/or deer as authorized by the Department Secretary. The rule change would allow the Secretary to authorize a terminally ill resident to hunt and take the above species outside established hunting season dates should the person’s illness advance to a point justifying this special allowance.

Motioned by Dennert with second by Phillips TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO 41:06:01 ALLOWING TERMINALLY ILL RESIDENT HUNTERS TO HUNT OUTSIDE THE ESTABLISHED SEASON PER SECRETARY AUTHORIZATION. Motion carried unanimously.

East River Deer Hunting Season

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the east river deer hunting season as specified below noting the recommended changes from the proposal.

1. Adjust resident license numbers from no more than 17,505 one-tag, 10,175 two-tag and 1,400 three-tag deer licenses to 21,085 one-tag, 5,250 two-tag and zero three-tag deer licenses.
2. Create a new Limited Access Unit (Unit 13L) in Brule County that would be restricted to Corp of Engineers property, all Game Production Areas, and the Elm Creek Lakeside Use Area immediately adjacent to the Missouri River, and the Pease Game Production Area in southwest Buffalo County (see map). This unit is all public land and landowner preference does not apply.
3. Modify Unit 13A to include all of Brule County excluding that portion within Unit 13L.
4. Modify Unit 14A to include all of Buffalo County excluding the Pease Game Production Area within Unit 13L.

Year	Buck Tags	Doe Tags	Total Tags
2016	19,955	22,100	42,055
2017-2018	18,870	12,715	31,585

Buck Tags (-5%)
 Doe Tags (-44%)

Recommended change from proposal presented by Switzer

1. Modify proposed Unit 13L to portions of the Brule Bottom Game Production Area and Corp of Engineers area lands north of 240th Street including the Pease Game Production Area in southwest Buffalo County and Boyer Game Production Area and Corp of Engineer area lands west of 342nd Avenue, south of 255th street and Canyon Road, and south of a line extending from 256th Street west to the Missouri River. This unit is all public land. Landowner preference does not apply.
2. Adjust resident license numbers from no more than 17,505 one-tag, 10,175 two take and 1,400 three-tag deer licenses to no more than 21,075 one-tag, 5,250 two-tag and zero three-tag licenses.

Motioned by Dennert with second by Sharp TO AMEND THE PROPOSAL AS PRESENTED FOR THE EAST RIVER DEER HUNTING SEASON. Motion carried unanimously.

Motioned by B. Jensen with second by Dennert TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO 41:06:21 AND 41:06:01 THE EAST RIVER DEER HUNTING SEASON AS AMENDED. Motion carried unanimously.

West River Deer Hunting Season

Kirschenmann presented the recommended changes to the west river deer hunting season as specified below noting the recommended changes from the proposal.

1. Adjust resident license numbers from no more than 14,345 one-tag and 5,420 two-tag deer licenses to no more than 15,340 one-tag and 3,320 two-tag deer licenses.
2. Discontinue the split seasons for Gregory and Mellette counties and align with the regular West River deer season (16 consecutive days beginning on the Saturday 12 days before Thanksgiving).
3. Change the season date for Unit 24B (Little Moreau) from open for 23 consecutive days beginning on the first Saturday of November to 16 consecutive days beginning on the Saturday 12 days before Thanksgiving.
4. Adjust rule to make allowance of issuing nonresident license for Unit 58D

Year	Buck Tags	Doe Tags	Total Tags
2016	16,480	8,705	25,185
2017-2018	16,175	5,805	21,980

Buck Tags (-2%)

Doe Tags (-33%)

Recommended change from proposal as presented by Kirschenmann.

1. Beginning with the 2018 hunting season, discontinue toe split seasons for Mellette County and align with the regular West River deer season (16 consecutive days beginning on the Saturday 12 days before Thanksgiving) and allocate license accordingly.
2. Retain the current split season structure for Gregory County and licenses allocated for 2017 will be the same for the 2018 season.

Motioned by B. Jensen with second by Sharp TO APPROVE THE AMENDED CHANGES TO THE EAST RIVER DEER HUNTING SEASON AS RECOMMENDED

Motioned by G. Jensen with second by Boyd TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO THE EAST RIVER DEER HUNTING SEASON 41:06:20 AND 41:06:01 AS AMENDED. Motion carried unanimously.

Black Hills Deer Hunting Season

Switzer presented the recommended change from last year to adjust the number of resident licenses from no more than 4,100 one-tag deer licenses to no more than 4,300 one-tag deer licenses.

Motioned by Olson with second by G. Jensen TO ADJUST THE NUMBER OF ONE-TAG DEER LICENSES TO NO MORE THAN 4,300 AS PRESENTED FOR THE BLACK HILL DEER HUNTING SEASON 41:06:19. Motion carried unanimously.

Custer State Park Deer Hunting Season

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the Custer State Park deer hunting season as specified below.

1. Increase the total number of one-tag licenses from no more than 40 to no more than 64.
2. Modify the hunting dates from 14 consecutive days beginning on the first Saturday of November to November 1-30, with only archery equipment allowed from November 1-15.
3. Modify the muzzleloader hunting dates from 14 consecutive days beginning on the first Saturday of November to December 1-15.

Motioned by Sharp with second by Phillips TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO THE CUSTER STATE PARK DEER HUNTING SEASON AS RECOMMENDED 41:06:41. Motion carried unanimously.

Refuge Deer Hunting Season

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the refuge deer hunting season as specified below.

1. For Lacreek National Wildlife Refuge, adjust the number of resident licenses from no more than 20 one-tag deer licenses to no more than 25 one-tag licenses.
2. For Waubay National Wildlife Refuge, adjust the number of resident licenses from no more than 30 one-tag deer licenses to no more than 20 one-tag licenses.
3. All licenses within Waubay National Wildlife Refuge are restricted to muzzleloading rifles.

Motioned by Dennert with second by Olson TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO THE REFUGE DEER HUNTING SEASON 41:06:36 AS RECOMMENDED. Motion carried unanimously.

Archery Deer Hunting Season

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the archery deer hunting season as specified below noting the changes from proposal

1. For Unit ARD-LM1, close units 17A, 25A, 41A, 50A, and 58A and open units 44A and 62A.
2. Extend the end date for archery deer hunting in Sand Lake NWR from December 31 to January 15.

2017-2018

Designated Area	Number of Access Permits		
	Any Deer	Antlerless Whitetail Deer	Total
Adams Homestead and Nature Preserve	5	25	30
Good Earth State Park	5	0	5

Recommended changes from proposal to close unit 13L for unit ARD-LM1.

Motioned by G. Jensen with second by B. Jensen TO APPROVE THE AMENDED CHANGES TO THE ARCHERY DEER HUNTING SEASON 41:06:22 AS RECOMMENDED. Motion carried unanimously.

Motioned by Boyd with second by B. Jensen TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO THE ARCHERY DEER HUNTING SEASON AS PROPOSED. Motion carried unanimously.

Muzzleloader Deer Hunting Season

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the muzzleloader deer hunting season for unit MZD-LM1, closing units 17A, 25A, 41A, 50A and 58A and open units 44A and 62A to mirror the antlerless season noting the recommended change from the proposal to close unit 13L for unit MZD-LM1.

Motioned by Dennert with second by Sharp TO APPROVE THE CHANGE TO THE PROPOSAL CLOSING 13L FOR UNIT MZD-LM1. Motion carried unanimously.

Motioned by G. Jensen with second by Boyd TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO THE MUZZLELOADER DEER HUNTING SEASON 41:06:45 AS PROPOSED. Motion carried unanimously.

Kirschenmann presented the comparison of number and type of hunting licenses in each unit for the Black Hills, East River, West River, Refuge, Muzzleloader, Archery and Custer State Park Deer Hunting Seasons and proposed allocation of hunting unit licenses and access permits.

Motioned by B. Jensen with second by G. Jensen TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO LICENSE ALLOCATIONS AND ACCESS PERMITS AS RECOMMENDED. Motion carried unanimously.

Trapping Regulations

Kirschenmann presented the Commission with the recommended change to clarify the trapping prohibitions to include snares. So neither traps nor snares can be used within 30 feet of any exposed bait.

Motioned by Sharp with second by Boyd TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO INCLUDE SNARES IN THE TRAPPING PROHIBITIONS 41:08:02. Motion carried unanimously.

Nonresident Waterfowl Licenses

Commissioner G. Jensen presented the recommended changes to the nonresident waterfowl licenses as specified below noting the recommended changes from the proposal.

Current Allocations of Temporary Nonresident Waterfowl Licenses:

1. Current total allocation is 2,000 licenses.
2. Unit NRW-00Y: the counties of Spink, Brown, Marshall, Roberts, Day, Grant, Clark, Codington, Deuel, and Hamlin – 500 3-day licenses.
3. Unit NRW-00X: the counties of Campbell, Edmunds, Faulk, McPherson, Walworth, Potter, Stanley, Sully, Hughes, and Lyman – 1,500 3-day licenses.
 - Private land only in Potter, Stanley, Sully, Hughes and Lyman Counties

Recommended changes from the proposal

Recommended Changes to Allocations of Temporary (3-day) Nonresident Waterfowl Licenses:

1. Make no reduction to the total number of temporary nonresident waterfowl licenses.
2. Move Brown County from NRW-00Y (counties in GREEN) to a new unit (NRW-00V) that also includes Walworth, Campbell, Faulk, McPherson, and Edmunds Counties and allocate 500 temporary nonresident waterfowl licenses to this unit (counties in BLUE).
3. Restore the boundaries of NRW-00X to include Hughes, Stanley, Sully, Potter and Lyman Counties and allocate 750 temporary nonresident waterfowl license to this unit (counties in BROWN).
4. Establish a new unit (NRW-00Z) that includes all of the state other than the counties in NRW-00V, NRW-00X and NRW-00Y and Bennett, Charles Mix, Bon Homme, Yankton, Clay and Union Counties and allocate 250 licenses to this unit (counties in YELLOW).
5. Keep the current license allocation for Unit NRW-00Y at 500 3-day licenses that are valid on both private and public land.
6. Make all temporary nonresident waterfowl licenses except those for Unit NRW-00Y valid only on private land.

G. Jensen then did a review of history on the contentious issue beginning in April 2017 when the Commission was presented with two different ideas. One to raise nonresident waterfowl numbers to double, and the second to reduce the nonresident waterfowl numbers by half or more. At that time the Commission decided to draft its own proposal that was more middle of the road. It was presented to the public and open for comments. Then in May due to comments received, changes were made to the Commissions proposed changes. . At the May meeting in Custer the Commission revised the proposal to reduce the allocation of 2000 temporary licenses by 250, and distributed them in the existing and newly proposed units.. After the proposed changes were made it was then sent out to the public for comments and meetings were held with groups and individuals that were advoates of both increasing and reducing the number of licenses available. Again numerous public comments were received and reviewed by the Commission noting the need to emphasize not increasing the numbers of 3-day licenses. G. Jensen then proposed an amendment to adjust the proposed allocations . He also noted another key part is that everyone has agreed that we would get together to develop objective scientific data to make decisions going forward. He also stated South Dakota is the only state that limits nonresident waterfowl licenses like this. He thinks the current proposal is a good and fair compromise and said there is always room for revisions going forward.

Motioned by G. Jensen with second by Phillips to amend the current proposal for nonresident waterfowl licenses. Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Olson thanked Commissioner G. Jensen for the effort he put into this very difficult process including emails, phone calls and public interaction. He said to keep in mind that compromise is good considering recent legislation sought to add 3000 more nonresident waterfowl hunters in the pool when overcrowding is already a problem.

Commissioner Olson inquired about the 250 licenses in proposed new unit asking if they have to indicate dates and location for hunting when they are applied for.

Tom Kirschenmann stated they do.

Olson would like to see this closely monitored stating he thinks we will then see complaints from resident hunters. Then maybe see three sets of dates to avoid a rush of hunters.

Commissioner B. Jensen inquired if all dates are removed and about private and public license allocations.

G. Jensen clarified the areas for restricted dates and where private and public licenses will be available.

Kirschenmann stated this should appease those concerned about the agreement made previously and allocation for Missouri river unit.

Tony Leif, wildlife division director, said modifications to 3 day licenses were made by legislation presented by Representative Werner. The revised proposal will balance license demand and hunter concentrations and restore the Missouri river unit. He noted drawing more lines on the map is not always a good, thing but is sometimes what needs to be done to meet the requests of the people.

Commissioner Peterson thanked G. Jensen and everyone for their hard work. She said it is difficult to please everyone and hopes this change will be taken with an open mind and reminder that changes can be made as we go forward. She said GFP is very helpful and the Commission are just citizen representatives who want to help and feel passionate about these matters.

Sharp said this is a good compromise and asked staff to look into items previously mentioned and boating near roosting areas.

Motion by Boyd with second by G. Jensen to approve the changes to the nonresident waterfowl licenses as amended. Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Phillis thanked those who wrote comments stating the Commission has to listen to everybody and emotions run high on this issue because we are talking about a continental resource as species that crosses international borders. He said he supports this and thanked those who worked on this and feel everyone gets something out of this. He said we also need to be more welcoming of out of state guests as there is a reduction of hunters nationally. He thinks we need to reach out to nonresidents and hopes this helps with that.

Cindy Longmire, human dimensions staff specialist, said in an attempt to identify criteria per comments from Commission, staff and public we would need to look at areas of consideration, history of use in an area, factors that contribute to quality of hunt, variations of types of waterfowl hunting, economic impact, and understand enforceability of regulations. She will work with staff and public to determine these factors. Then have those same people who provided input review the input received. She will utilize social science methods. Longmire said we are currently participating in studies: one with the National Waterfowl Hunters in the central flyway where preliminary data is being circulated and will be finalized soon. They are hoping to have it by this fall. We are also a part of another study on participation trends though the University of Nebraska as well as an in depth review of lapsed hunters and big game hunters who also hunt waterfowl.

OPEN FORUM

Chairwoman Peterson opened the floor for discussion from those in attendance on matters of importance to them that may not be on the agenda. No members of the public provided comments.

DIVISION OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Little Spearfish Canyon and Bismarck Lake Stewardship Plan Inventory Report

It was noted this agenda item will be presented at the July Commission meeting.

Adams Homestead and Nature Preserve Cottonwood Playground Project

Jeff VanMeeteren, parks and recreation regional supervisor, introduced Jody Moats, park manager, who will provide an overview of Adams Homestead and Nature Preserve and detail of current projects.

Moats indicated the Adams homestead began in 1872 with the mission being for people particularly youth could enjoy the land and learn more about the natural world surrounding them. The homestead site includes a school, church, house and cabin as well as an area dedicated to the brother Sonny which is a live animal working farm. Moats noted there are 1,500 acres of natural resources with approximately 450 acres of

cottonwoods, 525 acres of productive agricultural land, Mud Lake and native grass restoration. She said they provide recreation and education programs which include a trail system for hiking, biking, and cross country skiing; wildlife watching opportunities, hunting and environmental education programs including school field trips, summer camps and public programs with annual visitation at 36,000. Moats said that in effort to bring children and parents outside by way of unstructured play they are creating the cottonwood playground. The design is unique and will complement the park with a customer glass fiber playground, treelike structure and other naturesque pieces. Moats stated they have received excellent support from the community with great fundraising efforts thus far with work continuing and hope to have playground by August for 20th anniversary.

Parks Revenue and Camping Reservation Report

Bob Schneider, assistant parks and recreation director, provided the park revenue and camping reservation report. The report includes a year to date comparison of revenue by line and May 2017 year to date comparison by district item. Schneider noted overall revenue is up 6 percent although trail revenue was down 23 percent as the weather in May was not conducive for biking. He also stated camping was up 7 percent while visitation was down 1 percent.

DIVISION OF WILDLIFE

Land Acquisition Projects

Paul Coughlin, habitat program administrator provided a request to acquire the Costlow Property located in Lake County. The property consists of 0.8 acres at a cost of \$79,000 to be utilized as a Public water access area addition to the Payne water access area at Lake Madison.

Motioned by G. Jensen with second by Dennert TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 17-07(Appendix A) AUTHORIZING AND CONFIRMING THE PURCHASE OF 0.8 ACRES IN LAKE COUNTY. Motion carried

Coughlin also provided the list of proposed land acquisitions projects in early development including the Northwest Day County property consisting of 783 acres to be used as a GPA, the Addition to Bitter Lake property consisting of 580 acres to be used as a GPA and the North Sanborn GPA property inholding consisting of 1.13 acres. Coughlin also provided information on the Barrett property currently being leased as a parking lot at Lake St. John in Hamlin County which will be brought before the Commission at the July meeting to accept as a donation.

Waterfowl Season Structure

Tom Kirschenmann provided a powerpoint presentation on the waterfowl season structure detailing the 2016 duck limits and zone/splits explaining how they are part of the federal framework and what the states are allowed to do within the federal framework for setting seasons. He then provided information on duck zones in the surrounding states of North Dakota, Nebraska, Minnesota and Iowa discussing the pros and cons of how they have their utilize their splits based upon their zone set up.

Sportsmen Against Hunger

Tom Kirschenmann presented the annual summary information that was provided last month to the Sportsmen Against Hunger board. The summary indicated the majority of donations come from east and west river deer hunting antlerless licenses. The counties with the largest number of donations all have units with

antlerless licenses. Those counties are list indicating how many each donated: Butte 46, Pennington/Black Hills 42, Tripp 20, Gregory 19, Faulk 16, Harding and Meade 14 each, Edmunds, McPherson and Sully 13 each. Kirschenmann also provided information on Canada Goose that indicated they were down from the previous year as the time period accepting harvested geese was shorter and goose numbers are lower than previous years. Pronghorns are accepted as donations but no funds from GFP are used to cover this processing.. He then provided detailed information on the expenditures for processing and how funds are utilized.

Fishing Regulation Fundamentals Continued

Mark Fincel, fisheries biologist, provided a powerpoint on reservoir productivity and in different locations of the reservoir noting almost the same trend for both producer types. He said the transitional zone is the most productive providing a productivity graph for lake sharp from 2008. Fincel explained sedimentation impacts how reservoirs and lakes age with high productivity at point of fill then decrease. He noted low water years allow for vegetation to grow then be flooded creating the higher level of productivity. He also explained the difficulties of managing aging systems and that they need to manage for current potential not peak potential. Therefore it is difficult to manage for long lived fish.

B. Jensen asked if small stock ponds are similar

Fincel said yes, but small stock ponds also receive run off that provides nutrients and that they sometime get too much which causes blue green algae that is just an overabundance of unnatural nutrients.

Inaccessible Public Lands

Kirschenmann provided a document per Commissioner Sharp's request about landlocked public land. This map identifies those areas. By utilizing DOT roadmaps GFP GIS staff were able to create an overlay to indicate inaccessible property. Examples would be a small GPA in a body of water or a public parcel of land without a road going to it. The map identified by type, GPA, SPL, USFS, BLM and WPA. It indicates the majority of inaccessible public land is in the western portion of the state. Kirschenmann said that in alignment with the strategic plan these lands will be reviewed and that staff in the western part of the state have been working to obtain access to those additional public grounds to provide opportunity

Sharp said this is a good start and appreciates the work done by staff.

West River Fisheries Management Area Update

Chelsea Pasbrig, fisheries biologist, presented the Commission with a powerpoint on west river fisheries management area. She said all three large reservoirs provide good access for anglers as do the national grassland dams and small reservoirs. Pasbrig indicated the objective for 2016 to determine demographics and preference of anglers fishing rivers and streams and small lakes and ponds has been completed. Pasbrig said the small impoundments study is ongoing but provided primary results and also provided angler survey results. She noted standard operations for 2016 includes 48 lakes surveyed, 4 lakes creel surveyed and the fish stocked. Pasbrig also stated that of the 6 remaining objectives progress has begun on 4 of them.

Deer plan and grouse plan

Kirschenmann asked the Commission to take action at July meeting

Andy Lindbloom, senior wildlife biologist, explained the process to develop the plan and the public input process

Sage Grouse Population and Management Plan Update

Travis Runia, senior wildlife biologist, presented the Commission a powerpoint on the sage grouse population and management plan update which indicated a reduction in the counts from 280 to 218. They are finding low survival due to drought. He said the current population level is still better than where we were a few years ago. Runia indicated they are working to look at population and interface data with other states. He also said placing cameras at nest sites to identify predators and impacts of west nile virus will be helpful information.

Dennert inquired of forty sold what about the 10 people who didn't hunt as it appears lots of applicants that could have hunted did not.

Runia said we do not ask the specific reason, but some will volunteer the reason. It is only expect that half to 75 percent of people who draw actually hunt.

Peterson asked if staff take into consideration with all seasons that some do not hunt.

Switzer responded yes.

Antelope Population and Management Plan Update

Andy Lindbloom presented a powerpoint presentation on the antelope population and management plan update. He detailed biological surveys, season statistics, winter severity index and population objectives. Lindbloom noted harvest and success has increased and recruitment has been stable with a slight increase with surveys suggesting an approximate 15 percent annual growth rate of adults over the last 2 years. Lindbloom stated the current management plan is for 2014-2018 with revisions beginning next summer. He noted potential revisions topics and population objectives.

License Sales Update

Scott Simpson, wildlife administration chief, provided the license sales report as of May 30 for all resident and nonresidents for all license types. Simpson said annual fishing license sales are down two percent and nonresident annual fishing licenses sales are down even more with a decrease of five and a half percent which is most likely impacted by nonmeandered waters issues.

Solicitation of Agenda Items from Commissioners

No new agenda items were requested at this time.

Hepler thanked the Commission, staff and especially Commissioner G. Jensen for the work done in regards to nonresident waterfowl.

Leif introduce Mike Klosowski as the new wildlife regional supervisor in the northeast.

Adjourn

Motioned by Sharp with second by Jensen TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. Motion carried unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

RESOLUTION 17 - 07

WHEREAS, the Department of Game, Fish, and Parks (GFP) has expressed an interest in acquiring real property presently owned by Gladys B. Costlow, Trustee of the Gladys B. Costlow Living Trust, dated June 19, 1991, 1423 City Spring Road, Rapid City, SD 57702, which property is described as:

The Northeast One Hundred Twenty Feet (NE120') of Lot A of Lot Three (3) of Marr's Subdivision of Government Lot Five (5) of the Southwest Quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section Twenty-two (22), Township One Hundred Six (106) North, Range Fifty-two (52), West of the 5th P.M., Lake County, South Dakota, according to the recorded plat thereof, containing 0.62 acres, more or less, and hereafter referred to as COSTLOW PROPERTY; and

WHEREAS, said property is to be acquired by and utilized by GFP as a Water Access Area; and

WHEREAS, SDCL 41-4-1.1 requires that before GFP acquires and purchases property, GFP must notify owners of land located adjacent to the property sought to be acquired by publishing notice of the same once in each legal newspaper of the county in which the property to be purchased is located; and

WHEREAS, GFP has published the required legal notice at least thirty (30) days prior to the date of action by the Commission authorizing the intended purchases, which notice included the time and location of the meeting at which Commission action is expected and by giving notice of instructions for presenting oral and written comments to the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has reviewed any and all comments that may have been received relative to the intended purchase and after consideration of the same, the Commission approves the purchase of said property for use as a Water Access Area;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that GFP is authorized to complete negotiations for the purchase of the COSTLOW PROPERTY and execute and consummate an agreement with Gladys B. Costlow, Trustee of the Gladys B. Costlow Living Trust, dated June 19, 1991, which is acceptable to GFP to acquire by purchase, at the price of \$79,000.00, the COSTLOW PROPERTY for use as a Water Access Area.

Appendix B

2017-2018 BLACK HILLS DEER

Unit	Resident Licenses			Nonresident Licenses			License Totals							
	Any Deer	Any WT	Antlerless WT	Any Deer	Any WT	Antlerless WT	RE S	RE S	RE S	RE S	NR	NR	N R	NR
	01	11	13	01	11	13	1-tag	2-tag	Lic	Tags	1-tag	2-tag	Lic	Tags
BD1	0	0	500	0	0	40	500	0	500	500	40	0	40	40
BD2	0	0	100	0	0	8	100	0	100	100	8	0	8	8
BH1	200	3,500	0	16	280	0	3,700	0	3,700	3,700	296	0	296	296
TOTAL	200	3,500	600	16	280	48	4,300	0	4,300	4,300	344	0	344	344
Unit	Any Deer	Any WT	Antlerless WT	Any Deer	Any WT	Antlerless WT	RE S	RE S	RE S	RE S	NR	NR	N R	NR
	01	11	13	01	11	13	1-tag	2-tag	Lic	Tags	1-tag	2-tag	Lic	Tags
RES and NR:							4,644	0	4,644	4,644				

2016 VS 2017-2018 COMPARISON

Resident Licenses												
Unit	Any Deer				Any Whitetail				Antlerless Whitetail			
	Year		Change		Year		Change		Year		Change	
	2016	2017-2018	#	%	2016	2017-2018	#	%	2016	2017-2018	#	%
BD1									300	500	200	67%
BD2									100	100	0	0%
BH1	200	200	0	0%	3,500	3,500	0	0%				
TOTAL	200	200	0	0%	3,500	3,500	0	0%	400	600	200	50%

Note: An additional 8% of the number of licenses will be available to nonresidents.

2017-2018 EAST RIVER DEER

Unit #	Unit Name	Resident Licenses							
		AnyD	AtID	AD+AtID	2 AtID	AnyW	AtIW	AW+AtIW	2 AtIW
		01	03	08	09	11	13	18	19
01A	Minnehaha	450	100						
03A	Brown	1,100	1,300						
04A	Beadle					500	100		
05A	Codington	250							
06A	Brookings	450	100						
07A	Yankton	250							
07B	Yankton		75						
08A	Davison					200			
10A	Aurora					350	200		
12A	Bon Homme	150							
12B	Bon Homme						50		

13A	Brule	100				600		200	
13L	Brule	20							
14A	Buffalo	100						250	
16A	Campbell	20				400	300		
17A	Charles Mix	100				150			
18A	Clark	600							
19A	Clay	200							
22A	Day	600							
23A	Deuel	400							
25A	Douglas					150			
26A	Edmunds			700	600				
28A	Faulk			600	800				
29A	Grant	300							
32A	Hamlin	600							
33A	Hand	20				450	400		
34A	Hanson					200			
36A	Hughes	175				250	175		
37A	Hutchinson					100			
38A	Hyde	20						500	200
40A	Jerauld					350	200		
42A	Kingsbury	500	100						
43A	Lake	300	100						
44A	Lincoln	200	50						
46A	McCook	350	100						
47A	McPherson	500			500				
48A	Marshall	500							
51A	Miner	400	350						
52A	Moody	350	100						
54A	Potter	150						500	400
55A	Roberts	500							
56A	Sanborn					350	200		
57A	Spink	900	400						
59A	Sully West	100				250	100		
59B	Sully East	20				350	100		
61A	Turner	100							
62A	Union	250	50						
63A	Walworth	50				400	300		
	TOTAL	11,075	2,825	1,300	1,900	5,050	2,125	1,450	600
Unit #	Unit Name	AnyD	AtID	AD+AtID	2 AtID	AnyW	AtIW	AW+AtIW	2 AtIW
		01	03	08	09	11	13	18	19

2016 VS 2017-2018 COMPARISON

Unit #	Unit Name	2016 Resident Licenses	2017-2018 Resident Licenses	# Change	% Change	2016 Resident Tags	2017-2018 Resident Tags	# Change	% Change
01A	Minnehaha	650	550	-100	-15%	650	550	-100	-15%
03A	Brown	2,200	2,400	200	9%	2,200	2,400	200	9%
04A	Beadle	1,050	600	-450	-43%	1,300	600	-700	-54%
05A	Codington	250	250	0	0%	250	250	0	0%

06A	Brookings	550	550	0	0%	550	550	0	0%
07A	Yankton	250	250	0	0%	250	250	0	0%
07B	Yankton	75	75	0	0%	75	75	0	0%
08A	Davison	300	200	-100	-33%	300	200	-100	-33%
10A	Aurora	950	550	-400	-42%	1,650	550	-1,100	-67%
12A	Bon Homme	200	150	-50	-25%	200	150	-50	-25%
12B	Bon Homme	50	50	0	0%	50	50	0	0%
13A	Brule	1,150	900	-250	-22%	2,000	1,100	-900	-45%
13L	Brule	0	20	20	NA	0	20	20	NA
14A	Buffalo	400	350	-50	-13%	700	600	-100	-14%
16A	Campbell	720	720	0	0%	1,420	720	-700	-49%
17A	Charles Mix	550	250	-300	-55%	550	250	-300	-55%
18A	Clark	600	600	0	0%	600	600	0	0%
19A	Clay	200	200	0	0%	200	200	0	0%
22A	Day	600	600	0	0%	600	600	0	0%
23A	Deuel	400	400	0	0%	400	400	0	0%
25A	Douglas	325	150	-175	-54%	325	150	-175	-54%
26A	Edmunds	1,300	1,300	0	0%	2,600	2,600	0	0%
28A	Faulk	1,400	1,400	0	0%	4,200	2,800	-1,400	-33%
29A	Grant	300	300	0	0%	300	300	0	0%
32A	Hamlin	600	600	0	0%	600	600	0	0%
33A	Hand	870	870	0	0%	1,720	870	-850	-49%
34A	Hanson	300	200	-100	-33%	300	200	-100	-33%
36A	Hughes	600	600	0	0%	775	600	-175	-23%
37A	Hutchinson	100	100	0	0%	100	100	0	0%
38A	Hyde	920	720	-200	-22%	1,820	1,420	-400	-22%
40A	Jerauld	700	550	-150	-21%	1,300	550	-750	-58%
42A	Kingsbury	700	600	-100	-14%	700	600	-100	-14%
43A	Lake	450	400	-50	-11%	450	400	-50	-11%
44A	Lincoln	200	250	50	25%	200	250	50	25%
46A	McCook	450	450	0	0%	450	450	0	0%
47A	McPherson	1,000	1,000	0	0%	2,000	1,500	-500	-25%
48A	Marshall	500	500	0	0%	500	500	0	0%
51A	Miner	900	750	-150	-17%	950	750	-200	-21%
52A	Moody	450	450	0	0%	450	450	0	0%
54A	Potter	1,050	1,050	0	0%	1,950	1,950	0	0%
55A	Roberts	500	500	0	0%	500	500	0	0%
56A	Sanborn	900	550	-350	-39%	950	550	-400	-42%
57A	Spink	1,300	1,300	0	0%	1,300	1,300	0	0%
59A	Sully West	550	450	-100	-18%	950	450	-500	-53%
59B	Sully East	470	470	0	0%	920	470	-450	-49%
61A	Turner	100	100	0	0%	100	100	0	0%
62A	Union	250	300	50	20%	250	300	50	20%
63A	Walworth	750	750	0	0%	1,450	750	-700	-48%
	TOTAL	29,080	26,325	-2,755	-9%	42,055	31,575	-10,480	-25%

2017-2018 REFUGE DEER

Unit	Resident Licenses			Nonresident Licenses			License Totals							
	Any D	Any Atl D	2 Any Atl D	Any D	Any Atl D	2 Any Atl D	RES	RES	RES	RES	NR	NR	NR	NR
	01	03	09	01	03	09	1-tag	2-tag	Li	Tag s	1-tag	2-tag	Lic	Tags

Lacreek Refuge														
RFD-LC1	15	0	0	2	0	0	15	0	15	15	2	0	2	2
RFD-LC2	10	0	0	1	0	0	10	0	10	10	1	0	1	1
Sand Lake Refuge														
RFD-SL1	20	10	0	2	1	0	30	0	30	30	3	0	3	3
RFD-SL2	20	10	0	2	1	0	30	0	30	30	3	0	3	3
RFD-SL3	20	10	0	2	1	0	30	0	30	30	3	0	3	3
RFD-SL4	20	10	0	2	1	0	30	0	30	30	3	0	3	3
RFD-SL5	20	10	0	2	1	0	30	0	30	30	3	0	3	3
Waubay Refuge														
RFD-WA1	10	0	0	1	0	0	10	0	10	10	1	0	1	1
RFD-WA2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RFD-WA3	10	0	0	1	0	0	10	0	10	10	1	0	1	1
TOTAL	145	50	0	15	5	0	195	0	195	195	20	0	20	20
Unit	Any D 01	Any Atl D 03	2 Any Atl D 09	Any D 01	Any Atl D 03	2 Any Atl D 09	RES 1-tag	RES 2-tag	RES Lic	RES Tags	NR 1-tag	NR 2-tag	NR Lic	NR Tags
RES and NR:							21	5	0	21	5	0	21	5

2016 VS 2017-2018 COMPARISON

Resident Licenses									
Refuge Unit	Any Deer				Antlerless Deer				
	Year		Change		Year		Change		
	2016	2017	#	%	2016	2017	#	%	
Lacreek Refuge									
RFD-LC1	5	15	10	200%					
RFD-LC2	15	10	-5	-33%					
Sand Lake Refuge									
RFD-SL1	20	20	0	0%	10	10	0	0%	
RFD-SL2	20	20	0	0%	10	10	0	0%	
RFD-SL3	20	20	0	0%	10	10	0	0%	
RFD-SL4	20	20	0	0%	10	10	0	0%	
RFD-SL5	20	20	0	0%	10	10	0	0%	
Waubay Refuge									
RFD-WA1	10	10	0	0%					
RFD-WA2	10	0	-10	-100%					
RFD-WA3	10	10	0	0%					
TOTAL	150	145	-5	-3%	50	50	0	0%	

Note: An additional 8% of the number of licenses will be available to nonresidents.

STATE PARK ARCHERY ACCESS PERMITS 2017-2018

Designated Area	Number of Access Permits		
	Any Deer	Antlerless Whitetail Deer	Total
Adams Homestead and Nature Preserve	5	25	30
Good Earth State Park	5	0	5

2016 VS 2017-2018 COMPARISON

Designated Area	Number of Access Permits		
	Any Deer	Antlerless Whitetail Deer	Total
2016 Adams Homestead and Nature Preserve	5	25	30
2017-2018 Adams Homestead and Nature Preserve	5	25	30
2016 Good Earth State Park	5	0	5
2017-2018 Good Earth State Park	5	0	5

MUZZLELOADER DEER SEASON 2017-2018

	Resident	
	Any Deer Licenses	Any Deer Tags
Statewide	1,000	1,000
Total	1,000	1,000

2016 VS 2017-2018 COMPARISON

	Resident	
	Any Deer Licenses	Any Deer Tags
2016 Statewide	1,000	1,000
2017-2018 Statewide	1,000	1,000

CUSTER STATE PARK DEER 2017-2018

Unit	Resident Licenses		
	Any Deer	Any Whitetail	Antlerless Whitetail
	01	11	13
CUD-1	5	29	0
CUD-2	0	0	30

TOTAL	5	29	30
--------------	----------	-----------	-----------

2016 VS 2017-2018 COMPARISON

Unit	2016 Resident Licenses	2017-2018 Resident Licenses	# Change	% Change	2016 Resident Tags	2017-2018 Resident Tags	# Change	% Change
CUD-1	10	29	19	190%	10	29	19	190%
CUD-2	30	30	0	0%	30	30	0	0%
TOTAL	40	59	19	48%	40	59	19	48%

2017 WEST RIVER DEER

Unit #	Unit Name	Resident Licenses						Nonresident Licenses					
		Any D 01	Atl D 03	Any W 11	Atl W 13	AW+At IW 18	2 AtIW 19	Any D 01	Atl D 03	Any W 11	Atl W 13	AW+At IW 18	2 AtIW 19
02A	Pennington	400				200		32	0	0	0	16	0
02C	Pennington	100		50				8	0	4	0	0	0
11A	Bennett	150		100				12	0	8	0	0	0
11B	Bennett	100		125				8	0	10	0	0	0
15A	Butte	200				650	250	16	0	0	0	52	20
15B	Butte	150				500	150	12	0	0	0	40	12
20A	Corson	100		300				8	0	24	0	0	0
21A	Custer	100		200				8	0	16	0	0	0
21B	Custer	100		50	50			8	0	4	4	0	0
24A	Dewey	100		250	100			8	0	20	8	0	0
24B	Little Moreau			10	10			0	0	1	1	0	0
27A	Fall River	100						8	0	0	0	0	0
27B	Fall River	200		200	100			16	0	16	8	0	0
27L	Fall River	10		10				1	0	1	0	0	0
30A	Gregory	25		500		100		2	0	40	0	8	0
30B	Gregory	25		500		100		2	0	40	0	8	0
31A	Haakon	600		150	100			48	0	12	8	0	0
35A	Harding	300		300	250			24	0	24	20	0	0
35C	Harding	100		300	250			8	0	24	20	0	0
35L	Harding	125						10	0	0	0	0	0
39A	Jackson	150		100				12	0	8	0	0	0
39B	Jackson	250		150				20	0	12	0	0	0
41A	Jones	150		300				12	0	24	0	0	0
45A	Lyman	100		450		100		8	0	36	0	8	0
45B	Lyman	50		200				4	0	16	0	0	0
45C	Lyman	30					20	3	0	0	0	0	2
45D	Lyman	20		40				2	0	4	0	0	0
49A	Meade	700		250	150			56	0	20	12	0	0
49B	Meade	700		400	300			56	0	32	24	0	0
50A	Mellette	200		225				16	0	18	0	0	0
50B	Mellette	200		225				16	0	18	0	0	0
53A	Perkins	300				350	200	24	0	0	0	28	16

53C	Perkins	500				400	300	40	0	0	0	32	24
58A	Stanley	100		100				8	0	8	0	0	0
58D	Stanley	5	5					1	1	0	0	0	0
60A	Tripp	400		700	250			32	0	56	20	0	0
64A	Ziebach	300		200				24	0	16	0	0	0
65A	Oglala Lakota	100						8	0	0	0	0	0
67A	Todd	150						12	0	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL	7,390	5	6,385	1,560	2,400	920	593	1	512	125	192	74
Unit #	Unit Name	Any D 01	Atl D 03	Any W 11	Atl W 13	AW+At IW 18	2 AtIW 19	Any D 01	Atl D 03	Any W 11	Atl W 13	AW+At IW 18	2 AtIW 19

2018 WEST RIVER DEER

Unit #	Unit Name	Resident Licenses						Nonresident Licenses						License Totals							
		Any D 01	At ID 03	Any yW 11	Atl W 13	AW+AtlW 18	2 Atl W 19	Any D 01	At ID 03	Any yW 11	Atl W 13	AW+AtlW 18	2 Atl W 19	RE S 1-tag	RE S 2-tag	RES Licen ses	RE S Tag s	NR 1-tag	NR 2-tag	NR Licen ses	NR Ta gs
02 A	Pennington	40				200		32	0	0	0	16	0	400	0	600	800	32	16	48	64
02 C	Pennington	10		50				8	0	4	0	0	0	150	0	150	150	12	0	12	12
11 A	Bennett	15		10				12	0	8	0	0	0	250	0	250	250	20	0	20	20
11 B	Bennett	10		12	5			8	0	10	0	0	0	225	0	225	225	18	0	18	18
15 A	Butte	20				650	250	16	0	0	0	52	20	200	90	1,100	2,000	16	72	88	160
15 B	Butte	15				500	150	12	0	0	0	40	12	150	65	800	1,450	12	52	64	116
20 A	Corson	10		30				8	0	24	0	0	0	400	0	400	400	32	0	32	32
21 A	Custer	10		20				8	0	16	0	0	0	300	0	300	300	24	0	24	24
21 B	Custer	10		50	50			8	0	4	4	0	0	200	0	200	200	16	0	16	16
24 A	Dewey	10		25	10			8	0	20	8	0	0	450	0	450	450	36	0	36	36
24 B	Little Moreau			10	10			0	0	1	1	0	0	20	0	20	20	2	0	2	2
27 A	Fall River	10						8	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	100	100	8	0	8	8
27 B	Fall River	20		20	10			16	0	16	8	0	0	500	0	500	500	40	0	40	40
27 L	Fall River	10		10				1	0	1	0	0	0	20	0	20	20	2	0	2	2
30 A	Gregory	50		1,000		200		4	0	80	0	16	0	105	20	1,250	1,450	84	16	100	116
31 A	Haakon	60		15	10			48	0	12	8	0	0	850	0	850	850	68	0	68	68
35 A	Harding	30		30	25			24	0	24	20	0	0	850	0	850	850	68	0	68	68
35 C	Harding	10		30	25			8	0	24	20	0	0	650	0	650	650	52	0	52	52
35 L	Harding	12						10	0	0	0	0	0	125	0	125	125	10	0	10	10
39 A	Jackson	15		10				12	0	8	0	0	0	250	0	250	250	20	0	20	20
39 B	Jackson	25		15				20	0	12	0	0	0	400	0	400	400	32	0	32	32
41 A	Jones	15		30				12	0	24	0	0	0	450	0	450	450	36	0	36	36
45 A	Lyman	10		45		100		8	0	36	0	8	0	550	10	650	750	44	8	52	60
45 B	Lyman	50		20				4	0	16	0	0	0	250	0	250	250	20	0	20	20
45 C	Lyman	30					20	3	0	0	0	0	2	30	20	50	70	3	2	5	7
45 D	Lyman	20		40				2	0	4	0	0	0	60	0	60	60	6	0	6	6
49 A	Meade	70		25	15			56	0	20	12	0	0	110	0	1,100	1,100	88	0	88	88
49 B	Meade	70		40	30			56	0	32	24	0	0	140	0	1,400	1,400	11	2	0	112
50 A	Mellette	40		45				32	0	36	0	0	0	850	0	850	850	68	0	68	68
53 A	Perkins	30				350	200	24	0	0	0	28	16	300	55	850	1,400	24	44	68	112
53 C	Perkins	50				400	300	40	0	0	0	32	24	500	70	1,200	1,900	40	56	96	152
58 A	Stanley	10		10				8	0	8	0	0	0	200	0	200	200	16	0	16	16

58 D	Stanley	5	5					1	1	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	10	2	0	2	2	
60 A	Tripp	40		70	25			32	0	56	20	0	0	135	0	1,350	1,350	10	8	0	108	10
64 A	Ziebach	30		20				24	0	16	0	0	0	500	0	500	500	40	0	40	40	
65 A	Oglala Lakota	10						8	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	100	100	8	0	8	8	
67 A	Todd	15						12	0	0	0	0	0	150	0	150	150	12	0	12	12	
	TOTAL	7,390	5	6,385	1,560	2,400	920	593	1	512	125	192	74	15,340	3,320	18,660	21,980	1,231	266	1,497	1,763	
Unit #	Unit Name	An yD	At ID	An yW	Atl W	AW+ AtlW	Atl W	An yD	At ID	An yW	Atl W	AW+ AtlW	Atl W	RE S 1-tag	RE S 2-tag	RES Licen ses	RE S Tag s	NR 1-tag	NR 2-tag	NR Lic	NR Tag s	
		01	03	11	13	18	19	01	03	11	13	18	19	16,571	3,586	20,157	23,743					
														RES & NR:				16,571	3,586	20,157	23,743	

2016 VS 2017-2018 COMPARISON

Unit #	Unit Name	2016 Resident Licenses	2017-2018 Resident Licenses	# Change	% Change	2016 Resident Tags	2017-2018 Resident Tags	# Change
02A	Pennington	600	600	0	0%	800	800	0
02C	Pennington	150	150	0	0%	150	150	0
11A	Bennett	250	250	0	0%	250	250	0
11B	Bennett	225	225	0	0%	225	225	0
15A	Butte	1,000	1,100	100	10%	1,850	2,000	150
15B	Butte	800	800	0	0%	1,450	1,450	0
20A	Corson	400	400	0	0%	400	400	0
21A	Custer	300	300	0	0%	300	300	0
21B	Custer	150	200	50	33%	150	200	50
24A	Dewey	450	450	0	0%	450	450	0
24B	Little Moreau	20	20	0	0%	20	20	0
27A	Fall River	100	100	0	0%	100	100	0
27B	Fall River	500	500	0	0%	500	500	0
27L	Fall River	20	20	0	0%	20	20	0
30A	Gregory	850	1,250	400	47%	1,550	1,450	-100
30B	Gregory	850	0	-850	-100%	1,550	0	-1,550
31A	Haakon	850	850	0	0%	850	850	0
35A	Harding	650	850	200	31%	650	850	200
35C	Harding	500	650	150	30%	500	650	150
35L	Harding	125	125	0	0%	125	125	0
39A	Jackson	250	250	0	0%	250	250	0
39B	Jackson	400	400	0	0%	400	400	0
41A	Jones	550	450	-100	-18%	900	450	-450
45A	Lyman	800	650	-150	-19%	1,500	750	-750
45B	Lyman	250	250	0	0%	250	250	0
45C	Lyman	50	50	0	0%	70	70	0
45D	Lyman	90	60	-30	-33%	90	60	-30
49A	Meade	1,000	1,100	100	10%	1,000	1,100	100
49B	Meade	1,400	1,400	0	0%	1,400	1,400	0
50A	Mellette	450	850	400	89%	450	850	400
50B	Mellette	600	0	-600	-100%	600	0	-600
53A	Perkins	850	850	0	0%	1,400	1,400	0
53C	Perkins	1,200	1,200	0	0%	1,900	1,900	0
58A	Stanley	550	200	-350	-64%	550	200	-350
58D	Stanley	10	10	0	0%	10	10	0
60A	Tripp	1,800	1,350	-450	-25%	1,800	1,350	-450

64A	Ziebach	500	500	0	0%	500	500	0
65A	Oglala Lakota	75	100	25	33%	75	100	25
67A	Todd	150	150	0	0%	150	150	0
	TOTAL	19,765	18,660	-1,105	-6%	25,185	21,980	-3,205

Note: An additional 8% of the number of licenses will be available to nonresidents.

Public Hearing Minutes of the Game, Fish and Parks Commission
June 8, 2017

The Public Hearing Officer Scott Simpson began the public hearing at 2:00 p.m. at the Cedar Shores Resort in Oacoma, South Dakota with Commissioners Peterson, B. Jensen, Boyd, Dennert, G. Jensen, Phillips and Sharp present. Simpson 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.

Good Earth State Park Rental Fees

No oral or written testimony was received

Custer State Park Non-Trophy Bison Harvest Season

No oral or written testimony was received

Custer State Park Trophy and Non-Trophy Bison Harvest Fees

No oral testimony was received

Dean A. Johnson, Arlington, SD, emailed "I want to register my protest regarding the hunting fees for buffalo in Custer State Park. Those high fees prevent the ordinary hunter from applying. You are catering to the rich at the expense of ordinary South Dakota citizens."

Authorization for Terminally Ill to Hunt

No oral or written testimony was received

East River Deer Hunting Season

No oral or written testimony was received

West River Deer Hunting Season

Abby Smikle, Herrick, SD, as a cattle rancher in Gregory County she sent an email to the Commission in regards to the split season that she feels should stay in place. She says this would negatively affect the local economy for local taxidermy, butchers as well as ranchers. Also said too many hunters in one area unsafe, competitive with other seasons, split allows for better hunting opportunity due to mating season and allows for more options for in state and out of state hunters, allow her family more variety and option and allows them to be in the field longer.

Commissioner Phillips: if in line with WR that would allow more total days to hunt

Smikle we still want the split season and not ever for a split season.

Ken Krieger, Burke, SD, as a resident of Gregory County he wants to keep the deer season split due to the opportunity for motels, restaurants, taxidermy, etc. And it is important to people in the County. Krieger also prefers the one tag license instead of the two tags allowing more people opportunity to hunt. Private landowners in the county are concerned with number of hunters if the season is no longer split. Young men in the county are hoping to start a wild game processing business as the current game processing plant cannot handle the current need. He feels this would hurt their

business opportunities. The first season is good for older people and youth due to the milder climate. It is not in the best interest of Gregory County to discontinue the split season. He would like to see special buck tags issued addressed and change to allow from 500 to 1000 for residents and 500 to 1000 for nonresidents.

Representative Lee Qualm, Platte, SD, has received numerous phone calls that they do not want the split season removed and would put too many people in the field at one time.

Paul Tual, Herrick, SD, would like to keep the split season

Bob Waterbury, Herrick, SD, as a lifelong resident of Gregory County and outfitter for 30 year says the split season provides opportunity. He has been a part of the stakeholder workgroup and did not recall removal of the split season being mentioned once. He doesn't understand why this would be done and can't think of a good reason to remove the split season.

Rogers Wiltzs, Wagner, SD, as a writer for an outdoor column he knows how the people feel. His first concern for the split season is he hopes there is a good reason to split the season. He feels for people in the area and for himself. He says the commission needs to look at people who go multiple years without drawing a tag.

Chuck Bergman, Sioux Falls, SD, emailed "I am writing in response to the news that the commission is considering to stop the split season for west river deer in Mellette an Gregory Co. I have hunted in these counties now for 15+ years an the split is the main reason I do hunt them. With the split seasons the amount of hunters on public lands is tolerable but if they are combined then they double. I an many others have spent many days before season out driving an knocking on doors to try an find a private place to hunt but I just can't afford the prices if it is allowed. I know many of the ranchers out there that have allowed me to hunt turkeys an antelope but deer are a no go. My kids are now just starting to get into hunting an I was loving the fact that they may benefit from this split season due to the fact that there may not be 500 people out there fighting for the same 5 pieces of public land. I hope you reconsider your plan cause I would hate to see a good thing come to an end. Thanks for your consideration."

Russ A. Walz, Sioux Falls, SD, emailed" I'm writing to convey my desire to continue the split seasons for Mellette and Gregory counties. Merging the seasons will result in too many hunters competing for the same hunting grounds. I would like to see the split season remain as it has been for many years. Thanks"

Bill O'Neill, Gaylord, MI, emailed" Please see attached letter regarding the proposed season dates for the 2017 and 2018 West River deer hunting seasons. As the letter states I am asking you to reconsider the proposal and include a split season. Reducing to one period season will result in far fewer out of state hunters. South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks (GFP) Commission, I would like to start by complimenting your deer management efforts and habitat enhancement in the West River Region. I was privileged to participate in a West River early season hunt last year and found the management and quality of the hunting excellent, even with the disease challenges you faced. You and your landowners have combined to provide a truly excellent hunting opportunity. I am also writing to express my concerns with The South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks (GFP) Commission's proposal to change the West River hunt dates which eliminates the split season and reduces the season to one period. I

believe this change will result in a significant reduction of out of state hunters coming to SD. Our hunting party circumstances are fairly typical of many other Michigan and out of state hunters that travel to SD to deer hunt. Because of your split season we can enjoy both an opening day in Michigan and an out of state hunt in SD. Elimination of this split season requires all Michigan hunters to choose between hunting opening day in Michigan or traveling to SD. Many of us own property, belong to hunting clubs and enjoy a long family inspired tradition of hunting in Michigan. As it is in SD, this is a cherished tradition, one we value and enthusiastically participate in. I have not missed an opening day in over 40 years! Given the choice between our opening day hunt or hunting in SD, I would have to choose our traditional hunt in Michigan. Michigan hunters are not alone in this conflict. Others states have opening days at similar times so there will be many other out of state hunters that will be forced to pass on a SD hunt because of this conflict in seasons. Eliminating the early season will reduce hunting opportunity for your customers as well as reduce revenue for the state of South Dakota, South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks department and local communities. In conclusion, I am asking the Commission to reconsider eliminating the early season, it provides many positives with few negative consequences. Keep the split season with the early season option. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Ken Rasche, Rogers City, MI, emailed” My comments are directed to the elimination of the split season opening dates for the South Dakota rifle deer season. I have had the good fortune to the hunt firearms deer season in Gregory County for twelve of the last thirteen seasons. I have always appreciated the fact that your early start in that county has given me and numerous other non resident hunters the opportunity to enjoy a quality deer hunting experience and for that, I thank you. However, I am also a hunting land owner in Michigan and have had the opportunity to hunt the opening day of deer season in my home state for the past sixty years. Hunting in Michigan is a family tradition and if you change the opening dates as proposed, myself and many others will be forced to make a choice between Michigan and South Dakota. I believe that its fair to say that none of the Michigan hunters whom I have hunted with in South Dakota over the years will be coming back. I also believe its fair to say that many hunters in other Eastern states will be effected in a like manner resulting in a serious loss of revenue to your department as well as hotels, motels, restaurants and numerous hunting outfitters. In conclusion, I respectfully request that you reconsider eliminating the split season opening dates. As I see it, unless there is some very sound game management reason for making this change, please leave it " AS IS". In other words, " If its not broken, don't attempt to fix it". Thank you for allowing comments and also for allowing an old man the opportunity to hunt in your great state with your great people. Respectfully Submitted”

Justin Allen, Pierre, SD, emailed” I'm writing today in regards to deer tag/license proposals. I see it has been proposed to reduce any deer firearm tags in a couple counties along the Missouri River/Lake Oahe specifically West Sully and Stanley Co. I fully support the reduction if GFP believes it is needed but i do have a problem with firearm hunters taking the brunt of the effect of the reduced any deer tags. I believe archery hunters should also have reduced any deer license available in those particular counties along with other Missouri River/ Oahe lake counties. In West Sully it takes and average of 3-4 years preference to get an any deer tag but yet a non-resident archery hunter can gain a tag every year. I do not like this approach. I would like to see limited draw any deer licenses along Lake Oahe for residents and specifically Non-residents. Thank you for your time.”

Brad Beavers, Jefferson, SD, emailed” I am a west river and east river landowner. I am strongly opposed to the termination of the split Gregory county deer season. I own and operate a ranch in Gregory Co. I allow hunters on my property but only let one group on at a time. By doing away with this season there will be one group that won't be able to hunt. They plan their vacations a year in advance and already have the time off this year. I also know people that hunt the public areas and they have already made Motel reservations for this year for the early season. With the number of hunters on the limited amount of public land I feel it will be a total total disaster for public land hunters/landowners to have them all in the field during one season. Another item I feel needs addressed is the antlerless season in both east and west river. This includes muzzleloader,youth and bow. Some of these seasons extend until the middle of January. By then they are shooting a lot of bucks that have shed their antlers. Please look at closing these seasons the end of the year. Thank You”

Ken Krieger, Burke, SD, emailed” Discontinuing the traditional 2017 split deer hunting seasons for Gregory and Mellette Counties is not a good idea and is not in the best interests of deer hunters, land owners and County residents. Once again, land owners and deer hunters are caught in the middle of this proposal with the GF&P's "we don't care attitude." Someone surely isn't thinking clearly ... when the GF&P has all ready sold the 2017 Special Buck licenses, hunters have the tag in hand, planned their hunt (many of them for the first traditional deer season in the counties mentioned with land owner permission) and then the GF&P proposes closing the first season. What do private land owners tell the Special Buck hunters that were lucky enough to draw the tag, have taken their vacation time a year in advance to deer hunt and are planning to hunt the first four days of the traditional first season in 2017 in Gregory and Mellette counties if the season is discontinued? The first season hunters will not have a place to hunt in the second season if land owner have other guys hunting at that time. Is the GF&P willing to give these Special Buck hunters with no place to hunt their money back for the license? Please see additional comments in my attached file on the negative economic effects closing the first season will have for the counties ... mainly Gregory County. I would urge you to vote to continue the traditional split deer hunting season for Gregory and Mellette Counties for 2017 and beyond. I am sending my written comments to you about the proposed 2017 discontinue of the split deer hunting season for Gregory County West River Deer. This is certainly not a good idea and in not in the best interests of Gregory County residents. I would urge you to vote to continue the traditional split deer hunting season for Gregory County in 2017 and beyond. The GF&P has already sold and sent out the 2017 Special Buck licenses to hunters. There are many Special Buck hunters with tags in hand that are planning to hunt in 2017 in the first four days of the traditional Gregory County split deer hunting season. Land owners have given these hunters their consent to hunt and the hunters have put the land owners name and phone number down on the Special Buck applications as a requirement for applying for the tag. What do private land owners tell the Special Buck hunters that were lucky enough to draw the tag, have taken their vacation time a year in advance to deer hunt and are planning to hunt the first four days of the traditional deer hunting season of 2017 in Gregory County if the season is discontinued? Is the GF&P willing to give these Special Buck hunters their money back? Someone surely isn't thinking clearly here ... when the GF&P has already sold the 2017 Special Buck licenses, guys have a tag in hand, planned their hunt and then the GF&P and Game Commission discontinues the split deer hunting season in Gregory County. Private land owners in Gregory County will not have room for all the sportsmen planning to hunt deer in 2017 if everyone is put into one season. Especially if they have given other sportsmen permission to hunt in the second season of our traditional split deer hunting

season. You get too many people group up in one hunting area and no one is happy with the quality of their hunt. Close the first season and the first season deer hunters will not have a place to hunt. Lots of hot words and bad feelings will be the outcome and this will not be a positive thing for anyone ... especially the GF&P and the state of South Dakota. Gregory County needs the economic income that the traditional split deer hunting season brings in to the small communities located in our county. The economic impact of discontinuing the split deer hunting season to Gregory County will be huge and not in a positive way. I guess no one thought about that when they are looking at closing the first season. A couple of young guys in our county are talking about putting in a new wild game processing plant for deer. It is a business that our county needs. Their new business would be cut in half by the decision to discontinue the first deer season if all the first season hunters lose their scheduled time spot and place to hunt. I can't imagine a bank working with anyone on a loan if this happens. We need the new game processing plant for deer as the older plant can't keep up with the number of deer taken to them in both seasons when the deer hunting is spread out over another four days of hunting with the two seasons. Close the first season, put all hunters in a tighter time slot and a lot of deer will get turned away and not get processed. A lot of older sportsmen and younger kids hunt the first deer hunting season in Gregory County as the weather seems be a lot nicer than the second season. Close the first season and a lot of these deer hunters will not have a place to hunt in the 2017 second season, especially on private land. Keeping kids involved in hunting is the future of the sport. Discontinuing the first deer hunting season in Gregory County is not a good idea and is not in the best interests of Gregory County residents. Please vote to continue the traditional split deer hunting season in Gregory County for 2017 and beyond"

Lance Gerth, Clear Lake SD, Brendan Gerth, Clear Lake SD and Les Duncan, Parker SD, emailed" We see that there is a proposal to do away with the split season in Gregory and Mellette county and have it happen at the same time as other west river seasons. This would not work as well in our opinion. One of the reasons we like this season is because it allows us to hunt at a different time which causes less disruption in our workplaces. There are a lot of tags for these areas and if everyone shows up on opening weekend there will be a crowding problem. We are hoping that you will reconsider this idea and decide to keep these seasons the way they have been. Thank you,"

Jeff G. Johnson, Gregory, SD, emailed" I do own 640 acres and do help manage pheasant hunting on an additional 2500 acres in western Gregory County. I would like to comment on your proposal to change the Deer Season in Gregory County to one Season. If I am right, Gregory County has one of the highest number of deer permits in the State. Currently your 2 season system works very well. This system splits the deluge of hunters to separate weeks. Truly all deer hunters want to have the OPENING MORNING. I would offer that the single season proposal would heighten the Safety Concerns as well stretch the available hunting habitat. In western Gregory County we have very high deer populations who survive off the pheasant preserves' habitat fields and I am sure that the preserves would like to keep the split season that spreads the hunters. In eastern Gregory County there are many Deer Guides who could host more hunters for a better success rate. Please consider my input when you decide this issue. This Split Season has worked very well in the past and hopefully will continue."

Hank Wonnenberg, Gregory SD, emailed" This letter is being sent in response to the proposal to eliminate the split deer hunting season in Gregory County, SD. I

personally am not a deer hunter and, although my family farms, we don't take part in commercial hunting. I am sending this letter from my perspective as an Ag and Commercial Loan Officer. Our local businesses depend upon two primary industries to survive - agriculture and hunting. Many of our businesses need both industries to prosper in order to survive as we have little else to offer in our rural and somewhat desolate communities. Additionally, property values in our communities are extremely reliant upon agriculture and the hunting industry. Property values need to hold in order for many of our residents to be able to obtain financing for a variety of things. When the number of hunting licenses or tags are cut, or when a season is shortened or eliminated in any way, it has a direct impact on local businesses. In small communities like those in Gregory County and the surrounding area, every sales transaction matters. The proposal would reduce the amount of non-local traffic in our communities. Additionally, there are even larger impacts that could be felt over the course of several years - property values may decline as a result (both rural ag properties with hunting habitat as well as residential properties) because hunters and commercial hunting operations are often major players in land purchases. When we order certified appraisals for real estate loans, hunting impact is often cited in the appraisal and likely contributes positively to the appraised value of most properties. Gregory County has a lot of excellent deer habitat. Deer are thriving in this area. The split deer season with the earlier opener has been around a long time, and our deer numbers are plentiful. I do not see a "good" reason for adjusting the seasons in Gregory County. I do feel that the impacts felt within the communities in our area will only be negative if you decide to eliminate the earlier opener. The longer we can have hunters around, the more goods and services those in the communities can provide to the hunters (which also increases tax revenue). Please consider the issues I've addressed in this brief letter. I know I have heard other arguments for leaving things alone, but I have concentrated on addressing those issues which will adversely affect the financial positions of many within our communities."

Shon Ford, Miller, SD emailed" I am writing in response to the proposed elimination of the early Deer season for Mellette county. Please do not eliminate this season. This season, much like east river counties pheasant season, holds a long standing tradition for myself and hopefully my daughters as well. It is the first date marked on the new calendar every year and it is responsible for many cherished relationships I would not enjoy today if this season was eliminated. I understand fully the many aspects of a decision like this. I also understand that in South Dakota tradition weighs heavy on decisions your department makes. My children are now old enough to start traveling with me on this trip and have been looking forward to it as long as they've know what it is. This is the most important aspect of my writing. I could go on and on attempting to justify leaving the season alone but I'm sure others have issues as well. Thank you for your time and consideration."

Black Hills Deer Hunting Season

No oral or written testimony was received

Custer State Park Deer Hunting Season

No oral or written testimony was received

Refuge Deer Hunting Season

No oral or written testimony was received

Archery Deer Hunting Season

No oral testimony was received

Justin Broughton, Sioux Falls, SD, emailed” I am writing in response to your archery deer proposal for 2017/18. I strongly request that the commission consider limiting the number of non-resident tags available to archers. In 2016 almost 3500 non-resident hunters bow hunted in SD compared to 24,000 residents. The majority of these NR hunters are hunting on our limited public lands and creating pressure on our fragile mule deer herds in western SD. Specifically resident archers, outnumbering NR archers by a 6-1 margin harvested 481 mule deer bucks statewide while NR archers harvested 325. Only a difference of 156 animals versus a difference in 20,000 hunters. You can see my concern with the specific targeting of mule deer by NR hunters. They apply in other western states that ALL limit mule deer access by NR archers with the exception of Nebraska. When they do not draw, they all come to SD and hunt our limited public lands in pursuit of our dwindling mule deer. Each year this trend continues to grow and the pressure increases. I have written to the commission numerous times on this subject and have yet to see or hear it discussed. The big game commission also has brought this up as an issue. Limit mule deer targeting and harvest by managing the tag types through access permits or by creating a lottery for any deer tags for NR hunters. Whitetail tags can be left as is. Please consider the quality of hunt your residents are losing through this continued spread of mule deer hunters from out of state on our public lands west river. We are outnumbered at this point. Take a drive through the Black Hills, the Slim Buttes, or some other premier western public tracts and you will soon see my concern. This problem has an easy solution based upon processes that are already in place. Limit NR access to mule deer permits specifically via the access permit process. Thank you for your consideration.”

Muzzleloader Deer Hunting Season

No oral or written testimony was received

Trapping Regulations

No oral or written testimony was received

Nonresident waterfowl

Larry Stephen, Pierre, SD: President of Migratory Bird Association provided information on past work to get 2000 for Stanley, Sully and Hughes counties noting they have worked since then to keep these licenses. He inquired with Dennert on the original bill and that if 500 ran out they would like a guarantee they can get some licenses back. It makes a lot of people unhappy that these changes. He agrees with the increase in licenses, but want to keep some of them as well as guaranteed hunting in the original three counties.

Justin Bell, Pierre, SD, attorney for Flatlands Flyway, stated his clients operate private service and need assurance for cliental to continue to utilize their services. Bell said it is important to remember that South Dakota has residents as well as his clients that support the proposal to allow additional opportunity especially in Brown County and allow for utilization of tags throughout the state. His clients believe that current statute indicates the Commission doesn't have the authority to increase more than 5 percent per year. Future legislative work may be required.

Dick Paulson, Aberdeen, SD, has lived in Aberdeen and has hunted geese since for years. He says as more geese were hunted further west they moved due to pressure. Every year they had good hunting until pheasant season and lost birds due to

pressure. Then season has opened in September and has helped alleviate the pressure. This shows that birds will adapt and move. He is not against nonresident hunting and stated waterfowl is way different that fish and pheasant and you cannot stock them. Paulson said he was offered a place to hunt by landowner in which from Sunday to Friday 19 hunters stopped to ask permission 2 residents and 17 nonresident.

President of South Dakota Waterfowl Association feels for this issue and opposes this proposal for the same reasons as the last two hunters. This proposal does not help resident hunters it adds 250 licenses to eastern South Dakota which is already overcrowded and the other 500 will go to areas like Brown County that are already over pressured. Need reason like waterfowl hunting to keep retired people to stay and keep the youth here. If you continue to reduce the quality of outdoor activities the youth will leave. Hotel owners spoke to free money this brings in. Russo continue to go back to legislature when they do not get their way while his organization continues to work with the Commission as they should. This is not the best thing to do for resident hunters.

Bill Koupal, Pierre, SD, would like to compliment what the Commission has done in the past with the use of science and data using good information to make decisions. He spoke with Commissioner G. Jensen and was assured that GFP wants to do some surveys to utilize data to make decisions. Inquired what data and research is being used that shows the decisions to increase nonresident water fowlers to be relevant. Koupal said this proposal has no scientific basis and is driven by other factors which are political pressure. He urged the Commission to ask themselves where the data is and what is driving out decision.

George Vandell, Pierre, SD, would like the Commission to consider the impact of decisions on duck hunting and what will it be positive, neutral or negative. Only positive will be for flatlands flyways and businesses who are already be getting business. He said there is a myth that there is all this water and all these ducks, but in the age of cell phones ducks and hunters concentrate. This will result in more hunters in the northeast making it tougher for residents and make more competition and will lose more duck hunters as it will be difficult to find a place to have a good hunt without pressure. In conclusion the proposal will be negative.

Bobby Cox, Ipswich, SD, moved to South Dakota in 2002 for quality waterfowl hunting and said restrictions make waterfowl hunting good. Cox says the issue does not have a right or wrong answer noting where do you draw the line in the sand to make the most people happy. It's not like adding seats to a stadium. When you have too many people it detracts from the quality of hunting. In the past he commuted 120 to work out of state and come to South Dakota to hunt waterfowl. He said he will probably move if he loses quality waterfowl hunting.

Dick Werner, Herreid, SD, said he does not consider himself an authority on the issue but has done considerable amount of research and sponsored legislation. Commends the Commission for looking at options. He reviewed each proposal. He said we need to honor agreement made in the past and to move Brown County from east to the west and leave Brown and Spink Counties together or split at highway 212 taking flight patterns into considerations. He also agrees to preserve licenses for late season hunting. Werner said last year increase licenses was 253 and commended staff for their accurate estimate. He also asked not to reduce 250, and to either move them or keep current allocation in NE He would also like licenses in Y to only be valid in private land and Need to leave public land as is.

Rosie Smith, Glacial Lakes Tourism Association, represents membership that says most hunters are respectful and happy to get licenses every few years. They would like to keep things as is, but do not want to see a reduction. They do not want to see private land and would prefer public land that is currently being hunted. Local lodges rely on tourism dollars and her group does not want to hurt the locals and would like to see everyone work together.

Arnold Veen, Milbank, SD, emailed, "GFP commissioners, I have reviewed the proposed seasons for 2017 & 2018. I am opposed to the season extensions into January of the following year on all the hunting seasons (Archery, East and West Rifle, Youth and Muzzleloader deer seasons) I was also hoping to see a limit of Non-Resident licenses of 8% to allow the SD residents more opportunities to draw a hunting license in areas where there is limited licenses available. I believe that the Non Resident 8% rule should apply state wide. "

Doug Tieszen, Encampment, WY, emailed, "I am a non resident landowner in Gregory county and have been for twenty years. I am OPPOSED to the elimination of the split season in Gregory as it allows for a better quality hunt by spreading out pressure on opening day and the early part of the season. Please leave it as it has been."

Mike Van Cleave, Aberdeen, SD, emailed, " Please make no changes to nonresident waterfowl, we have to many now as it is."

Duane Ganser, Highland Hts., OH, emailed, "Sirs, I have been coming to S D for more than 40 years hunting both pheasants and waterfowl. These new proposals make no sense to me! First, reducing the number of licenses helps no one. The guides loose out. Towns, gas stations, motels, restaurants and anywhere non residents can spend money, loose out by reducing the number of hunters who can come and hunt. Second, all waterfowlers over the age of 16 must purchase a Federal Duck stamp. As you know, these stamps help support, fund and procure more waterfowl land. This new proposal will make it illegal for some non residents to hunt WPA's. Lands that waterfowls have helped pay for. Where is the common sense in that? There is none! Please leave the non resident waterfowl licenses the way they have been! Common sense in America has been missing for some time. Please help bring it back to main stream America! Thank You."

Dave Junker, Colville, WA, emailed, "I was born and raised in Aberdeen, SD. I own a house in Roscoe, SD for hunting purposes. I currently live in Colville, WA. Last year after 3 years of being un-successful in getting a general non-resident waterfowl license, I was drawn. I hunted the first 10 days of Nov. and never shot a bird, weather conditions were not favorable for fall migration. That happens. I also generally buy a non-resident archery deer license. Now you finally offer a solution to the limited number of non-resident licenses that allow people who did not draw successfully an opportunity to still hunt a 3 day season on any type of land in Edmunds and McPherson Counties (where I've hunted since I was 12 years old, I am now 61 and have never missed a season), but probably due pressure from the private hunting guides and big time leasers, you chicken out and propose to change to appease these controllers, forcing the average hunter, who make up the majority of hunters that pay your salaries, to only hunt private land in December, where the only hunting opportunities will be around

Pierre with private guides. North Dakota is looking and sounding better all the time. Thank you for your time.

Wade Kouril, Higginsville MO, emailed” Good afternoon, I am a South Dakota born and raised waterfowl hunter who now lives in Missouri. I would like to share my opinion on this topic. I now have 2 teenage sons who also love waterfowl and pheasant hunting like I do. Last year, I bought an adult pheasant license, youth pheasant license, and was drawn for the NR waterfowl license for myself and 1 son. We as a family look forward to making this a tradition once a year to return to my SD roots, visit friends and family, and harvest pheasants and waterfowl. This year both of my sons will be eligible to hunt, but the cost of the NR waterfowl licenses make it pretty hard to afford since there is not a discount for youth. I would absolutely love to apply for the 3-day waterfowl license and would encourage you to add more 3-day or replace some of the 10-day licenses. Assuming the 3-day is less expensive than the 10-day, this would most likely make it more affordable for us to do. I understand the responsibility to not “over-hunt” waterfowl on their breeding grounds, but I would guess a large percentage of people that purchase the 10-day would be satisfied with a 3-day. If you charged (for the 3-day) 55% of what a 10-day license costs; and reduced the number of 10-days but added double that same number of 3-days, you would be money ahead and have sold less “hunting days”. Of course you can play with the figures, but my point is that I think a good number of your NR customers would rather purchase the 3-day as it’s more affordable and we don’t hunt more than 3 days anyways. A discount for youth waterfowl should also be considered into the process. Missouri charges non-residents \$11 per day for waterfowl; I’d gladly pay \$33 each for three 3-day licenses for myself and 2 teenage sons. In fact, I’d gladly pay twice that amount versus the \$121 each I paid last year for the 10-day. Thank you for considering this point of view. If nothing else, maybe add this to the year-end NR survey, “would you rather purchase a 3-day NR waterfowl license at X% of the price versus a 10-day with X number of available licenses versus the 10-day. Thanks again.”

David Mines, Yankton SD, emailed:” I would like to comment on your revised non-resident waterfowl proposal. When will you get it through your head we don't want anymore non-residents hunting here. If I wanted to live in a state with too many people and depleted natural resources I would move to wherever all these people are from. I choose to live in a low population state with great hunting and fishing. Enough with the non-residents. Pheasant hunting has been ruined by out of state hunters, enough is enough.”

Mitchell Reuss , Sioux Falls, SD, emailed” In regards to the nonresident license changes up for finalization on June 8th, I would like to provide the following comments for the record: I am opposed to any licenses being valid for private land only, unless there is a component attached that provides additional public access. Further, restricting these licenses to private land only promotes additional commercialization of waterfowl hunting, and could actually reduce access to residents and non residents alike. I am opposed to removing Brown County from NWR-00Y and adding it to NWR-00X. Brown County is a popular destination for nonresident hunters. The many existing 00Y licenses that previously would be used in Brown now would be used in the remaining 00Y counties, increasing the amount of hunters in those counties. Also, It only makes sense that hunters who enjoy Brown County would apply for the 500 unrestricted date licenses and likely continue to hunt there; so now you have a situation where pressure would continue to be the same in Brown County, but now also more pressure would be created in the remaining 00Y counties. At the same time, a majority of the proposed 500

unrestricted date licenses would likely be marketed towards prospective clients of guides and outfitters, again, doing nothing but adding additional commercialization. This portion of the proposal smells nothing more than a veiled attempt to appease commercial interests specific to Brown County. I am in favor of reallocating existing 00X licenses to a statewide 3 day license option, but only if those licenses are valid for private and public land. I would take that one step further, leaving Brown in 00Y, leave 500 or 750 licenses for the original 5 county 00X area, and have the remaining 1000-1250 as a state wide 3 day license, valid for public/private. This idea could be taken one step further allowing half of the licenses to be available for use before November 1, and half after. This would allow those non residents who come here during the first two weeks of pheasant season an additional chance to draw a waterfowl license who may not otherwise hunt waterfowl in SD. This seems to be a common theme that comes up during every nonresident license debate, "our pheasant hunters ask about hunting ducks and we have to tell them no." Being that the nonresident pheasant hunter numbers are highest before early November, it would make sense to create a license pool that would be valid during that time frame. I would be in favor of a pilot program, offering perhaps 250-500 statewide licenses to be used before November 1st, and see what the feedback is regarding sales, usage, and public comments regarding pressure & overall experiences. I appreciate the committee's work regarding this never ending issue, but please remember that the majority of all hunters, both resident and nonresident, are fine with the current system, therefore any proposed changes have to make sense to all hunters, and commercial interests should not influence license allocations."

Thomas J. Estrem, Elbow Lake, MN, emailed" I am 63 years old and have hunted South Dakota most of my life for Pheasants and occasionally waterfowl. Most of the time when out pheasant hunting see ducks everywhere and nobody hunting them.

When I have gotten drawn your none resident license is 10 continuous days not two 5 day which makes no sense. Don't know many people that could hunt 10 days in a row or would want to with possession limit. At risk. There can only one reason why you have number of none resident licenses offered and you have to be lucky enough to have your name drawn. You don't want us there. Why can't you be fair like North Dakota and be able to purchase license on your way out to hunt. Unlike pheasants they are a migratory bird. Time for you to make a change. Wish I was 25 years younger now that your finally coming around!"

Jeff Smith, Eden Prairie, MN, emailed" Thank you for taking the time to read this opinion. I'm not sure where the need keeps coming from to change the current nonresident waterfowl license structure.....could it be increased revenue? If so the solution is very simple – increase the license fee's! As a non resident waterfowl hunter from Minnesota, I'd gladly pay more for the best quality experience in the COUNTRY!! For the last 50 years I've had the privilege to hunt Canada, North Dakota, South Dakota, Illinois, Kentucky, Missouri and Arkansas and consistently South Dakota provides the highest quality US experience. I'm sure there are lots of nonresident duck hunters that would agree with a fee increase if that will keep the current system in place and not increase numbers for the benefit of a few commercial operators. Commercial guides are not the people bringing money into the many small businesses around the state during duck season. The only people getting that money are the outfitters themselves!! Please DO NOT change the NRW license system!"

Kerry Stiner Burke SD, emailed" I am in favor of reducing the out of state licenses by 250. Personally I would reduce it further. If it gets to the point that only non

residents and rich people can hunt it will be the end of hunting as the rest of the people will vote to ban it. The only people wanting more out of state licenses are the business people and lodges that cater to them. The rest of the people don't want them."

Eric Marquardt, Champlin, MN, emailed" Thanks you for all your work in trying to come up with a solution that supports both the resident and non-resident hunter. Migratory Waterfowl are a national if not continental resource and to continue to severely limit and further restrict the non-resident access is wrong on so many levels. You end up punishing yourself and the resident business owners, tax payers and hunters as the dollars spent by non-residents dwindle and are moved to other more non-res friendly states. You also pit the sportsmen and women against each other as the non-res is as much if not more responsible for the public land that produces much of the waterfowl as the SD resident is. My tax and sporting goods dollars buy those lands and my membership in PF, DU, Delta Waterfowl and other organizations do the same thing. Should I be asking my chapters and national reps to not invest in SD because they are so restrictive? That will come very quickly if proposals like this continue to be advanced. The reductions you are making to the current NWR-00X is almost certainly a 1,000 license reduction with the change to 500 after Dec 1st and the removal of 250 licenses to statewide. I completely understand that this license (in its form prior to last year) has not typically sold out, but as the eligible counties have expanded and the additional public land potential was added for the expanded counties, I expect that the allotment of 1,500 would be used over time. I see my self and my family/friends potentially buying 2 of these licenses every year possibly 3 if ducks are around late season. The removal of public land will cripple the license as the public land is the jewel of SD. I can honestly say in 25+ years of waterfowl hunting in Potter, Edmunds and Faulk County mainly on public land, I have never been in a situation where another hunter and I were trying to hunt the same WPA, in fact I rarely ever even see another waterfowl hunter, resident or non-resident, so the "over crowding", "non-res are chasing the birds away" lines are just that... lines of adult male bovine dung! All your licenses are restrictive and limit access to the non-res. Please reconsider keeping the license the same as proposed from last year's changes. Add in the additional counties and allow hunting on public lands as well as private, not many non-res hunters have access to private land. If you need to take 250 for statewide then do it, but don't mandate the Dec 1st deal when you know the odds are good that no waterfowl are in the state except maybe along the river, so very few would need the license then. Thanks for reading

Brandon Marquardt, Champlin MN, emailed" Thank you for all your work in trying to come up with a solution that supports both the resident and non-resident hunter. Migratory Waterfowl, I would consider a continental resource and continuing to drastically limit and restrict the non-resident access is a weird way to go about it. This new plan I would argue has bigger economic implications on South Dakota residents, tax payers and hunters as more non resident's will choose to hunt in more non - resident friendly states. Another argument could be made that non - resident's are more responsible for the public land that produces much of the waterfowl as the SD resident is. If proposals like this continue to happen more people will be asking their chapters (DU, PF, Delta Waterfowl) to not invest in SD based on the heavy restrictions, which is a likely outcome for the limited availability to the non resident with these changes. Myself and at least 5 members in our group apply and buy non -resident licenses every year and if birds are still around come Dec 1st then yes I'm all for that "late season" license as well. I can honestly say in my 12 years of hunting waterfowl in S.D. I have never had to compete with another group of hunters or had any issues with over crowding. The whole argument for "over - crowding" or non - resident's are chasing the

birds away I would argue is 100% wrong, at least coming from my 12 years of hunting at least 2 weekends in Potter and Edmunds County. Please reconsider keeping the license the same as proposed from last year's changes. Add in the additional counties and allow hunting on public lands as well as private, not many non-res hunters have access to private land. If you need to take 250 for statewide then do it, but don't mandate the Dec 1st and after deadline, I can count on one hand how many ducks I've seen in December over 12 years when late season pheasant hunting, yes I understand this is most likely for outfitter to hunt geese over the river. Kind Regards"

Eric Paulson, Pierre, SD, emailed" My name is Eric Paulson and I live in Pierre. I grew up in Aberdeen and my grandparents have a farm by Claremont. I spend a vast majority of my hunting season in Brown county whether its hunting waterfowl, deer, or pheasants. I wrote a couple of letters previously about the original proposal and the downside to it. From what I can tell, this revised proposal 1)still moves Brown county into a geographic grouping that makes zero sense especially for management purposes, 2)increases the total amount of licenses available for use in Brown County, 3)will continue the trend of increased pressure in Brown county and declining hunting quality. Like I've said previously in other emails, I don't hunt the other areas that will also see an increase much or at all so my comments will be directed towards Brown County. First off I'd like start with saying the idea of splitting 500 of the licenses for NWR-00X will not cut down on the number of licenses sold to be used in Brown county. There is still 500 that can be used there during the peak of the migration. At least as it currently sits, the 500 are spread out over about 9 good hunting counties. Now the 500 would be spread out over 1 good hunting county and 3 ok counties and 7 poor counties for hunting prior to December, during the peak of the migration. You know, I know, and anyone else who hunts waterfowl knows, anyone hunting the river will get one of the 500 for December and on season and the other 500 will be used in the peak of the migration and those 500 will be used as far east as possible, and primarily speaking used in Brown County. And now on top of still having 500 available in the peak of the migration, there will also be another 500 available for "late season" in Brown county, I understand that the season does end about 2 weeks into December. The fact of the matter is 1,000 licenses are now available to be used in one of the most pressured counties in the state. This does nothing to help alleviate the pressure I talked about in a previous email and again will elaborate on in this email. I'll reiterate, Brown county is the 3rd most pressured county in the entire state for resident hunting and the 2nd most pressured county in the state for nonresident hunting, this is from the survey in 2015 conducted by the GFP. Any form or amount of increase in Brown county is not warranted. It's already over pressured and already declining in quality hunting opportunities due to pressure and water drying up. I won't rewrite a book on the other topics in my letter covering the survey but again, they apply here for this revised proposal. I would encourage you to reread my last letter for those comments on increased pressure and hunter satisfaction over the last 10 years. They are very much pertinent here as well with this revised proposal. That letter was based on data provided in a GFP survey of hundreds of sportsmen, not emotional testimony from one individual who doesn't want to see quality waterfowl hunting in Brown county erode any further. another reason why any increase at all should be nixed right from the get go is, who knows if people are even going to be able to hunt water like they could before! I don't like water hunting, but some people do. The way the state is right now, in limbo, you could get yourself in some serious trouble hunting a non-meandered water hole if a farmer decided he wanted to call you in for trespassing. It's unclear at the moment where one can and cannot go. As it sits right now, there is 2,324 lakes/sloughs, of more than 40 acres of size, covering 325,000 acres and 26,709 lakes/sloughs, of 40 acres or

less, covering 263,000 acres that are off limits according to how the GFP understood the Supreme court ruling in the non-meandered water case and has presented it at the non-meandered water meetings. Those numbers are taken from the power point presentation created by the GFP staff and presented to the public. You talk about condensing pressure! Take away 588,000 acres of access, primarily in northeast South Dakota and you are talking some serious limitations on where water hunters can and cannot go. This part alone should be a big enough reason to not allow any increases anywhere to even be considered, let alone in one of the most pressured counties in the state! Granted some of those waterholes are in walk-in or CREP, but the huge majority will still be off limits. The pressure will be incredibly condensed! I'm not sure if you remember my testimony a couple of years ago at the previous non-resident waterfowl work group meetings. I stated another example of the significant pressure in the northeast. It was about 2-3 years ago now we were hunting up in the northeast part of the state. We hunted ducks in a field one Sunday morning and they went right back to the field Sunday evening. We asked the landowner, who is a family friend, if we could hunt there again the following Saturday if the birds were still around. They said yes. We stopped back the following Friday to scout and just make sure it was still ok to hunt. The birds were there again. We stopped again. The landowner said during the week they had 19 different people stop to ask permission for 1 field! 17 of them were from out of state! If that doesn't scream over pressured than I don't know what does. This is 100% the truth and it's what the whole area up in the northeast is turning into. Tons of people hunting the same flock of birds. It's gotten quite ridiculous. And also, for those two days we hunted up there, we had friends from out of state hunting with us, which leads me to my next point. Again I will reiterate this point as well, I am NOT against non-resident hunting. Like I've said before, I've had friends from a handful of different states that have come to South Dakota hunting. They should be allowed to come, within reason. Jacking up license numbers every single opportunity isn't the answer. Monkeying with "reallocations" to hide the fact that license numbers are increasing in pressured areas is not the answer. Licenses are, in my opinion after being out almost every weekend last fall hunting either birds or deer and watching the hunter traffic, significantly too high already. People are everywhere. Flashback to my previous letter talking about the guys hunting a refuge because that's all the birds they could find. I do think at this point a reduction is required, but to "compromise" I think a no change is necessary right now, but in the future I'd like to see the GFP propose a reduction of some quantity of licenses. Right now there are not that many hunters, percentage wise, that get denied when applying. Last year there were, for licenses available for use in Brown county in 00Y or 00B, 4,225 people were drawn with their first choice in the first draw. 793 were not (taken from the drawing statistics on the GFP website). Of the 5,018 applicants, that is a mere 15.8% that were not drawn. 84.2% of applicants who had 00Y and 00B as their first choice got to hunt in South Dakota. The most telling factor that pressure WILL increase in the Brown county area given the demand for the licenses as laid out previously is this statistic, in the 00X region from last year 1,500 licenses were available, 0% of applicants were unsuccessful. In fact, only 107 licenses in the first drawing as a first choice were given out and 1393 first drawing first choice licenses remained. That is a take rate of a mere 7.1%. That proves right there, you add the availability of these licenses to Brown county, or any other area for that matter, 92.9% of the licenses will be available for any new additional counties if trends continue and all license available to Brown County are sold out. Now you aren't talking Brown County being one of the most pressured counties in the state for nonresident waterfowl hunting, it would in all likelihood be THE #1 most pressured county in the state. An over pressured county already would become more pressured. Hunting would be completely ruined. If the 15.8% of people who get denied a license truly wanted to hunt in South

Dakota, they could have applied for the left over 00X or Bennett county licenses. There is opportunity out there, I know this because I hunted in 00X many times this year after the normal season in the northeast was closed, but they decided against hunting those spots. Truly no one was turned away from hunting in South Dakota, they decided not to hunt in South Dakota. In reality there were 1,296 unused licenses after all the drawings were completed that the 793 hunters could have taken. They chose not to take them and hunt here. That is not our fault. The license availability is already there for them, they just chose not to take advantage of the opportunity that was offered to them. If they don't want to hunt those counties, why do the rest of the residents in the already pressured counties and the nonresidents who get drawn in the pressured counties need to suffer by making things more pressured to accommodate for people who chose not to hunt in an available region because its not as convenient for them? The only people in the world who would think an 84.2% success rate for license drawing the state is too low are the commercial guys. They won't settle until that number hits 100%. Their wallet depends on it. In reality, the number of licenses available already would be enough for 100% success. So nothing needs to increase. The license are there. It's the nonresident hunters who are choosing not to use them. Don't make everyone else suffer from their decision to leave licenses unused. Similar to deer hunting, if you can't draw in one county but truly want to deer hunt, you'll apply in a different county. I did a quick count of letters filed with information Commission for the meeting in Custer. From what I counted, there were 33 letters written in opposition of the proposal with 2 people writing 2 letters so really 31 letters in opposition. There were 11 letters written for the proposal with 3 writing 2 letters so really 8 letters for it. Of those 8, I know that at least 6 of them were written by clients, friends of guides, or guides. And also of those 8, most of them hunt in the Brown county area with a guide, they don't freelance hunt. Only 2 letters were written in opposition that I do not know if they have ties to commercial hunting. There were also 2 that were unclear to me on if they did or didn't oppose the proposal. That is overwhelmingly in opposition of the proposal as it originally stood. Really not much has changed so I'm quite confident those numbers would still hold for this proposal. The 31 who opposed were your average hunters from both in state and out of state. I'll say that again, out of state hunters also oppose this proposal too. The vast majority of people for the proposal have ties to commercial hunting in some way shape or form. Basically the only people who want this proposal to pass want to commercialize hunting. Your average hunter wants nothing to do with this proposal. Please listen to the average hunter and vote this proposal down! By now you are sick of reading about pressure. Pressure and hunter success can be two very opinionated topics. But when there is statistical evidence, evidence gathered, and posted by the GFP no less, that backs those opinions, then the discussion turns from being an opinionated argument to being based on facts and numbers, not opinion. It is my opinion there are too many hunters in the northeast. It is fact that based on GFP numbers, Brown county is the 3rd most pressured county in the entire state for resident hunting and the 2nd most pressured county in the state for nonresidents. Too much pressure equates to low quality hunting, of which, as discussed in my previous email to you, is made evident in the statistical surveys conducted by the GFP showing declines in both hunter satisfaction and average daily bag even with daily limits at all time highs. Thank you for reading my letter, again, and if you have any question on anything I've brought up in this letter or a previous one I encourage you to send me an email and we can line up a time to talk. I urge you to flat out deny this proposal. No revisions, just a flat out denial. The statistics on pressure, the already incredibly high draw rate, the ruling on the legalities of accessing non-meandered water, and the overwhelming majority against the proposal need to carry some significant weight in this. Please do not further increase the presence of commercial hunting in South Dakota. Thanks for your time and again, I

urge you to please vote against this proposal. It is not good news for waterfowl hunting in South Dakota.”

Chris Johnson, Claremont, SD, emailed” My name is Chris and I live near Claremont, SD. I'm opposed the most recent waterfowl proposal that would create 500 3-day licenses that could be used in Brown Co. on private land only. I'm actually opposed by large to Brown Co. to being moved from the current 3-day North East SD unit that now is in. Please leave Brown Co. where it is now. Knowing the area well I can only see this Brown Co. deal is to please one group of people and it no way to make decisions that effects the local hunters. Don't fix what isn't broken and leave Brown alone.”

Jason Long. Aberdeen, SD, emailed” As a life long resident of South Dakota I'm very sad to see once again the NR waterfowl license issue arise. Once again I'm opposed to any change in current license allocations. I have chosen to stay in the area largely for the waterfowl hunting the area provides. Over the last 15 years the ability to access private hunting land in Brown Co. and other counties near by has gotten very hard. I grew up hunting the Sand Lake/Putney Slough area with my father, grandpa and bothers. In my opinion it has been ruined by paid hunting and leasing of land. Over the last few years it has gotten bad enough that I don't even hunt in that area. To move Brown Co. from the unit it is in now is a terrible move. Creating any licenses that are for private land only is clear step in the wrong direction and a 100% gain for guides and outfitters. These licenses will likely not ever sell out making it basically an over the counter licenses for NRs to hunt with guides on private land. Brown Co. is already being ruined by paid hunting! Keep money out of waterfowl hunting, it only takes away from the locals and the other great residents of South Dakota. My family, friends and myself are 100% against moving Brown Co. from its current unit in any shape or form.”

Bill Koupal, Pierre, SD, emailed” This email is to inform the commission that I oppose their May proposal to add 250 more nonresident waterfowl licenses to the state.”

George Vandel, Pierre, SD, emailed” Despite the modification in your April Proposal to reduce the number of 3-day nonresident licenses by 250 the overall impact of the May proposal will make the licenses more attractive to nonresidents, more will be sold which will result in a net loss of waterfowl hunting access for our 30,000 resident hunters. The bottom line is this is a big loss for resident duck hunters and a big gain for those in the commercial hunting business. Your actions will not improve hunting for resident hunters and in fact will contribute to even more resident hunters hanging up their guns. Such a result is not positive for South Dakota, our economy, support for our conservation efforts or our quality of life. I urge you to kill this proposal, and reduce the number of nonresident 3-day licenses to keep it as was intended when the “great compromise” created the licenses. Keep them on private land in the counties along the Missouri River where a public access program was developed. Actions by the Legislature, the Governor and now the Commission involving these 3-day temporary nonresident waterfowl licenses will make establishing future “compromises” involving nonresident license increases virtually impossible. Resident hunters are loosing their trust in our state government involving this issue. Your vote to increase the number of nonresident waterfowl hunters in South Dakota is not the compromise you envision and it will not put an end to this issue.”

Rich Widman, President SDWF, Brookings, SD, emailed” I still amazes me that this proposal is even out there for consideration after over 90% of comments and testimony were against it? How can commissioners not listen to the people of SD? (and the non-residents who testified to leave SD the way it is because it works now, and they’ve seen what it has done to their state when it was opened up.) That’s proof you shouldn’t ignore! Some on the commission have said show us some surveys and prove it will hurt, but before you even get those surveys, you go with the opposition’s extreme recommendation. It does not look good when the commission ignores SDWF and SDWA recommendations, especially since we have the people who actually know what has and what will work! Still haven’t gotten an answer as to why the Governor refuses to meet with the SDWF and the sportsmen/women he is supposed to represent, but he will meet with the Commercial Waterfowl Hunting operator that is pushing for all these non-resident licenses? History has shown again and again that when you pick money over people, South Dakotan’s lose every time.

Mike Olmstead, Cottage Grove MN, emailed,” As a non-resident I am writing to say I am against the proposed NR waterfowl license changes. I have been coming to SD for years to hunt waterfowl; the proposed changes will cause overcrowding and spoil the experience. Each year I have seen resentment towards non-resident hunters increase from both resident hunters and local farmers. The proposed changes will only aggravate this situation. Contrary to popular belief; Change is not always a good thing. Please leave the system as is.”

Maynard Isaacson, Sioux Falls, emailed” I want to go on record to say I am NOT in favor of anymore Non-Resident Waterfowl Licenses. Thank you for your consideration in this important matter.”

Larry Lewis, Hecla, SD, emailed” Don't sell our public waterfowl resource & quit supporting the privatization of our publicly owned wildlife. Outfitters bypass the local small town gas stations, cafe's, etc & will lease or by the best hunting land in the area. Please quit pandering to their demands and support the average local sportsmen and women! Thank you”

Terry Madson, Aberdeen, SD, emailed” Please do not pass the proposals in any way!! Why are we making changes to Brown Co.? They are not needed. The proposal will not do anything to reduce pressure on public lands since a large percentage of the current 10 day licenses are used in Brown Co. but the proposal will make it much tougher to gain access to private land since the licenses are private land only. If passed we will not only will we have over pressured public but create a rat race land grab for private land. The proposal is a 100% gain for commercial hunting interest and a loss for resident hunters. IMO the Brown Co. proposal would actually increase pressure on public land because more private land will be leased pushing folks that previously hunted those farms onto public. Take it from a life long resident of Aberdeen, Brown Co. already has a crazy amount of waterfowl hunters so why are we looking to make access even tougher? It makes no sense to me. Surely this proposal of Brown Co. has Pay to Hunt ties. Please leave Brown Co. in the current NE unit. Don't fix what isn't broken and keep commercial hunting interest out of waterfowl hunting. Why make 1% happy at the expense of the other 99%? Please vote against the Brown Co. move in any way.”

Dave Zumbaugh, Kansas Wildlife Federation, Shawnee, KS, emailed” I have questions and concerns on the proposed changes in migratory waterfowl seasons and non-resident licenses in South Dakota. First, South Dakota nor it's citizens "own" the

waterfowl that migrate through the state each autumn. Most states do not have a separate license requirement for waterfowl; a small game license, state stamp or habitat stamp and federal stamp suffice. The \$126 I pay each year is already a premium to hunt in SD. Is the reduced number of non-resident licenses based on science/harvest data or to give residents a huge opportunity advantage? Secondly, limiting hunting in Brown County to "private land" for non-residents seems very odd. Why would SD restrict me from hunting on Sand Lake NWR on nearby WPA's? My duck stamp dollars bought/lease these acres and fund the maintenance efforts. Is this change based on wildlife management principles? I would like an explanation on this provision. I have spent lots of money in SD over the last ten years. I would like to continue to enjoy the adventures SD offers. However, if your restrictions continue to increase, I will be forced elsewhere."

Jeff Clow, Harrisburg, SD, emailed" Please do not add any more non-resident waterfowl licences to eastern South Dakota."

Duke Remitz, Frederick SD, emailed" I am writing to express my concern and opposition to allotment of more NRW's in the NE part of the state. I stand with SD Waterfowlers Assoc.in opposing the increase. On a biological perspective, Ducks are very sensitive to hunting pressure. They'll move if harrassed too much. Geese are more tolerable of the pressure. In the last two years the migrating birds have been pushed out areas I've been hunting for years. The only thing that has changed has been a guiding service in the area. Not only have I witnessed it here in SD but in Canada as well. I understand if the lack of funding for GFP is in part due to the lack of pheasant hunting licenses sold. I'm sure you are being asked to do more with less. If true, I understand that. Please do not try to "make up" that gap by selling more NRW licenses. This would hurt our state and our residences. If you want to bridge the budgetary gap increase the price of Waterfowl licenses. Otherwise the few who benefit are the guides and most of that money stays with them and doesn't go into the community. On average,,,for every new dollar that comes into a community it changes hands 7(seven) times supporting other business and people. Lastly, on a personal note. The sportspeople of this state are already getting squeezed out of fishing opportunities with recent SD Supreme Court rulings. Now SD outdoorsmen will be squeezed out more. These are two basic reason I have friends that are contemplating quitting hunting and fishing. These people have children that might not fall in love with the outdoor life. Think about it....less future license sales ! Please do the right thing for the wildlife in this state. Everything shouldn't have to be about the almighty dollar. Principles !!! Thank you."

Rick Downes, Frederick SD, emailed" I'm writing to comment on adding more non residents duck license. I beg you to not do this. Do not cave into the outfitters so that they can get more money for themselves and enable them to keep leasing up more land crowding out the locals. I'm already a victim to big money leasing up land I used to be able to hunt. The days of driving up to a farm and getting permission to hunt are few and far between now with land being leased out. If you add more out of staters you are crowding out the residents that live here paying taxes year round. Past legislators had the foresight to limit license to out of staters to keep our resources so as not to deplete it like other states have (why do you think there coming here). Let's not become a commercial state. We have pretty much done that already for pheasants. Let's not make hunting a rich man sport. Are you here for special interest groups or for the all people in this state. Thank you in advance a citizen and registered voter."

Chad Johnson, Groton, SD, emailed” It has come to my attention that Brown Co. has been proposed to be moved out of the current NE corner counties and moved into an area that will have 500 private only tags. This is a terrible move for anyone that hunts Brown Co. Brown Co. has a ton of people hunting and the weekends are already crowded with hunters. While the current 3 day licenses will not be able to be used in Brown Co. if moved the other 3750 10 licenses still can be used on public. So not only will there be just as much NR hunters on public, now their will more opportunity for NR to hunt private. This is also a huge benefit for paid hunting and promotes leasing of land. Bad bad deal. Keep the commercial interest out of SD waterfowl hunting!!”

Paul Bezdicek, Harrisburg, SD, emailed” Please leave the current nonresident waterfowl license structure the same as it is now. The system works very well and over all the nonresidents that I hunt with enjoy knowing that even if their license is not guaranteed that they will have a quality hunt. We do not need more guiding and outfitting for waterfowl which the proposed license changes will definitely effect. Flatland Flyways knew the rules for the licenses when they started their business and now they want to change the rules to benefit them. This is simply unjust and not needed. Also, please make no changes to the Brown County. It is hard enough to get on private land now to hunt, I can't imagine if guides and outfitters are leasing up more land. In the end, the commission needs to look out for the benefit of residents and non-residents alike and a vast majority of sportsman agree that there is no issue with the current license system. If it is about revenue, lets increase the nonresident fishing license.”

Cody Warner, Webster, SD, emailed” I'm writing you today to express my displeasure in the current proposal to reallocate waterfowl licenses. Once again, I cannot understand how or why things need to be changed. As you read these comments, you'll once again see an overwhelmingly support of making no changes. While I am adamantly opposed to changes, I could possibly live with the changes as long as Brown County is not moved from it's current zone. There is only one explanation for why this is being considered and I would guess most of the commissioners know why. It is of little surprise that the most vocal waterfowl outfitter operates in Brown county. This stinks of corruption. There is absolutely no reason to move Brown county out of it's current zone. This will only provide the outfitter with more opportunities to get licenses. Please reconsider moving Brown Cty out of it's current zone.”

Robert Naylor, Chapel Hill, NC, emailed” . I have been traveling to South Dakota for 10 straight years to enjoy your wonderful state and the amazing wildlife resources that you steward. As you know, managing natural resources is never easy, but there are certain things that are bright red flags that should be avoided at the risk of destroying the benefits of a great resource. I am always happy to support hotels and other rental establishments, restaurants, stores, and so many other operations that need customers to support their businesses. I travel to South Dakota each year, with or without a non-resident waterfowl license. My understanding is that there are certain outfitters, or hunting guides, that would like to change things for their exclusive benefit. That on the surface is a serious conflict of interest. I understand that they would like you to ration or reallocate non-resident waterfowl licenses and also move Brown County into a different license area. I am strongly opposed to changing any of the existing rules – they are not broken, nor are there any economic or fairness issues with the way it currently is currently structured. You have an obligation to listen to the SD residents first, and not a select few hunting guides who do not care about the SD resident sportsmen and sportswomen. The current regulations are structured to protect the resources, and they fairly allocate opportunities to both the SD residents and the visiting non-resident

waterfowl hunters alike. The proposed changes provide a select few outfitters and/or lodges with special wildlife resources for their personal gain. This is not an economic development proposition, and it will not sit very well with either the resident hunters of South Dakota nor the non-resident hunters to South Dakota that have happily supported the economy and played by a fair set of rules. Other states have done this, and those states have succeeded in destroying their wildlife natural resources as one "favor" leads to another "favor", and then the state has suffered irreparable harm. I am very strongly opposed to making any changes to the current non-resident waterfowl licensing regulations, first and foremost on behalf of the resident SD residents that enjoy your amazing resources. Please use every opportunity to oppose the commercialization of the wildlife natural resources that your state is so blessed to have, because those resources are fragile, and the commercial exploitation of any wildlife natural resource never ends well. Thank you very much"

Andy Vandell, Pierre SD, emailed" I am against any type of increase in non-resident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota. By utilizing unsold waterfowl licenses this will increase the overall number of non-resident hunters. If this is down, resident hunters will be lost in the long run. My recommendation instead would be to limit the number of non-resident waterfowl licenses to 8% of the prior years resident numbers like west river deer is done today."

Curt Tesch, Rosholt, SD, emailed" I'm hoping all or at least some of you will recall my verbal comments at the Watertown commission meeting. I just want to emphasize what I stated at that time. If you don't recall, I live in Roberts county in the very northeast corner of South Dakota. My primary reason for moving here some 28 years ago was to enjoy the resident waterfowl hunting privileges Since that time I have seen a steady erosion in the quality of waterfowl hunting mainly due to the steady increases of nonresident hunting licenses. By the GF&P own power point program it showed the increase of the 10 day licenses from I believe it started at 1350 and is now 4000. That's a 300% increase in not that long of a time period. Then there's the 3 day licenses. I have to mention again that these licenses were created for a special "deal" along the Missouri River. They were never intended to be spread out over the state. They should be removed from the northeast. Now I'm pretty sure that ship has sailed and it's not going to happen, but I need to remind everyone of it again anyway. If you can't remove them from the northeast at least exempt Roberts County. As I mentioned before most of those licenses are used by "day hunters" from the Wheaton area. There is virtually no additional revenue from these license other than the cost of the license. These additional licenses have already drastically reduced the quality of our waterfowl hunting in the northeast. Please consider the proposals of the South Dakota Waterfowl Association or at least the spirit of what is being proposed. We are not a bunch of crazy crackpots. We are a group of dedicated waterfowl hunters trying to preserve a heritage that we take very dear to our hearts. Waterfowl hunting takes a lot of dedication and is generally a fairly solitary endeavor. It cannot be compared to pheasant hunting. It is very sensitive to hunting pressure. PLEASE some things just shouldn't be for sale for the sake of the almighty dollar."

Maynard Isaacson, Sioux Falls, SD emailed" I would like to go on record as OPPOSING the 250 3-day license increase in eastern South Dakota AND also OPPOSING the 500 3-day license increase in Brown County. Please take this into consideration at your commission meeting on June 8th and 9th."

Charles Rokuek, Sioux Falls, SD, emailed” I am contacting you in regards to your proposal of increasing non-resident waterfowl licenses across the state of South Dakota. First, I was born and raised on a farm in Hutchinson County, and currently I am a retired Science Teacher and live in Sioux Falls and still enjoy my time in the outdoors. By passing these proposals it will increase the pressure on the ducks and geese and it will deteriorate the quality of our waterfowl hunting. This will also negatively impact both resident and non-resident waterfowl hunters alike. With this increase in hunting pressure, it will decrease the quality of waterfowl hunting for all of the hunters in the field. When waterfowl receives a lot of hunting pressure it moves until it finds a quiet place, and that could lead to an early exit from South Dakota by many of our local ducks and geese. If that happens early in the season, and the local ducks and geese are burned out of the state; it will lead to a very poor season while waiting for the fall migration which seems to get later and later every year. The biggest part of this issue that is not being considered; is the changing of the landscape as more and more land is converted to cropland and more wetlands either being drained or compromised; there will be fewer places that will offer quality waterfowl hunting opportunities. This then leads to more competition for the available places that do provide that quality waterfowl hunting experience that everybody is looking for to enjoy. I also believe by passing these proposals we will be opening the flood gates for the commercialization of our waterfowl hunting, and the resident waterfowl hunter would be in the same boat as the resident pheasant hunter with fewer and limited opportunities. I also hear that it is always the same people that come and testify at the meetings against the increase in non-resident waterfowl licenses. That may be the case, because most of the resident sports men and women have jobs and cannot get off of work to testify at these public meetings; therefore, their organizational leaders are the individuals who have been attending these meetings and testifying on behalf of them. I also believe when I travel for any type of hunting and fishing within the state it is economic development as I spend money on gas, food and lodging and the entire state benefits from the money I spend when I am enjoying my pass times. Many of us could take that money and spend it on trips to other states which would have a negative impact on our state’s economy.

As a resident of this state and a taxpayer I have become very frustrated with the proliferation of the commercialization of our fish and wildlife resources. I use to love the opening of pheasant season; but now because I have limited areas to hunt, I prefer to hunt waterfowl because of the commercialization of our hunting heritage. This continued onslaught of increasing non-resident hunting and fishing opportunities at the expense of resident opportunities will eventually come back to bite us. We will be losing our next generation of hunters and fisherman as they will not have had the opportunities that many of us had the opportunity to enjoy. With that said, I ask that you do not pass the increase in non-resident waterfowl licenses and return them back to their proper place the Pierre Area. Thank you for your time and consideration on this issue.”

Pete Koupal, Rapid City, SD emailed” My opinion is that resident waterfowl hunters actually have more of an impact, especially on a year long basis, than any non-resident hunter. And residents to me continue to be moved to the back ever more often. PLEASE DO NOT APPROVE MORE NON-RESIDENT LICENSES.....I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE A PLACE TO HUNT THIS COMING WATERFOWL SEASON”

Spencer Vaa, Brookings, SD, emailed” I oppose adding any Nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota. Resident hunters are finding it harder and harder to find good hunting spots, and are getting squeezed out by nonresident hunters. It’s time to hold the line and provide quality hunting for both resident and nonresident hunters.”

Don Soderlund, Bath, SD, emailed” It's clear, the vast majority of resident and non-resident waterfowl hunters in SD do NOT want an increase in waterfowl licenses. This current proposal is a slap in the face to the majority. Some say it's actually a decrease, but the fact of the matter is that it will add hunters in the field statewide, but especially locally in my home County of Brown. We've already seen an unprecedented increase in pressure and competition for fields in Brown County due to the commercialization of waterfowl hunting. It's clear this proposal is only meant to appease one outfitter at the expense of many who live and hunt here. Any vote to increase waterfowl licenses in this area or any other area in the state is an absolute show of disrespect to the majority voice. We are very tired of the repeated attempts to increase non-resident waterfowl licenses, but because this is a passion and a reason why many of us continue to live in this great state, we will not give up fighting to keep South Dakota one of the highest quality waterfowl hunting areas in North America. Do NOT change the current licensing system. Do NOT allow politics or big money dictate our quality waterfowl hunting. Vote against the current non-res waterfowl license proposal.”

Justin Allen, Pierre, SD, emailed” I'm contacting you in regards to the Non-resident waterfowl proposal to be finalized in during the June commission meeting. The proposal would make several changes to the current 3-day license structure. As an avid SD waterfowl hunter that hunts across the state every year I'm against any change to the current structure that has worked extremely well for 95% of the waterfowl hunters of South Dakota, residents and non-residents alike, for well over a decade. As you all know the vast majority of residents are against additional NR hunters in already crowded areas of the state and more importantly against the commercialization of waterfowl hunting in SD. This proposal is the commercialization of at least 750 private only 3-day licenses in all counties excluding the original “Pierre Area” Missouri River Counties and NE SD. For this reason I'm against the change in the current licenses structure especially moving Brown Co. from the current NE SD 3-day license unit (NRW-00Y) My number one issue by far with the whole proposal is moving Brown Co. from current NRW-00Y (NESD) and moving it into NRW-00X (NCSD). I can't even begin to understand this proposed move and I'm against moving Brown Co. out of NRW-00Y. Of the current 500 3-day licenses that are available in 00Y likely 150 plus of those licenses are used in Brown each year. By taking Brown Co. out of 00Y those licenses that were previously used in Brown Co. will now be used in Day/Marshall/Clark. So you would make the counties that have the highest pressure in state have even more. However, since Brown Co is the second most used county by NRs you still have a large population of NRs hunting in Brown Co. under the current 10 day statewide licenses, many of which are likely used on public land in Brown Co. So the notion that moving Brown Co. out the current 3 day licenses area and into the private land only area will decrease NR hunting on public land is awful wishful thinking. By moving Brown not only will public land be just as crowded but you create additional competition for private land that isn't already leased. It is a fact when you increase the demand for private land pay hunting increases and folks and guides start leasing land so they have a guaranteed place to hunt. The rest that don't want to pay hunt are forced to either settle for crowded public land or quit hunting. This is already an issue and likely why many continue to quit waterfowl hunting. I have a tough time believing anything else but that the proposal to take Brown Co. out of current 00Y and moving into proposed 00X for private land only is anything but to please commercial hunting interest. I think you're going to find that anyone that supports the move for Brown Co. has commercial interests. This proposal to move Brown Co. is a bad deal for the common resident and NR waterfowl hunter. Please leave Brown Co in the NE SD 3-day unit. An additional reason why this proposal as a whole is a bad deal is the continued loss of access to quantity waterfowl

hunting areas. Over the last 15 years many of the smaller wetlands across the state have been drained or altered to the point where they are often dry by fall thus limiting hunting over water. IMO resident waterfowl hunting participation and increase in lack of quality access to private/public ground go hand in hand thus the decrease in resident hunters. GFP should be addressing this issue not pour gas on the fire by adding additional NR hunters to the state. Another potential huge issue when it comes to access is the Non-Meandering Water Issue. We all hope to have a positive outcome for all involved in the issue in the near future but the fact of the matter as it stands right now 10,000s of previously accessible acres public/private are not accessible and it is going to have a tremendous effect this fall on waterfowl hunting areas. Many of the bodies of water that are closed were used heavily by waterfowl hunters that are now going to have to find other areas to hunt creating additional pressure on other areas. South Dakota waterfowl hunters do not support additional NR waterfowl licenses or the increase in licenses sold. Additionally there is a big chunk of non-resident hunters that don't support it either. South Dakota may be one of only a small handful of states that restrict NR waterfowl licenses but it is also basically the only state left where an average Joe can show up scout the night before, knock on a stranger's door, gain permission and have world class hunting that rivals with Canada. Why do we want to potentially jeopardize this? At best 10% of residents want to increase NR license numbers, the other 90% don't. The 10% all have commercial interest the other 90% are hunters that truly care about the quality of the hunting and the resource as a whole. Should changes be made to NR waterfowl to please commercial interest at the expense of the other 90%. IMO it is a bad way to manage the resource. Thank you for time,"

Chris Hesla, SD Wildlife Federation and Camo Coalition, Pierre, SD, emailed "Please listen to the residents of this State. We do not want more non-residents, make it easier for the residents to find access."

Renee Allen, Pierre, SD, emailed "I'm against any change that increases the sale of NR waterfowl licenses. I'm also against moving Brown Co. from its current 3 day unit. I'm deeply concerned for the future of hunting for my husbands and I 4 kids that all love to hunt with us. As a life long SD resident hunter I have seen the opportunities for resident hunting slowly, now quickly vanish. If the rate continues by the time our kids are our age there will be nothing left but paid hunting and overran public ground. Pheasant hunting is already there. Protect the waterfowl resource for the residents hunters of the state not guides/outfitters and non-residents. Think about the future generations of South Dakotans."

Tom Viet, Renner, SD, emailed "Please take this email as opposition to the May, 2017 proposal regarding the nonresident waterfowl licenses. We cannot, as South Dakota citizens, allow the commercialized hunting of waterfowl in this state. It will ruin the opportunity for all the residents in the state as the non-residents continue to flock here to pay fees to commercial hunting operations that really do not help out states funding. This money is not spent in all the communities but rather paid fees to out of state owners and operations that leave the state as soon as the migration is gone. Please keep something for the local residents of this great State! Thanks"

Phil Kahnke, Salem, SD, emailed "I am writing to express my concerns about the proposals to increase non-resident hunting licenses in Eastern South Dakota as a whole and also specifically in Brown County. These proposed changes will have a negative impact on the waterfowling opportunities for residents of our state. As someone who was not lucky enough to be born in South Dakota, but made a conscious decision to

move here, based very much on the excellent waterfowl hunting in this state I would be very disappointed to see things change for the worse simply so that a very limited number of people can capitalize on it monetarily. I have listened to testimonies from many different parties and I cannot fathom the level of selfishness expressed by these groups wanting to change these laws to specifically benefit themselves. These businesses were started under the current laws and somehow expect that every other resident of the state should have to suffer so that some unwise investment decisions can be justified. I have several other friends that are also waterfowl guides in this state and they are specifically opposed to the increase of licenses, despite the fact that it may bring them some additional money, but they realize that it will damage the overall level of satisfaction of their clients and of current residents. This state has something special in its waterfowling. A lot of that is due to the current regulations. When I was not a resident of this state I was still in favor of the lottery system and the fact that the licenses weren't extremely easy to get as I was guaranteed a great trip on the years that I did draw. For those that want to hunt in "the Dakotas" every single year, North Dakota is open to everyone and a very small amount of research of any North Dakota resident hunter will prove that that is not the optimal way to run a non-resident licensing system. While we are not to that level yet, our state is different geographically in terms of waterfowl use. While only a small sliver of our state is really productive for waterfowl hunting, almost all of our neighboring state to the North is productive with much more water. When examining this bill, please keep in mind the thousands of current residents that enjoy our current situation...many of whom have made specific choices to either move here or stay here for those benefits."

John Moisan, Ft. Pierre, SD, emailed" Ladies and Gentlemen: My name is John Moisan and I grew up in Watertown in the 1950's and 1960's. I learned how to hunt ducks (mostly canvasbacks) and geese with my grandpa, Bud Hoy, on Stover's Pass west of Florence, SD. In those days, few people were tough enough and diligent enough to stick out the bad weather waiting for canvasbacks in a blizzard. We were, independent, hard core, did our scouting homework and staked out a hole on a windy hilltop just to get a shot. We were willing to work for our ducks. In my hunting/fishing lifetime (60 years), I have seen the South Dakota commercialization (guided hunts) of pheasants, prairie chickens/grouse, Canadian geese, snow geese, walleyes and all types of fish, white tail deer, mule deer, wild turkey, prairie dogs, "wild" buffalo, "wild" and truly wild elk, antelope, and almost every single species of wildlife South Dakota has to offer. As each species is commercialized, the places for the "average guy" resident hunter decrease dramatically. We have been, for a long time, over the breaking point in South Dakota, where there will be no where for us to take our grandchildren for a quality, no cost, outdoor experience. For the record, I AM a landowner in Tripp County as well as a resident of Fort Pierre. I have bills to pay just like every other landowner and could easily and quickly charge people to hunt or establish a hunting preserve. BUT I won't do it. Most of my farm neighbors charge \$150-\$300 per person/per day to hunt pheasants/grouse. One neighbor, charges \$30,000 per group for a 3 day weekend hunt. Most of what they do is about greed and killing. It's not about hunting - it's paying to kill tame pheasants. The quality outdoor experience with our grandchildren is dead in Tripp County (and most other counties). Your vote to add non-resident waterfowl licenses to satiate the greed of a few "professional" guides will put the final nail in the coffin for quality waterfowl hunting with our grandchildren in South Dakota."

Chad Carlson, Aberdeen, SD, emailed" I am writing to oppose the proposed increased of nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota. The current allocation of

nonresident waterfowl licenses is widely supported by the vast majority of resident and nonresident waterfowl hunters. Currently we have a balanced system that manages quality over quantity, while providing ample opportunity to all. The average successful draw rate for nonresident waterfowl hunters is around ~75%. This means on average nonresidents are able to hunt waterfowl in South Dakota in greater than 7 out of 10 years. On the off year they do not draw, they are guaranteed a tag the following year. I know many nonresident waterfowl hunters who appreciate and value the current allocation and the protection of quality over quantity. I have three nonresident family members who apply to waterfowl hunt every year in SD. It is very rare for any of them to be turned down. In fact, my uncle has been successful 10 years in a row. We are fortunate to live in a state that consistently provides quality over quantity. Our highways have room for more, our child's class sizes have room for more, our tax rates could be higher, the towns we live in could be triple the population within the same geographic area, etc., etc., but we as South Dakotans appreciate quality over quantity. I ask you to continue providing a quality waterfowl hunt over quantity, while still providing opportunity to the nonresident base. I am aware there is a small percent of people who wish to commercialize waterfowl hunting in South Dakota. I would propose two recommendations to help alleviate the concerns of those who wish to commercialize and profit from the public's resources. First, move the nonresident waterfowl draw date to earlier in the year. I have heard the commercial interests argue potential hunters do not have enough time to plan a waterfowl hunting trip to South Dakota when the draw date is in July. To ease these concerns, I propose we host our nonresident waterfowl drawing in February. This will give nonresidents more time to plan their trip. The second recommendation would be to identify a threshold that could trigger a need to increase the nonresident waterfowl allocation. Example---- If the nonresident waterfowl license success rate drops below an identified threshold (perhaps 50%?) we are arguably starting to deny opportunity and may need to explore the increase of nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota. In my opinion, identifying a threshold based on nonresident draw success % would be more scientifically grounded and agreeable by all, rather than plucking license allocation numbers out of the clouds. I apologize for the lengthy letter. I left much information out but wanted to cover some highlights. I would like to thank you for taking the time to read my letter and thank you for being public servants in this important role."

Derek Larson, Aberdeen, SD, emailed" I am writing in response to the proposed bill increasing nonresident waterfowl licenses in Eastern South Dakota. I am a firm believer on keeping the out of state licenses the way it is. I think we have a great system right now that supports both out of state and more importantly instate hunters. As my research has produced it looks to me as if the waterfowl drawing success rate is around 70%. There are many other drawings in South Dakota with a much lower rate for instate hunters at this current time. I know offering our state's resources such as hunting is important, which I agree, but I am thinking of my two son's (1 and 3) when it comes to this bill. I would like them to experience this great state as I have, and would like to introduce them into the outdoors."

Brett Johnson, Rapid City, SD, emailed" I oppose the additional increase in SD nonresident waterfowl permits. Don't sell off our nations greatest treasure ."

Jimmy Krsnak, Chester, SD, emailed" I request that the two season format for West River Deer Season in Gregory County be continued. The two season format has been working just fine from the hunter's point of view. I have been deer hunting in Gregory County for 30 years and I have never heard a negative comment from another

hunter. I do not believe that Gregory County has sufficient infrastructure (motels, restaurants, processing) to support a single season format. These facilities are maxed out even with the two season format and would not be able to support the increased number of hunters with the proposed format. The public lands available for deer hunting are very crowded and would be even more so under the proposed season. Private lands are tied up by commercial interests who charge \$700 to \$1,500 on up for a buck and \$400 on up for a doe. The two season format makes the best use of available lands for South Dakota hunters who do not or can not support commercial hunting operations. Thank you for your consideration.”

Cartor Carlson, Aberdeen, SD, emailed” As a South Dakota resident concerned about the number of number of nonresident licenses I am opposed to the proposed increase.”

Scott Hed, Sioux Falls, SD, emailed” Good day, and thank you for the opportunity to submit my thoughts on a proposal you will be considering this week in Chamberlain. I firmly oppose the idea of adding additional non-resident waterfowl licenses. South Dakota has tremendous waterfowl hunting opportunities, and it is in part due to the fact that it's not a "free for all" as far as hunting areas being crowded. Actually, some places are already experiencing crowded conditions, making it already difficult to find spots to hunt. Adding additional non-resident licenses will only exacerbate this problem. Many non-residents that hunt waterfowl in South Dakota enjoy the hunt quality and believe that the current quota system and needing to apply and be drawn to hunt contribute to the quality of the experience here. The odds of being drawn are not outlandish, and most hunters get to hunt every other year or two out of every three years even. Resident hunters will be the most impacted, as an increase in non-resident licenses will only serve the interests of commercial operators who seek to profit from the public's resource. More hunting lands and waters will be leased up and made off limits to the average South Dakota resident. The days of a parent taking their son or daughter on their first hunt will become even less possible, as more land is tied up by guides and outfitters who charge top dollar to hunt. Please vote against the proposal to increase non-resident waterfowl licenses. Thank you for considering my feelings on this matter, and thank you also for your service to South Dakota sportsmen and women.”

Nancy Hilding Black Hawk, SD emailed”I am opposed to more non-resident waterfowl licenses. The current proposal will add 250 3-day licenses to eastern South Dakota. That means there will be 250 more hunters crowding the already heavily hunted areas such as Brookings, Kingsbury, Hamlin, Codington and Clark counties. The proposal would also add 500 3-day licenses to Brown County. These licenses in Brown county will be moved from the Missouri River corridor to increase the commercialization of waterfowl hunting for the benefit of one outfitter who leases land near Sand Lake Refuge. With an additional 500 licenses, massive new areas will likely be leased. I would like some waterfowl left for birders to watch...especially near a wildlife refuge.I don't want commercialization and overhunting of waterfowl.”

Dave Ode, Pierre, SD, emailed” Regarding the finalization of your 2017 non-resident waterfowl license proposal – Bad Idea, don't do it. Except for my time in the military, I've hunted ducks in South Dakota, as a resident, for almost 50 years. Even in a rural state like South Dakota, duck hunting is not that easy, and it hasn't gotten any easier. Adding more non-residents isn't going to help anything but make it more crowded. When I first started hunting waterfowl in 1968, goose hunting was hard; duck hunting was easy, i.e. access was easy, ducks were abundant, and limits were

generous (possibly overly generous, with 10 pintails a day). Today, goose hunting is easy (Canada geese are everywhere, and snow goose populations are at record highs), but duck hunting is hard. Access to private land is no longer easy. Rural South Dakota has depopulated, some counties losing more than half their rural population every decade. You can no longer go to the nearest farm place and find a duck slough's owner. Public land provides some great duck hunting opportunities, but they are limited – and it's a zero sum game – there are only so many “honey holes” and once they're occupied – everybody else is out. When I moved to Pierre in 1981, Antelope Island in the Missouri River was a truly great place to hunt ducks. It annually provided hundreds if not thousands of man-hours of duck hunting opportunity every year. Not anymore. The river has changed, the cattails have thinned out, it's now a better place to hunt geese than ducks. Federal Waterfowl Production Areas (WPAs) are great places to raise ducks, but many of them are lousy places to hunt ducks, either because they don't have fall water, do not have enough emergent cover, or because hunter access to the water is next to impossible. Go look for yourself! I've introduced my son and other kids to duck hunting. Allowing even more non-resident waterfowl hunters into South Dakota will only make it harder for young South Dakota kids to find a place to hunt ducks. Let these non-residents kill geese, but don't reduce duck hunting opportunity for residents, by letting in even more non-resident duck hunters.

Tim Olson, Pierre, SD, emailed” I respectfully ask that you reject the current proposal to amend the allocation of nonresident waterfowl licenses. For brevity sake, I will refrain from reiterating the arguments already presented against the proposal, which will most assuredly result in further erosion of opportunity for resident, as well as some non-resident waterfowl hunters”

John Gors, Vermillion, SD, emailed” I respectfully request that you DO NOT expand and increase the number of out of state waterfowl licenses issued in Eastern South Dakota. This will overly burden already heavily hunted areas of the State to the detriment of resident hunters and serve to increase the commercialization of hunting. If the current trends continue South Dakota will be an entirely "pay to play" state.”

Jason Schuchard, Pierre, SD, emailed” Please withdraw the proposal to move nonresident waterfowl licenses from the Missouri River to the northeast part of the State. I feel this plan would be detrimental to the very successful Lower Oahe Waterfowl Access Area. This change would be detrimental to the hunting experience of both residents and non-residents by shifting more hunting pressure to an already crowded part of our state. Please put the interests of the people above the interests of commercial hunting and withdraw this proposal.

Colette Hesla, Pierre, emailed” Please do not increase non-resident waterfowl license numbers”

Eric Paulson, Pierre, SD, emailed” My name is Eric Paulson and I live in Pierre. I've written multiple letters and this is my last one for this proposal, I promise. I was hoping to make the meeting but I have a work meeting I cannot get out of that came up this Thursday at the same time as the GFP meeting so I have to give my final thoughts here. My biggest fear after reading all of the letters is the commercial operators, who don't have clients now and have a lot of free time, will show up and speak in person since I've seen minimal letters from guiding people. While folks like myself who have can't get away “in the off season” whenever we want will be relegated to just writing letters and won't be able to provide live testimony and show up at the meeting. I just

hope that the letters written against the proposal that arrived in droves will have some influence on the decision. As it appears to me, the average resident hunter and many non-resident hunters are entirely on the same page, vote no. Leaving the nonresident licenses unchecked will inevitably lead to the commercialization of goose and duck hunting in the fall. It's not a matter of if it will happen but when. It has for spring snow geese on a huge scale. Non-resident licenses are essentially unchecked in the spring and it has led to the proliferation of snow goose guides and commercialization of snow goose hunting in the spring time. Some of the guides lease fields in the spring for snow geese even. Here is a list of guides that do business in South Dakota in the spring, this probably is not a complete list: - Top Gun Guide Service - Waterfowl Junkie Outdoors - Goose Grinders - Hideaway Hollow Outfitters - Northern Plains Outfitters - Northern Skies Outfitters - Dirtybird Outfitters - Goose Hog Outdoors - Banded Gandr Outfitters - The Goose Guys - Migrator Valley Outfitters - Maxxed Out Guides - Eagle Head Outdoors - Goose and Duck Smackers - Neu outdoors - Outdoor Adrenaline - Migration X Outfitters - Pepper Slough Outfitters - First Light Finishers - Prairie Storm Outfitters - Whiteout Outfitters - Last Pass Guide Service - Big Guns - Up North Outdoors - Flatland Flyways - Midwest Migrators - Snow Goose Commander - AWA Waterfowling Adventures - Black goose Outfitters - Midwest Waterfowl Outfitters - Snow Goose Specialists - Goose Grinders - Drift Prairie Outfitters - Goose Xperts - Waterfowl Connection - Big River Outfitters - GB Guide Service - Flight Stoppers Guide Service - Mid Migration Outfitters - Snow Goose Addiction Outfitters - Death Row Snows - Epic Guide Service - Waterfowl Assassins Guide Service - Fowl Exposure - South Dakota Outdoor Adventures - Elite Outdoorsman - All Or Nothing Outdoors - Red Stag - Potters's Fields - Migratory Madness - Ducks r Down - Goose Busters Guide Service. This commercialization will happen in the fall as well. It might take a couple years like it did for snow goose hunting but before long you'd have a list of guides 50+ names long that would be in this state leasing land and ultimately eliminating any hope a freelance hunter has to hunt. Nonresidents and residents alike who cannot afford or will not pay a guide would be SOL. The path this nonresident waterfowl issue has been on the last few years, this commercialization is the way we are headed. Brown county will be well on its way with this proposal. If you don't believe me that these all guide in South Dakota for snow geese then look them up on Google. They will be here in the fall if these licenses are left unchecked just like in the spring. You also have probably read by now the latest proposal for the nonmeandered water issue. All nonmeandered water would be closed to hunting if that proposal passes. Hunters would be losing hundreds of thousands of acres of water for hunting. You add more people to dramatically less access and you are in reality increasing the pressure many times over with increases in licenses. To be honest, if the nonmeandered bill passes, licenses will need to be drastically reduced just based on accessibility. Pressure will continue to get condensed into smaller and smaller pockets. Throw in leasing land, which the guides do, the problem is further exacerbated. I know you want testimony based on numbers. I sent many sets of numbers in the previous letters based on GFP numbers. But here is some pure emotional testimony; I've talked to several people who hunt the brown county area and we are under similar sentiments. If this passes, hunting in Brown county will never be the same and quite honestly will not be worth a resident, such as myself, hunting in as much. Our business will go to other counties and quite frankly with all the fighting that is going on with this issue, my business may wind up being a one week hunting adventure in Canada each year and hunting the road ditches by Pierre in the winter and not wasting my time fighting the guides and the pressure that will move into South Dakota. Everyone is sick of dealing with the commercialization attempts at waterfowl every single year. It gets old and a lot of people are sick of it. Again, I want to make sure you are well aware that I do not think non-residents should be banned from hunting

here. Absolutely not. There should be some. The amount needs to be kept in check though so that we don't have full on 50+ guide list like we have for the unchecked snow goose season. Right now there are too many nonresidents coming in. Adding more solves nothing and only makes the problems worse for your average resident and all the nonresidents who get licenses. Again, I would urge you to vote against this proposal. This in conjunction with the nonmeandered water bill, of which I get you don't have any control yet, will decimate the hunting even more in South Dakota. I really wish I could have made it to Oacoma to testify but my job doesn't always permit me to leave whenever I'd wish. Thank you for your time and I urge you to vote against this proposal.

TJ Johnson, Aberdeen, SD emailed" Good morning or afternoon and I hope you are having a wonderful day. I'm writing because I am very concerned about the proposal of adding 250 3-day licenses to eastern South Dakota along with the proposal to add 500 3-day licenses to Brown County. I am Dr. TJ Johnson with Living Life Chiropractic in Aberdeen. We do not have enough room for all of these extra hunters. I do have some experience hunting in the Brookings area, however I'm most concerned about the Brown County proposal. It is already very difficult to find a field to hunt, adding these extra licenses would make it even harder and it would deter myself, along with many other South Dakota residents, who voted for you,, from hunting the fields and sloughs we have grown up hunting. I am aware that there are basically two commercial outfitters that are pushing these proposals, Flatland Flyways and the SD Opportunity Group. Approving either of these would help the commercial openers, however would be horrible for the rest of the waterfowl hunters in the state. Residents hunters bring in much, much more money to South Dakota versus nonresident hunters. I have written multiple of these letters and, through legislation, we have said, time and time again, no more nonresident licenses. Please listen to the majority, not the two commercial outfitters, and oppose both of these proposals."

Matt Judson, Pierre, SD, emailed" Please understand that I oppose the Commission's May 2017 proposal regarding nonresident waterfowl licenses."

The public Hearing concluded at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kelly R. Hepler, Department Secretary