

Minutes of the Game, Fish, and Parks Commission
May 3-4, 2018

Chairman Barry Jensen called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. MT at Creekside Lodge in Custer State Park, Custer, South Dakota. Commissioners Barry Jensen, Gary Jensen, Mary Anne Boyd, Cathy Petersen, Scott Phillips, Russell Olson and Douglas Sharp and approximately 50 public, staff, and media were present.

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION

Conflict of Interest Disclosure

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

Approval of Minutes

Chairman B Jensen called for any additions or corrections to the April 5-6, 2018 minutes or a motion for approval.

Motion by Olson with second by G. Jensen TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5-6, 2018 MEETING. Motion carried unanimously.

Additional Commissioner Salary Days

Commissioners Barry and Gary Jensen each requested an additional salary day for attending the sportsman summit.

Motioned by Phillips with second by Olson TO APPROVE THE REQUESTED SALARY DAY. Motion carried unanimously

License List Request

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

Resident Nonresident Discussion

G. Jensen provided the commission a handout outlining the discussion asking the questions: what is a resident, and what is a nonresident; who are nonresidents; what are the reasons some propose restrictions for nonresidents, what factors should the Commission consider, is there a legal basis for a distinction: what is the true nonresident fiscal impact; what are fair criteria to be used in determining rules and what should that criteria be based on; and how can the public best be engaged.

Phillips asked the question who are the nonresidents. He stated they are often times family. He said both of his children have moved out of state and he likes for them to be able to come back to hunt pheasants and fish. He said he is also someone who hunts out of state and is therefore a nonresident hunter and that is something he thinks we need to keep in mind when making comments. He noted 17 million is collected for DJ & PR funds which are mostly raised out of state.

Peterson agreed with Phillips saying many nonresidents' family look forward to the traditions and having them come home.

Kelly Hepler, cabinet secretary, said the department brings as much information forward as possible to assist the Commission in their discussions. Currently discussing

quality hunting and using social science to quantify as most department determinations are biologically driven.

Tony Leif, wildlife division director, said our mission is to help the commission get to a level where they are comfortable making decisions. Staff are ready to help wherever they can to assist the commission in their deliberations and decisions.

Commissioner Boyd stated she has discuss this issue with people in Yankton and they do not care for nonresidents as they take up space stating they do want nonresidents to come in and they understand this will not go away. They also do not want resident fees to increase.

Commissioner Sharp said if you go to your favorite fishing or hunting place does it matter differently if a resident gets there before you or if it is a nonresident. We need to realize the need to go forth as there are a lot of dollars involved and those dollars allow the commission to do bigger and better things. He looks forward to the conversation.

B. Jensen wants to fully understand impact with hunting license and fees.

G. Jensen asked this item be added this to the July agenda with a request for public input.

Nonmeandered Waters Update

Kevin Robling, special projects coordinator, provided the commission and update on nonmeandered waters. He said the ice is off and work is being done to transition from ice markers to buoys.

Robling spoke to numerous discussions with the Reetz family with proposal being brought forward at the June meeting in Aberdeen to request public input with hopes of an agreement.

Robling spoke to recreation and respect as an honest and respectful approach. The reoccurring theme is litter generated from recreational users and this has resonated with the department working to establish an adopt a lake program with multiple groups being involved. The department will purchase trash bags and pay dump fees as well as signs to recognize organizations helping with the program. Staff will coordinate permissions with landowners and be available to assist. Robling is working to have two clean up days conducted by July.

G. Jensen thank you this will be a win win for all involved.

Fish and Wildlife Resources Summit

Arden Petersen, special assistant, briefed the commission on the recent fish and wildlife resources summit held April 21, 2018 in Oacoma, SD. The department invited 35 sportsman associations to hold a listening session to have open dialog on a number of topics including 5 challenges including sustainable habitat, public access, sustainable funding, recreation and respect and a collective and effective conservation voice. Petersen said the meeting noted the importance of habitat. Information will be brought forward in regards to additional forums with other groups such as preserve operators, nonconsumptive users, and ag groups. Then the department will hold a conservation summit with all groups as communication is the key to success.

B. Jensen stated he attended and it was a good meeting. All were willing to work together and had spirited discussion. He looks forward to seeing what comes from the other groups.

100 Years of Tradition

Emily Kiel, communications director, provided information on the 100 years of tradition campaign noting this is an exciting time for the department for pheasant hunting and camping traditions and the outdoor traditions of our customers. Kiel detailed efforts beginning with the launch as Pheasant Fest, the social media marking campaign, special events and clothing sales.

Strategic Plan/Leadership Team Update

Kiel provided an update on the recent strategic planning meeting. She explained the plan is a roadmap with innovative goals, measurable objectives and accountable action plans to guide the department in what do and how to do it. She focused on the gap analysis which identifies priorities and aligns them with the department's budgeting process.

PETITION FOR RULE CHANGE

Youth and Mentored Deer Seasons

Tony Leif, wildlife division director, explained the process and noted that the Commission has 30 days to take action on petitions. He presented the petition and noted less mule deer would be harvested because the intent of petition is to increase the population of mule deer. He explained the tradeoff would not allow as much opportunity for youth to harvest deer.

Peterson noted the petitioner asked the Commission to have enough info to make a decision before moving forward.

Andy Lindbloom, senior wildlife biologist, provided harvest data and survival of radio collared deer across the state and radios on harvest and license allocation. He said all but a few licenses have been removed with the only exceptions being youth, mentored and landowner owned land. Lindbloom said annually 1,100 mule deer and doe are harvested by youth and mentor seasons. 31 percent by any antlerless license 11 percent landowner 70 percent landowner archery license. The peak was in 2009 with 3,000 deer. Radio collars rates are 83 percent survival, 17 percent mortality with 4 percent from harvest. He said they are keeping harvest low at approximately 1,000 deer annually for the last three years.

B. Jensen said he feels it is well restricted currently.

Phillips stated 4 percent harvest doesn't seem like very much and a lot has been done to reduce harvest. He is okay with moving the petition forward to take comments, but being part of deer working group and discussing internally and work done to control harvest. He does not think the 4 percent harvest is a problem. Phillips feels this problem has already been dealt with by the Commission and department.

Peterson knows this affects the statewide area while the petitioner's county is putting forward this to help in their area.

B. Jensen doesn't see a need as work was done 3 years ago to address this.

Sharp inquired if this would reduce harvest positively enough to affect the herd?

Lindbloom said they changed Butte and Harding County's to which showed a slightly positive impact on growth rates up there.

Phillips noted there are no whitetail deer in certain areas, but are seeing mule deer causing depredation problems on ranches.

Motioned by G. Jensen second by Sharp TO DENY THE PETITION. Roll call vote: Boyd-yes; G. Jensen-yes; Olson- yes; Peterson-no; Phillips – yes Sharp- yes; B. Jensen-yes. Motion passes with 6 yes votes and 1 no vote. Motion passes.

Motioned by Phillips second by G. Jensen TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 18-05 (APPENDIX A) DENYING THE PETITION. Roll call vote: Boyd-yes; G. Jensen-yes; Olson- yes; Peterson-no; Phillips – yes Sharp- yes; B. Jensen-yes. Motion passes with 6 yes votes and 1 no vote. Motion passes.

PROPOSALS

Archery Deer Hunting Season

Tom Kirschenmann, wildlife deputy director and terrestrial's chief, presented the recommended changes to the archery deer season dates providing the commission 3 alternatives to consider.

1. September 1 to January 1
2. Begin on the second Saturday of September to January 1
3. No change to current season dates

Kirschenmann explained that prior to the development and adoption of the deer management plan, a petition was brought forward to the Commission requesting the start date of the archery deer hunting season be changed from the fourth Saturday of September to the second Saturday of September. The Commission denied the petition with the agreement that the archery season start date would be evaluated under the guidance of the deer management plan. Therefore, a list of potential alternatives and summary of archery season dates for adjacent states are presented for discussion and consideration.

Motioned by Olson, second by G. Jensen TO APPROVE THE PROPOSAL CHANGING THE ARCHERY DEER HUNTING SEASON DATE TO BEGIN SEPTEMBER 1 AND END JANUARY 1.

Mentored Hunter Restrictions

Kirschenmann presented the recommended change to remove the minimum age restriction for mentored youth big game licenses. He explained how senate bill 137 amended 41-6-81 removed the minimum age requirement of 10 years of age for mentored youth hunting. He noted that age requirements currently found within ARSD 41:06:01:12 are unnecessary and repetitive of state law.

Motioned by Olson, seconded by Boyd TO REMOVE THE MINIMUM AGE REQUIREMENT OF 10 YEARS OF AGE FOR MENTORED YOUTH HUNTING. Motion carried unanimously.

Maximum Size of Hunting Groups

Andy Alban, law enforcement program administrator, presented the recommendation to repeal the hunting party size limits and allow individual members of a hunting party to determine the safety guidelines for their particular hunt. He explained how the rule change originated from the Department rules review workgroup and aligns with the strategy of allowing more opportunity. He said the rule was established due to fair chase issues and the concern was safety factors. He said the department receives requests that cannot be accommodated for example disabled hunters asking for allowances. He noted that 20 is an arbitrary number and it is more important to allow hunting party to be able to decide what is safe depending on the group and the terrain.

Motioned by Boyd, second by Sharp TO REPEAL THE HUNTING PARTY SIZE LIMIT. Motion carried unanimously.

Accompaniment While Hunting

Alban presented the recommendation to allow an archery hunter to possess a firearm in the field provided they possess a firearms big game license that is valid for the same geographic area and time of year as the archery license and allow for an armed nonlicensee to accompany an archery big game hunter in the field provided they possess a big game license that is valid for the same geographic area and time of year as the licensed archery hunter.

Peterson asked if this would be just during rifle season.

Alban explained the proposal allows for both weapons if you have the proper license for the time of year and area so both seasons would have to be open and they would have to have licenses for that time of year and geographic area.

Motioned by Phillips, second by Sharp TO AMEND THE ARCHERY RESTRICTIONS TO ALLOW FOR ACCOMPANYMENT. Motion carried unanimously.

Fur Dealer License Application Requirements

Alban presented the recommendation to create a new rule to require all fur dealers to list employees/agents on their application who will purchase or contract to purchase fur-bearing animals and allow the Department to refuse the issuance of a license to a fur dealer with and employee/agent who has received a suspension or revocation of their fur dealer's license or that has been denied issuance of a license.

Alban noted the Commission asked staff to take a look at other licensees when discussing the bait dealer license restrictions. He also stated the suspension period would not exceed one calendar year.

Motioned by G. Jensen, second by Sharp TO APPROVE THE RESTRICTIONS OF A FUR DEALERS LICENSE. Motion carried unanimously

Muzzleloading Rifle and Pistol Requirements

Dale Gates, conservation officer district supervisor, presented the recommended changes to muzzleloading rifle and pistol requirements.

1. 41:06:04:11 – eliminate the use of the term “factory rated”, and replace with “rated”. Require a minimum standard of .50 caliber bullets when using muzzleloading handguns for big game

hunting.

2. 41:06:04:14 – clarify that muzzleloading handguns are specifically authorized for big game hunting.

Gates explained these changes would set a minimum standard for the use of .50 caliber bullets when hunting with a muzzleloading handgun. Setting the standard at .50 caliber is desirable, as the vast majority of loads using smaller calibers do not meet the minimum standard currently in place for foot-pounds of energy at the muzzle. And noted these changes would also clarify that hand loaded ammunition meeting the minimum energy standard is specifically authorized for big game hunting. As currently written, the use of the term “factory rated” suggests that hand loaded ammunition is prohibited.

Motioned by Olson, second by Boyd TO APPROVED THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO MUZZLELOADING RIFLE AND PISTOL REQUIREMENTS. Motion carried unanimously

Bowhunter Education Requirement

Scott Simpson, wildlife administration chief, presented the recommended changes to the bowhunter education requirements. He explained this change does not eliminate this program only the requirement for elk hunters and first time archery hunters comply with education requirements. He said when the program was established the department did not have the equipment they do now nor was bowhunting readily excepted. Conversation turned to educating elk hunters and first time bowhunters. So requirement was established to complete education courses before hunters could apply. Archery is now a popular sport and at a point that information is readily available and even online without the barriers that there were in 1993.

Simpson said Bowhunter Education would remain available for anyone wishing to earn their National Bowhunter Education Foundation certification. He explained information will continue to be available online, as it is the preferred method, and will offer classes, just asking to eliminate the requirement this would make it similar to firearms for anyone over the age of 16.

Motion by Phillips, second by Olson TO REPEAL THE Bowhunter education requirement in place for all bowhunters under age 16, all first time archery licensees and all archery elk licensees. Motion carried unanimously

Retention of Accrued Preference Points

Robling presented the recommended change to remove the requirement that would force applicants to forfeit preference points accrued when the applicant fails to submit an initial drawing application in a single season for a period of five consecutive years. He explained this rule is no longer needed because applicants now purchase preference points for limited draw licenses and the licensing system database is capable of storing these records.

Phillips asked if you are a resident then become a nonresident would you keep your preference points?

Robling responded yes those points remain in your profile and if you become a resident again you will continue to accumulate points.

Motion by Peterson, second by Phillips TO REPEAL LANGUAGE THAT FORFEITS PREFERENCE POINTS. Motion carried unanimously.

Potential Adjustments to Snaring and Snare/Trap Marking Proposal from April Meeting

Leif presented the recommended changes to trapping to align an affected administrative rule with proposed change for all public lands and improved road rights-of-way west of the Missouri River, remove the dates that restrict use of snares and allow snares to be used year-round; Modify the dates that trapping and snaring equipment (i.e. traps, snares, stakes, cables, chains, wire, etc.) must be removed from public lands and improved road rights-of-way west of the Missouri River, to allow that type of equipment to be placed year-round.

Proposed changes from last year:

1. For all public lands and improved road rights-of-way east of the Missouri River, extend the existing prohibition on the use of snares to run through the last day of the pheasant season.
2. For all public lands and improved road rights-of-way west of the Missouri River, remove the dates that restrict use of snares and allow snares to be used year-round.
3. Create a new administrative rule which requires all traps and snares placed on public lands and improved road rights-of-way, statewide, to be marked with the owner's name and address or personal identification number. The Department will generate and issue one unique personal identification number to each individual.

Recommended changes from proposal:

1. To align an affected administrative rule with proposed change #2; Modify the dates that trapping and snaring equipment (i.e. traps, snares, stakes, cables, chains, wire, etc.) must be removed from public lands and improved road rights-of-way west of the Missouri River, to allow that type of equipment to be placed year-round.

Leif offered to assist the commission should they have adjustment they would like to make and recommended taking action later in the meeting.

Phillips inquired about adding options and asked if this would allow the commission to finalize options 1, 2 or 3. We could pass any of them or just number 3 or reject all, select one or two or all.

Leif responded that those are all the options available.

B. Jensen stated the trapping community is opposed to change and recommended putting changes out for public comment.

Phillips recommended not making a decision today and the need to leave the broader options in there.

Peterson noted that one of the recommendations takes away the locking snare.

Phillips responded that it allows for all snare year round on GPA's and WPA's excluding dispatch snares that have the spring on them and it also leave in the option for identification for comment.

B. Jensen asked if this would include all traps types for identification requirements.

Fisk responded that this would require identification on all traps and snares on public lands and road right of way and not private land.

Proposed changes from last year (as amended during the May Commission meeting):

1. For all public lands and improved road rights-of-way, extend the existing prohibition on the use of snares to run through the last day of the pheasant season.
2. Create a new administrative rule which requires all traps and snares placed on public lands and improved road rights-of-way, statewide, to be marked with the owner's name and address or personal identification number. The Department will generate and issue one unique personal identification number to each individual.
3. No snare using springs or other powering devices that hold the snare closed may be used on Game Production Areas and Waterfowl Production Areas above water, year-round.

Motioned by Phillips second by G. Jensen TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE TRAPPING REGULATIONS AS AMENDED. Motion carried unanimously.

Hunting Requirement – Mandatory CWD Testing

Switzer presented the recommended changes to include the mandatory submission of required samples for chronic wasting disease (CWD) testing for all deer harvested from any Custer State Park (CSP) deer hunting season. Switzer explained the disease management action was implemented to strengthen the sample size for determining a prevalence rate of elk within CSP; mule deer and white-tailed deer are also susceptible CWD. Department staff will evaluate disease test results and adapt as needed for future CWD management and hunting seasons.

Motioned by G. Jensen, second by Sharp TO REQUIRE CWD TESTING FOR ALL DEER HARVESTED IN CSP. Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Public Hearing began at 1:58 p.m. and concluded at 2:03 p.m. on Thursday, May 3, 2018. The minutes follow these Commission meeting minutes.

FINALIZATIONS

East River Deer Hunting Season

Chad Switzer, wildlife program administrator, presented the recommended change for the 2018 east river deer hunting season

1. Adjust resident license numbers from no more than 21,085 one-tag and 5,250 two-tag licenses to no more than 20,900 one-tag and 5,250 two-tag licenses.
2. Create a new Limited Access Unit (Unit 59L) in Hughes and Sully counties limited to all Game Production, Corp of Engineer, and Park Recreation Area Lands north of Oahe Dam in Hughes County and west of US Hwy 1804 to Bush's Landing boat ramp in Sully County at 182nd St.; excluding the Spring Creek Recreation area (see map). This unit is all public land and landowner preference does not apply and hunters must obtain a free access permit to hunt archery, muzzleloader, youth or mentored youth as required on other Limited Access Units.
3. Eliminate Unit 59B (that portion of Sully County east of U.S. Highway 83).
4. Modify Unit 59A to include all of Sully except that portion within 59L.
5. Modify Unit 36A to include all of Hughes County excluding that portion within Unit 59L, Farm Island Recreation Area, LaFramboise Island, and the land from the entrance to Farm Island west through the city of Pierre.
6. Modify the antlerless-only deer hunting season dates from 9 days beginning on the Saturday after Christmas to nine consecutive days beginning the Saturday following the 16th day of the East River deer season.

Recommended changes from proposal:

1. Retain 2017 resident license numbers.
2. Rescind the establishment of Unit ERD-59L.
3. Retain current unit boundaries for Unit ERD-59A, Unit ERD-59B, and Unit ERD-36A.

Motioned by G. Jensen, second by Sharp TO AMEND THE FINALIZATION TO REGAIN 2017 RESIDENT NUMBERS AND MODIFY THE UNITS AS RECOMMENDED.

Motioned by G. Jensen, second by Boyd TO FINALIZE THE FINALIZATION OF THE EAST RIVER DEER SEASON AS AMENDED. Motion carried unanimously.

West River Deer Hunting Season

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the 2018 west river deer hunting season.

1. Reinstate the antlerless-only deer season for nine consecutive days beginning the Saturday following the 16th day of the East River deer season.

Motioned by Phillips, second by Sharp TO APPROVE THE FINALIZATION OF THE WEST RIVER DEER SEASON. Motion carried unanimously.

Muzzleloader Deer Hunting Season

Switzer presented the recommended change to the 2018 general muzzleloader deer hunting season.

1. For Unit MZD-LM1, close unit ERD-59L.
2. Both any deer and antlerless whitetail deer licenses are valid December 1 – January 1.

Recommended changes from proposal:

1. Rescind proposed change to Unit MZD-LM1.

Motioned by Olson, seconded by Sharp TO AMEND THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE MUZZLELOADING DEER SEASON. Motion carried unanimously.

Motioned by Sharp, seconded by Peterson TO FINALIZE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE MUZZLELOADING DEER SEASON AS AMENDED. Motion carried unanimously.

Archery Deer Hunting Season

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the 2018 archery deer hunting season

1. For Unit ARD-LM1, close unit ERD-59L.
2. Modify the season end date from January 15 to January 1.
3. Antlerless whitetail deer licenses are not valid after January 1.
4. Change the archery season end date for Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge, Lacreek National Wildlife Refuge, Waubay National Wildlife Refuge, and Waubay State Lake State Game Refuge from December 31 to January 1, except during the firearm deer seasons established for such refuges.

Recommended changes from proposal:

1. Rescind proposed change to Unit ARD-LM1.

Motioned by Peterson, seconded by G. Jensen TO FINALIZE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE ARCHERY SEASON AS AMENDED. Motion carried unanimously.

Motioned by G. Jensen, second by Olson TO FINALIZE AS AMENDED RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE 2018 ARCHERY DEER HUNTING SEASON. Motion carried unanimously.

Deer Hunting Season Dates

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the deer hunting season. He explained that because applicants are using several years of preference to obtain licenses for this season, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and Department staff would prefer these two seasons do not overlap. To maintain hunter opportunity and meet deer population objectives at Sand Lake NRW, the recommendation is to adjust the start date to keep the current nine day antlerless-only deer season and end on January 1.

1. Change end dates for all deer hunting seasons that currently go past January 1 to end no later than January 1.
2. Eliminate administrative rule language which specifies that only antlerless licenses are valid from January 1-15 in the archery and muzzleloader deer seasons.

Recommended changes from proposal:

1. Change the antlerless deer season dates at Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge from nine consecutive days beginning on the Saturday following December 25 to nine consecutive days beginning on December 24.

Motioned by Sharp, second by Phillips TO AMEND THE CHANGES TO THE DEER HUNTING SEASON DATES. Motion carried.

Motioned by Phillips, second by Boyd TO FINALIZE THE CHANGES TO THE DEER HUNTING SEASON DATES AS AMENDED. Motion carried.

Public Land Access Permits for Deer Hunting

Switzer presented the recommended changes to the access permits required for specific deer hunting units and public land.

1. Require any resident and nonresident deer hunter possessing an archery deer license to obtain and possess a free access permit to hunt in the Black Hills as defined in ARSD 41:06:19:02. An unlimited number of free access permits may be issued.

Motioned by Phillips, second by Sharp TO FINALIZE THE CHANGES TO THE ACCESS PERMIT REQUIREMENTS (Appendix B). . Motion carried.

Switzer presented the recommended change in administrative action to allocate deer hunting licenses by unit.

Motioned by Sharp, second by G. Jensen TO FINALIZE THE ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION ALLOCATING DEER LICENSES. (Appendix C). Motion carried.

Depredation Hunts

Keith Fisk, wildlife damage program administrator, presented the recommended changes to the depredation permits.

1. Modify the dates that big game species (excluding elk) depredation hunts may occur from December 1 to March 31, to August 15 to the following March 31.
2. Modify the dates that the pool of hunters is valid from December 1 to the following December 31 for all species.
3. Eliminate the \$20 fee for elk depredation permits.

Motioned by Boyd, seconded by Phillips TO FINALIZE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO DEPREDATION PERMITS. Motion carried.

Apprentice Hunter Deer Season

Tom Kirschenmann presented the recommended changes to the youth deer hunting season.

1. Rename ARSD Chapter 41:06:44 from Youth Deer Hunting Season to Apprentice Hunter Deer Season.
2. License is valid for any resident who has not previously held a license to hunt deer in South Dakota.

Recommended changes from proposal:

1. Mentor hunters are eligible to hunt during the apprentice deer hunting season.
2. Remove the current closed restriction on Farm Island State Recreation Area and LaFramboise Island Nature Area in Hughes County.
3. Change license eligibility for any resident who has not held a license to hunt deer during the previous 10 years.

Peterson said this is good change not only for our youth but other hunters and to make it as simple as possible.

G. Jensen inquired if the years for eligibility should we move the 10 down to 5.

Kirschenmann said this was identified as a reasonable number by staff to allow the opportunity for someone who has not been involved in the recent past to reactivate

G. Jensen would like to see it at 5 years.

Phillips noted he has no concerns with 5 years then asked if this recommendation grew out of the petition that was received?

Kirschenmann responded yes this a result of the petition to give adults an opportunity.

Phillips asked if the change can be made at this time.

Kirschenmann explained that yes the commission generated the proposal based on her petition. Once it was a proposal you can make recommended changes.

Sharp said he thinks it is a good proposal and is comfortable with the way it is written and recommended reviewing it a year from now a see if concept worked.

Motioned by Sharp, second by G. Jensen TO AMEND THE FINALIZATION TO AS RECOMMENDED. Motion carried.

Motioned by G. Jensen, second by Peterson TO FINALIZE THE APPRENTICE HUNTER DEER SEASON AS AMENDED. Motion carried.

Custer State Park Non-Trophy Bison Harvest

Mark Hendrix, parks and recreation division staff specialist, presented the recommended change to adjust the Custer State Park non-trophy bison harvest from 47 days to 40 days beginning the first Monday in October instead of the last Monday. He explained this allows the non-trophy bison to be harvested as soon as they have been identified and sorted from the other sale animals in late September. And shortening the season will allow it to close before the trophy season begins.

Motioned by Phillips, seconded by Sharp TO FINALIZE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE CUSTER STATE PARK NON-TROPHY BISON HARVEST AS PRESENTED. Motion carried.

Custer State Park Trophy Bison Bull Harvest

Hendrix presented the recommended change to adjust the Custer State Park trophy bison harvest from 47 days to 61 days beginning the third Monday in November instead of the last Monday. He explained the 14-day season extension allows for more flexibility in scheduling the 3 days trophy hunts. Currently two hunters are scheduled each week. If a bull has not been harvest by the second day two hunters overlap. Our goal is to have 1 bison hunter in the park at a time to provide them with the best hunting opportunity.

Motioned by Boyd, second by Sharp TO FINALIZE THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE CUSTER STATE PARK TROPHY BISON HARVEST AS PRESENTED.

OPEN FORUM

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

Blair Waite, Custer, SD, former state trapper and retired CO still works part time in parks. Would like to find a solution and not eliminate something. Believes wildlife division, with Commissions assistance can make regulations that will minimize problems catching hunting dogs. Dogs are usually with hunter and are rescued. If close to end of pheasant season closes off prime fur season. Presented a snare catching collar to the commission noting how it works which is currently being tested.

Russ Cambern, Brookings, SD, trapper for over 50 years in 3 different states. Has lived in states that requires name tags. Says a good trapper will put name tags on and do his job doing it the right way. Normally when weather allows for snaring in ditches there is too much snow. (public land, guys have had 25 days to hunt) presented a breakaway snare mainly for deer. Doesn't see a problem getting animals off this type of snare. Recommended including information in the wildlife handbook and GFP website on how to remove a dog from a snare.

Jeff Clark, Veblen, SD, landowner and livestock producer in Marshall County. Spoke against proposal doesn't think any changes need to be made to regulations. If snaring is not allowed on public land until after pheasant season

John Hopple, South Dakota Trappers Association, spoke in opposition to the proposed changes.

Tuffy Halls, Hot Springs, SD, WSDFH, official stance opposed to these recommended changes noting concerns for future of all sportsmen activities if one group is pitted against another. He noted a large number of dogs parish each year due to heat related conditions. He supports the department's original recommendations on signage and public education and said trap tags serve no purpose other than to put them in legal jeopardy.

Marshall LaMont, Union Center, opposes the proposal.

Larry Bowden, Hot Springs, SD, WSDFHA: was present at the meeting when the petition was brought forward. Noted suggested changes and those that he preferred. Said both trapper associations volunteered to assist in making videos and huntsafe materials. Noted petitions request to tag traps explained that this would not resolve the problem and has no bearing. Tagging concerns are expense, among other things. Wants to know how we get youth involved and if you add unnecessary expense and regulations this is a deterrent. Stated trapping impact on predator populations is important.

Vince Lougue, Oelrichs, SD with WSDFHA supports the group, education which is key to solving problems. As commission how tags will help as the tags would need to be dug up to read them and this would interfere with trapping. Park of wildlife management and predator control without trapping would have to hire people to fill these roles.

Tammy Basel, Union Center, SD, SD Sheep Growers Association, supports current regulations as they are. Has empathy for dogs noting small amount impacted and the impact by coyote depredation

Dallis Basel, Union Center, SD, livestock and landowner, attended meeting in RC. One thing reiterated after meeting is the need for education. Need to education pheasant hunters that it is public land and there are trappers out there too.

David Nieme, Buffalo, SD, opposed to restriction on the use of snares. Snaring is a valuable tool in the predator control tool box. Snares are useful for coyotes and fox and if there is restriction it will be detrimental to livestock.

Craig Parkhurst, Armour, SD SDTA vice president, lifelong hunter, fisher and trapper, and Douglas County States Attorney. As an attorney does not like rules and laws that are overly broad and do not make a solution to problems. Attended summit and noted discussion to increase access to public lands finds it ironic that this proposal does the opposite. Noted more dogs are loss due to overheating, shot by hunter, lost or run over. GFP has no record of a dog being loss to a trap. Different regulations are required for different snares; possibly adjust these regulations instead of just not allowing them on public lands. Solution to go back and study to find facts that will make a different starting with education. Noted trapped tags in other states are prima facie cases.

Tom Krafka, Rapid City, SD Black Hills Sportsmen Club, had lively discussion with 30 of 150 members of organization on May 1. Support proposal. Had 3 had dogs caught in snares with no fatalities. Hoping a compromise can be worked out and thinks anything that happens east river should also happen west river.

Nancy Hilding, Black Hawk, SD PHAS, provided the Commission handouts. She thanked the commission for putting trapping idea on the table. Provided info from born free and data noting South Dakota gets an F. 7 states with stricter regulations believe trapping is commercial and not recreation. She again stress her concerns with rule 41-08-

02-03 in regards to the number of hours between trap check times. Says South Dakota times are odd.

Representative Tim Goodwin, Hill City, SD, had a dog caught twice in snares in and out of water. Both times he was with the dog and cut the snare and dog was not harmed. Encourages more snaring noting how many raccoons are dead along the side of the road. He disagrees with tagging traps saying it is needless government regulation and we do not need more as we are a conservative state. Recommended leaving regulations as they are.

Kevin Wooster, Rapid City, SD, semi-retired reported. Speaking on own behalf. Noted lots of dogs get caught in traps. He said he was hunting in GPA by Miller and many dogs range out. Like what the commission is doing and this is what it is all about. Likes extending this west river. He disagrees with trapper friends and notes those that hunt pheasants hard hunt until the end of the season. He could not get the dog out of snare but is not a mechanical person. Think the commission is headed towards a solution. Likes the idea recommend use of nonlethal snares on public land for predator control

Mark Steck, Lennox, SD, Dakotaline Snare. Moved to SD in 1983 for hunting trapping and fishing opportunities. Has raised dogs all his life and has been a trapper. Committed learning in life to trapping. Sells snares and gives lessons and free demonstrations. Not a hazard to dogs the problem is fear. Dog has been caught in snares many times. Goes trapping west river takes dogs along and fear is when dogs get near highway. What causes an animal to die and what does not. Demo with Kelly. Nonlethal snare will not kill an animal unless. Affixed snare to Hepler's arm and easily removed it. Animal will not die unless tangled by cutting off of blood. Same goes for skunk. 10 years trapping for income. Also demonstrated a dispatch snare that a dog could easily die in. Explained the spring keeps pressure on and that is what kills the animal. Provided pictures of caught coyote in snare that died from entanglement. An attended dog will not die in a snare. An unattended dog may.

DIVISION OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Roy Lake Concession Prospectus Update

Al Nedved, parks and recreation assistant director, provided an update to the Commission regarding the advertised prospectus for the sale of Roy Lake Resort. Commission approved the most recent prospectus at the March meeting. The price of the required purchase was established by an appraisal at \$975,000, which is required under administrative rule. The prospectus was a repeat of the prospectus of the previous offering in November 2017 and contained the Settlement Agreement approved by the Commission in November as well as the same lease terms offered. It was issued immediately after the March meeting on March 5th and it expired on May 2nd. No proposals were received in response to the prospectus. The current lease expires at the end of 2018. Nedved indicated that staff will continue to work through the required sale process. Staff may be back at the next meeting with an amended proposal.

BOR Future Resource Management Plans

Al Nedved, parks and recreation assistant director, and Jay Leasure, Bureau of Reclamation, natural resource specialist provided a presentation on Bureau of Reclamation planning efforts at Belle Fourche and Shadehill Reservoirs. Current management agreements have been at place at Angostura – 2012 – 2037, (GFP management since 1959), Shadehill – 2000 – 2025, (GFP management since 1952), Belle Fourche – 1969 – 2019, (GFP management since 1969) and Deerfield/Pactola - Fisheries

Management. Resource management plans foster proper stewardship of public lands. Nedved presented some of the management zones currently under agreement around Belle Fourche. Leisure presented the efforts and schedule for planning such as surveys and public meetings. A survey will be conducted during the summer fall of 2018, and the draft RMP will be out for public comment in October of 2019. The Shadehill survey will also be conducted in 2018, with a public meeting to be held in Lemmon on June 14, 2018. Draft RMP for Shadehill will be available November of 2018. Nedved also gave a history of Title 28 funding which has provided \$8,516,288 in federal dollars since 2009. These funds provide 50% matching funds for recreational development and 75% for wildlife habitat enhancement.

Peterson said the partnership at Angostura is great and thanked them for their help.

B. Jensen inquired about Title 28 fund levels?

Leisure said they have been pretty steady for the last 10 year. He explained they get a lump sum which is divided between South Dakota, North Dakota and Wyoming then work with partners to identify key areas for funding. Most recently Angostura and Shadehill state recreation areas have seen the bulk and anticipate more funding for South Dakota parks.

Mickelson Connector Trail

Nedved provided a presentation on the vision and history of the Connector trail proposal. Feasibility study started in 2008 and was completed in 2012. Permit Application Issued in 2013, with the MOU with USFS/NPS signed in 2014. In 2015, the EIS contractor was selected and Scoping letter issued June 1, 2016. In 2017, USFS requested and GFP engaged working group consisting of Norbeck Society, Friends of the Norbeck, Black Hills Sportsman's Club, and Black Hills Chapter of Wilderness Society to formulate alternatives for consideration in the inclusion of the EIS that will help reduce the impact of the trail within the Norbeck Wildlife Preserve. In November 2017, GFP provided those recommendations to USFS. In January 2018, the EIS resumed and final feasibility of the alternatives will be completed in May. During the summer of 2018, environmental analysis will resume and a Draft EIS is scheduled to be available for 45 day comment period in September of 2018. Final EIS is anticipated for March of 2019.

Peterson stated watching the history shows you are making progress and asked if it will come down to one path

Nedved responded yes, but there will be alternatives. From a feasibility stand point we will be able to weed some of those out.

Parks Revenue Report

Katie Ceroll, parks and recreation assistant director, provided the year to date revenue report by item as well as the breakout of district revenue. The revenue report indicated an increase of 3 percent even with permits down 14 percent and lodging up 5 percent. She explained we will need to see a higher increase in lodging to show a true increase as fees were increased. She noted that weather is a huge driver in current statistics not only in permit numbers but revenue and camping by district. She reported camping is down 41 percent noting April only makes up 2 percent of the annual camping.

DIVISION OF WILDLIFE

Land-locked Public Lands

Kevin Robling undated the commission on land-locked public lands. He noted providing outdoor recreational opportunities and access is a top priority for the Department referencing the strategic plan objective B: enhance hunting and trapping opportunities, strategy 2.c., directs that we shall develop opportunities with private landowners to access inaccessible public lands in an effort to increase public hunting land access by 50,000 acres by 2020. The vast majority of these acres are in western South Dakota and are managed by the US Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and SD Office of School and Public Lands (SPL). BLM manages 274,000 acres in South Dakota with 98,460 of those acres with no direct public access. SPL manages 760,000 acres in South Dakota with 200,550 acres remaining publicly inaccessible. GFP staff have developed priority lists of parcels of inaccessible public lands and are starting to work with surrounding private landowners to acquire public access.

Peterson said this is great the more you can accomplish for access the better.

Olson inquired about use of section lines as access points for truly landlocked areas .

Robling responded the department is currently identifying 66 foot section lines that are not conspicuous access corridors and are working with area landowners to make section-line access to these land landlocked areas more obvious for the public. He said this could be identified in the hunting handbook, atlas and app with definite media outreach to inform the public.

Olson said there needs to be a gentle relationship building with landowners who have coveted this land as their own, and noted people should truly be able to hunt. We want a good relationship as we move forward.

Aquatic Invasive Species Outreach and Education

Kiel and Chris Hull, communications specialist, updated the commission on the aquatic invasive species (AIS) outreach and education. The explained the objective of the 2018 AIS communications plan is to target male boat owners ages 18-35 with information on what actions are required to slow the spread of AIS. Social media marketing will continue through memes, targeted ads on Facebook in the market areas mentioned above and an Instagram video that will launch Father's Day weekend.

Kiel noted "takeover marketing" efforts will include wrapping gas pump toppers and ice box wraps with placement in areas along I-90 and the northeast region near popular boating and fishing areas. Geo-fencing technology will be used at 4 locations in and around Lewis and Clark Recreation Area to make boaters aware of boat plug regulations. To inform recreational boaters with ballast system boats about AIS regulations, we intend to give away a full wakeboard package. AIS interns will be handing out rack cards directing boaters to the website. Multiple radio and web-based ads throughout the summer will also announce the giveaway and direct the public to the *SDLeastWanted* website. Boaters must complete a short survey on the website to become registered for the prize package.

Boyd inquired about utilizing podcasts.

Hull said this is an idea staff have been thinking about this as it is a really good way to get messages to millennials and younger. You have 5 minutes to get their attention and if they are not interested you have one chance to catch these folks. We are well on our way to doing these as they are fairly inexpensive, but a little time consuming.

Boyd what about a youth example such as junior naturalists?

Kiel currently this is not being done, but will reach out to education staff to begin the effort.

B. Jensen asked about doing weekly radio shows

Hull stated this is being done quite often in the regional offices.

Hepler said geofencing is another tool staff are working on as a new way of gaining information noting the department hopes to use it to promote recreation and respect as well as other programs.

G. Jensen thanked staff for their work on this very important issue.

Peterson noted it takes the young, excited vibrant minds to get these things going. We appreciate it as you teach us how to do it and how you capture the audience.

Implementation of Amended Mentored Hunter program

Simpson informed the commission that the Communication and Education teams have been working together to update the mentorship page on the GFP website. The website explains how the regulations surrounding mentored hunting will change as of July 1, 2018. The page also now includes a more detailed "FAQ" page that answers some of the most common questions new mentors ask. The website covers the "10 Commandments of Mentored Hunting" to ensure new mentors have a basic understanding of the expectations they are held to in the field. In addition to these resources, visitors to the web page can follow a link to the updated hunting handbook for regulations and laws surrounding mentored hunting.

As the Communication and Education teams continue to work together, they will be providing links to videos and articles that speak to issues such as how to know when your child is ready to go hunting, how to set yourself up for success on your first mentored hunt, how to manage the ethics and expectations of a first hunt, and equipment to consider in order to make your first hunt comfortable and effective. There is potential for the Education team to provide further training and support for future mentors as the need arises through in-person classes and additional online resource

Outdoor Campus West Shooting Sports Facility Development

Simpson informed the commission that a contract has been signed with Scull Construction and construction has begun on this development project at The Outdoor Campus West. Project will include a 14 lane traditional archery range and a 14 station walking archery course. A building is included that will allow for year around archery and BB gun instruction. The project is expected to be completed by September 1, 2018.

Bighorn Sheep Workgroup

Kirschenmann provided an update on the bighorn sheep workgroup. Following the direction of stakeholder groups formed to work on previous management plans (example elk and deer); the current bighorn sheep group has been formalized to establish a bighorn sheep and mountain goat stakeholder group. The make-up of this new stakeholder group

consists of nongovernment organizations, federal natural resource agencies, tribal partner, landowner, and individuals. The scope and functionality of the group now includes mountain goats and will be utilized to discuss management direction of each species. The group is meeting on May 4 to provide group members the opportunity to share comments with GFP staff on draft management plans and to discuss management activities around these species. Like other stakeholder groups, the department asked if there was any Commissioner interested in being part of the stakeholder group.

Commissioner Boyd requested Kirschenmann to keep her informed and include her on future notifications as she will be the commission representative.

License Sales Update

Simpson presented the license sales update to the commission noting License sales, particularly fishing licenses, are currently running \$685,000 behind 2017. This is due to the late ice out in 2018. When comparing 2018 to 2013, the last year ice out was this late, we see very similar trends.

Shikar Safari Award

Hepler informed the commission that the Shikar-Safari Award is awarded annually in all 50 states and in 10 Canadian provinces by the worldwide conservation organization. It has been presented to a South Dakota officer each year since 1968. The award honors wildlife officers for their performances in wildlife protection, wildlife law enforcement and the implementation of wildlife conservation programs. This year Bill Eastman has been honored by Shikar-Safari Club International as the 2017 South Dakota Wildlife Officer of the Year. Eastman who has been stationed in Belle Fourche has been with GFP since 1998, was recognized for his focus on improving habitat on public lands and his passion for recruiting and teaching youth and new hunters. It was noted that each year, Eastman organizes a youth pheasant hunt, youth turkey hunt, two large Step Outside events, a kids' fishing event, and he is an instructor for 4-H shooting sports, Hunt Safe and Bowhunter Education

Solicitation of Agenda Items from Commissioners

No agenda items were recommended

Hepler thanks for people coming to testify and helping make the process what it is. He also thanked Regency for hosting.

Adjourn

Motioned by Boyd, second by Sharp TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. Motion carried unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 10:42 a.m.

Appendix A
RESOLUTION 18-05

WHEREAS, Darrick Van Dyke of Wessington Springs, South Dakota, submitted a Petition to the Game, Fish and Parks Commission (Commission) dated April 28, 2018, requesting that the Game, Fish and Parks Commission amend ARSD § 41:06:44 (Youth Deer Season) and § 41:06:01:12 (Mentored Deer Season), – Elimination of the unlimited antlerless deer license for Youth and Mentored Deer Seasons for the reasons more fully set out in the petition (hereinafter referred to as “the Petition”); and

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS, the Commission has reviewed and carefully considered the requirements and procedures set out in SDCL §1-26-13 and the contents of the Petition, including the reasons advanced by Petitioner in support of elimination of unlimited licenses for Youth and Mentored Deer Season; and

WHEREAS, harvest of doe mule deer by mentored and youth hunters during the youth deer hunting season is currently minimal both statewide and within each deer management unit in South Dakota; and

WHEREAS, from 2014 - 2016 the average harvest rate for youth and mentored hunting season was approximately 550 doe mule deer. Of the doe mule deer population, current research in South Dakota estimates that only 4% of the deer are lost due to harvest; and

WHEREAS, on some lands in western South Dakota mule deer are the only deer species present and landowners desire to have youth and mentored hunting opportunities; and

WHEREAS, Allowing mentored and youth deer hunters to harvest any antlerless deer including doe mule deer provides the least chance of an inadvertent violation of shooting a misidentified deer; and

WHEREAS, Allowing mentored and youth deer hunters to harvest any antlerless deer including doe mule deer provides the maximum opportunity for recreation by youth hunters; and

WHEREAS, Recruitment and retention of hunters is an important component of the GFP Department strategic plan.

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

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

Appendix B

**Access Permit Survey Archery Deer Harvest Projections
Custer National Forest (35L)**

		Harvest Projections												
		Permits Issued	Projected Hunted	Hunter Success	Permit Success	Whitetail				Mule Deer				Total Deer Harvest
Year						Bucks		Does		Bucks		Does		
						Adult	Fawn	Adult	Fawn	Adult	Fawn	Adult	Fawn	
2014	Resident	262	112	14%	6%	3	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	15
	Nonresident	105	75	28%	20%	2	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	21
2015	Resident	355	176	12%	6%	3	0	0	0	16	0	1	1	21
	Nonresident	102	71	22%	15%	4	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	16
2016	Resident	488	270	13%	7%	8	0	4	1	19	0	1	0	34
	Nonresident	172	134	24%	19%	3	0	0	0	28	0	0	1	32
2017	Resident	497	298	8%	5%	3	0	0	0	21	0	1	0	25
	Nonresident	326	248	21%	16%	7	1	4	0	30	1	8	0	51

Hill Ranch GPA (27L)

		Harvest Projections												
		Permits Issued	Projected Hunted	Hunter Success	Permit Success	Whitetail				Mule Deer				Total Deer Harvest
Year						Bucks		Does		Bucks		Does		
						Adult	Fawn	Adult	Fawn	Adult	Fawn	Adult	Fawn	
2014	Resident	126	54	14%	6%	4	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	7
	Nonresident	23	8	29%	10%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
2015	Resident	136	61	9%	4%	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	5
	Nonresident	33	18	0%	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2016	Resident	157	51	6%	2%	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	Nonresident	52	24	24%	11%	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	6
2017	Resident	149	58	17%	7%	0	0	4	0	6	0	0	0	10
	Nonresident	62	22	18%	6%	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4

Little Moreau GPA (24B)

		Harvest Projections												
		Permits Issued	Projected Hunted	Hunter Success	Permit Success	Whitetail				Mule Deer				Total Deer Harvest
Year						Bucks		Does		Bucks		Does		
						Adult	Fawn	Adult	Fawn	Adult	Fawn	Adult	Fawn	
2014	Resident	82	17	7%	1%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Nonresident	15	6	40%	15%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
2015	Resident	95	23	26%	6%	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	6
	Nonresident	22	12	11%	6%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2016	Resident	118	30	14%	4%	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
	Nonresident	28	4	33%	5%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
2017	Resident	113	25	10%	2%	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
	Nonresident	47	7	33%	5%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Brule County certain GPA/Corps (13L)

		Harvest Projections												
		Permits Issued	Projected Hunted	Hunter Success	Permit Success	Whitetail				Mule Deer				Total Deer Harvest
Year						Bucks		Does		Bucks		Does		
						Adult	Fawn	Adult	Fawn	Adult	Fawn	Adult	Fawn	
2017	Resident	112	16	17%	2%	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
	Nonresident	44	0		0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Black Hills Unit Harvest

		Harvest Projections												
		Permits Issued	Projected Hunted	Hunter Success	Permit Success	Whitetail				Mule Deer				Total Deer Harvest
Year						Bucks		Does		Bucks		Does		
						Adult	Fawn	Adult	Fawn	Adult	Fawn	Adult	Fawn	
2014	Resident	NA	NA	NA	NA									
	Nonresident	NA	NA	NA	NA									
2015	Resident	NA	NA	NA	NA									
	Nonresident	NA	NA	NA	NA									
2016	Resident	NA	NA	NA	NA	384	31	215	11	83	0	15	5	744
	Nonresident	NA	NA	NA	NA	76	4	39	3	49	0	7	0	177
2017	Resident	NA	NA	NA	NA	448	13	258	17	85	0	24	0	844
	Nonresident	NA	NA	NA	NA	101	3	49	3	35	0	12	0	204

Appendix C
Deer Hunting Season – Hunting Unit License Allocations

2018 East River Deer

Unit #	Unit Name	Resident Licenses								License Totals			
		AnyD	AtID	AD+AtID	2 AtID	AnyW	AtIW	AW+AtIW	2 AtIW	RES	RES	RES	RES
		01	03	08	09	11	13	18	19	1-tag	2-tag	Licenses	Tags
01A	Minnehaha	450	100							550	0	550	550
03A	Brown	1,100	1,300							2,400	0	2,400	2,400
04A	Beadle					500	100			600	0	600	600
05A	Codington	250								250	0	250	250
06A	Brookings	450	100							550	0	550	550
07A	Yankton	250								250	0	250	250
07B	Yankton		75							75	0	75	75
08A	Davison					200				200	0	200	200
10A	Aurora					350	200			550	0	550	550
12A	Bon Homme	150								150	0	150	150
12B	Bon Homme						50			50	0	50	50
13A	Brule	100				600		200		700	200	900	1,100
13L	Brule	20								20	0	20	20
14A	Buffalo	100						250		100	250	350	600
16A	Campbell	20				400	300			720	0	720	720
17A	Charles Mix	100				150				250	0	250	250
18A	Clark	600								600	0	600	600
19A	Clay	200								200	0	200	200
22A	Day	600								600	0	600	600
23A	Deuel	400								400	0	400	400
25A	Douglas					150				150	0	150	150
26A	Edmunds			700	600					0	1,300	1,300	2,600
28A	Faulk			600	800					0	1,400	1,400	2,800
29A	Grant	300								300	0	300	300
32A	Hamlin	600								600	0	600	600
33A	Hand	20				450	400			870	0	870	870
34A	Hanson					200				200	0	200	200
36A	Hughes	175				250	175			600	0	600	600
37A	Hutchinson					100				100	0	100	100
38A	Hyde	20						500	200	20	700	720	1,420
40A	Jerauld					350	200			550	0	550	550
42A	Kingsbury	500	100							600	0	600	600
43A	Lake	300	100							400	0	400	400
44A	Lincoln	200	50							250	0	250	250
46A	McCook	350	100							450	0	450	450
47A	McPherson	500			500					500	500	1,000	1,500
48A	Marshall	500								500	0	500	500
51A	Miner	400	350							750	0	750	750
52A	Moody	350	100							450	0	450	450
54A	Potter	150						500	400	150	900	1,050	1,950
55A	Roberts	500								500	0	500	500
56A	Sanborn					350	200			550	0	550	550
57A	Spink	900	400							1,300	0	1,300	1,300
59A	Sully	100				250	100			450	0	450	450
59B	Sully	20				350	100			470	0	470	470
61A	Turner	100								100	0	100	100
62A	Union	250	50							300	0	300	300
63A	Walworth	50				400	300			750	0	750	750
	TOTAL	11,075	2,825	1,300	1,900	5,050	2,125	1,450	600	21,075	5,250	26,325	31,575
Unit #	Unit Name	AnyD	AtID	AD+AtID	2 AtID	AnyW	AtIW	AW+AtIW	2 AtIW	RES	RES	RES	RES
		01	03	08	09	11	13	18	19	1-tag	2-tag	Licenses	Tags

East River Deer
2017 vs 2018 Comparison

Unit #	Unit Name	2017 Resident Licenses	2018 Resident Licenses	# Change	% Change	2017 Resident Tags	2018 Resident Tags	# Change	% Change
01A	Minnehaha	550	550	0	0%	550	550	0	0%
03A	Brown	2,400	2,400	0	0%	2,400	2,400	0	0%
04A	Beadle	600	600	0	0%	600	600	0	0%
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	200	200	0	0%	200	200	0	0%
10A	Aurora	550	550	0	0%	550	550	0	0%
12A	Bon Homme	150	150	0	0%	150	150	0	0%
12B	Bon Homme	50	50	0	0%	50	50	0	0%
13A	Brule	900	900	0	0%	1,100	1,100	0	0%
13L	Brule	20	20	0	0%	20	20	0	0%
14A	Buffalo	350	350	0	0%	600	600	0	0%
16A	Campbell	720	720	0	0%	720	720	0	0%
17A	Charles Mix	250	250	0	0%	250	250	0	0%
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	150	150	0	0%	150	150	0	0%
26A	Edmunds	1,300	1,300	0	0%	2,600	2,600	0	0%
28A	Faulk	1,400	1,400	0	0%	2,800	2,800	0	0%
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%	870	870	0	0%
34A	Hanson	200	200	0	0%	200	200	0	0%
36A	Hughes	600	600	0	0%	600	600	0	0%
37A	Hutchinson	100	100	0	0%	100	100	0	0%
38A	Hyde	720	720	0	0%	1,420	1,420	0	0%
40A	Jerauld	550	550	0	0%	550	550	0	0%
42A	Kingsbury	600	600	0	0%	600	600	0	0%
43A	Lake	400	400	0	0%	400	400	0	0%
44A	Lincoln	250	250	0	0%	250	250	0	0%
46A	McCook	450	450	0	0%	450	450	0	0%
47A	McPherson	1,000	1,000	0	0%	1,500	1,500	0	0%
48A	Marshall	500	500	0	0%	500	500	0	0%
51A	Miner	750	750	0	0%	750	750	0	0%
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	550	550	0	0%	550	550	0	0%
57A	Spink	1,300	1,300	0	0%	1,300	1,300	0	0%
59A	Sully	450	450	0	0%	450	450	0	0%
59B	Sully	470	470	0	0%	470	470	0	0%
61A	Turner	100	100	0	0%	100	100	0	0%
62A	Union	300	300	0	0%	300	300	0	0%
63A	Walworth	750	750	0	0%	750	750	0	0%
	TOTAL	26,325	26,325	0	0%	31,575	31,575	0	0%

Public Hearing Minutes of the Game, Fish and Parks Commission
May 3-4, 2018

The Public Hearing Officer Scott Simpson began the public hearing at 1:58 p.m. Creekside Lodge in Custer State Park, Custer, South Dakota. Commissioners Barry Jensen, Gary Jensen, Mary Anne Boyd, Cathy Petersen, Scott Phillips, Russell Olson and Douglas Sharp present. Chairman B Jensen indicated written comments were provided to the Commissioners prior to this time and will be reflected in the Public Hearing Minutes. Simpson then invited the public to come forward with oral testimony.

East River Deer Hunting Season

No verbal comments were received.

Jim Hyde, Pierre, SD, emailed "I'm writing about the GF&P's proposed deer hunting unit 59L. I'm a lifelong resident of Pierre and have hunted public land along Lake Oahe for close to 40 years. Although lower hunting pressure initially sounds interesting, 59L would be bad for a vast majority of hunters. By only issuing 40 licenses, I'll estimate it'd take 10-20 years to draw a license. This public land has very good access and personally don't feel limiting the number of people who can rifle hunt it to 40 is right. The wildlife lives on the public land as well as the private land, so I doubt the trophy quality would change. Would you consider not making any changes, and leaving it the way it is today? Would you consider an early rifle season and a late rifle season 59L? Because of how difficult it currently is to draw an West Sully Any deer rifle license, my family hasn't apply together as a group for the past 5 years. Hunting is about spending time together and passing down the tradition to another generation. I do not support the GF&P's proposal to create unit 59L."

Scott Gregg, Pierre, SD, emailed "As a person that routinely hunts the take ground in Sully County, I am really concerned about the proposed 59 L rifle deer hunting unit. If I understand, the purpose of this new unit is to enhance the trophy quality of the deer herd. To me it sounds like a way to limit hunting on public ground with the main beneficiary being the land owners who border take ground. As I read through the proposal they are recommending 40 deer tags for all of that take ground including Mail Shack and Little bend in Hughes and Sully Counties. As someone who hunts east river exclusively, my opportunity to draw a tag will be greatly diminished. The Game Fish & Parks states that it wants to recruit more hunters, but limiting hunting opportunities on Public Ground seems to contradict this philosophy. In my experience diseases such as EHD have a far greater impact on the trophy potential than actual deer hunting the last couple of years have decimated deer populations in Hughes and Sully County. I have had many great hunting experience hunting with family and friends on the take ground. Please do not limit those opportunities to benefit the few. Thank you for the consideration. This is provided to provide comment to the SD GFP Commission during its upcoming meeting on May 3, 2018 regarding the proposal to create a new East River Deer Limited Access Unit 59L, and to subsequently realign Units 59B, 59A, and 36A."

Terrance L. Dosch, Pierre, SD, emailed "I wish to register my strident opposition to the proposal. In my view, this would serve to improperly limit the use of this tract of public land. I have always appreciated the opportunity to hunt either public, walk-in, or private land in Unit 59A in the past. If this proposal comes to pass, I envision that the result will be similar in many respects to what has happened with Unit 45D. That is, the area will be assigned an extremely limited number of tags and, because of the composition of desirable public lands in combination with ever-diminishing opportunities to hunt private land, the unit will be overwhelmed with applications. Like Unit 45D, it will take years of

preference to successfully draw a tag. This not only unacceptably denies hunting opportunity, it converts our public land holdings into major revenue generators for GFP by enhancing collection of preference fees by reducing draw opportunity. The land tract proposed for inclusion in Unit 59L is already difficult enough to access due to restrictions imposed by bordering private land-owners. Hunting by boat is often the only option that many sportspersons have for achieving reasonable access over most of the land in question. Limiting the number of tags and restricting hunters to the public access areas located within this area plays directly into the hands of self-serving land-owner and commercial hunting interests by restricting legitimate use by the general public. It feeds into and promotes a “lock-out” strategy. Thank you for accepting and considering this input. I urge the commission to NOT adopt this proposal.”

Derek Schiefelbein, Pierre, SD, emailed “Folks, I assume part of the reason for this new unit (59L) is to try and protect Little Bend Rec. Area in some way? It is the majority of the 13,206 acres. Little Bend Rec. Area could use some separate management similar to the Ft. Pierre National Grasslands. Why include Hughes county at all? Maybe just include all of West Sully County? Start 59L at Hughes/Sully county line (Spring Creek) and take it all the way up to the Sully/Potter county line (Sutton Bay). Then it would include the Sutton Bay Game Production Area and the School and Public lands acres at Sutton Bay. “

Michael Kroger, Bridgewater, SD emailed “Hey there, My name is Michael Kroger and I live in Bridgewater South Dakota. I have been hunting in unit 59B for the last 5 years. I have only been successful at drawing a tag twice in 59B. Which is perfectly fine with me. Typically we only hunt the public grounds next to the river. My question is how many tags will be given out to this new unit of 59L? In the years I didn't draw a tag in 59B. I sent in for a 2nd chance tag in Brule county. This last year a different unit tag had been set up there as well. Unfortunately not realizing that, a good portion of the public river ground I had hunted in the past was taken away. For granted it was a smaller area, but it made hunting very difficult there to see any deer for a non local. I will never send in for a brule county tag again. If I had a vote, I would vote no to the change of those units. It will make getting a tag for that unit take even longer to get for a non resident of the county that only hunts the public ground. This would make the 3rd county I have been drove out of getting a tag on a reasonable amount of time.”

Jeffrey Flood, No. Mankato, MN, emailed “To: SD GFP Commission I am writing this email for you to consider MULE DEER ONLY LICENSE for the 2018 East River Deer Season in Brule County. As a long time hunter of your state (since 1970) I can tell you Brule County has very few worthy Whitetail Deer to hunt based on the 2016 disease that hit the Whitetail population extremely hard. Brule County does however have plenty of Mule Deer to offer us Non-Resident hunters. GFP has offered MULE DEER ONLY LICENSE in the past which gave us Non-Resident hunters a chance to draw a firearms tag in the third drawing and be able to hunt an antlered Mule Deer. Please consider this option to again be able to hunt Antlered Deer in Brule County. Respectfully submitted”

Timothy Pugh, Pierre, SD, emailed “Dear Commissioners, My name is Tim Pugh. I am a wildlife biologist, avid hunter, fisherman, trapper and conservationist. I am a retired USDA Wildlife Services employee and currently work full time in my own wildlife consulting business. I have two children that just started college and I actively mentor community youth in a variety of ways, including the shooting sports. I appreciate you reviewing my comments below regarding the recent proposals related to East River Deer hunting and East River Snare use on public lands. Proposed Changes to East River Deer Hunting Antlerless only Tags: The proposal to limit “antlerless only” tags to Dec 8-16 will virtually eliminate most college students from hunting deer. During the Thanksgiving break, along

with their necessary travel and family activities, most students will be lucky to get in more than of a half day or two of hunting. Previously, the “antlerless only” season allowed students the opportunity to hunt deer during their Christmas break. The proposed change will eliminate that. I know my kids are not going to apply for a license if they are only able to hunt for maybe a half day or so during the entire season. I hope you can find a solution that allows students the opportunity to hunt deer during their college years. We need to keep them interested in the shooting sports! New Limited Access Unit (Unit 59L). I have been a resident of Hughes County for the past 25 years. Without access to private lands for hunting, I have exclusively hunted deer on the small amount of public land available in the county, primarily the land along the edge of Lake Oahe designated for the proposed Unit 59L. Having hunted this land during both the regular and muzzleloader seasons for the past 25 years, I am very familiar with it as well as the deer activity associated with it. I appreciate you reviewing my comments below pertaining to this proposed unit: While the new unit 59L has been proposed, the public has not been provided with information on the number and type of licenses that will be made available. This is necessary and could sway opinions one way or another. The proposed unit may be long, but is very narrow, only a few hundred yards wide, if that, through most of its distance. There are very few public access points. Deer won't be moved around the unit by hunters, they are simply pushed off. Bordered by water on one side and private land on the other, the first hunter into the area during the day, will push any deer present onto the adjacent private lands where they will remain for the rest of the day, maybe longer. To have any chance of being successful hunting in this area, you MUST be the first one into an area on any given day. If you are the first person of the day to reach an access point, once you have walked the narrow strip of land, for whatever distance, your deer hunting is done for the day. You are then forced to backtrack to where you started. By the time you return to your vehicle, you can be assured that all other access points have had other hunters, and the deer pushed off onto adjacent land. I know what it is like to hunt here, and I accept the fact that I will likely only get in a couple hours of deer hunting a day (if I'm there first). However, it is not a quality hunt. Along with the minimal hunting opportunities in this unit, having a license restricted only to this unit will eliminate any opportunity to hunt on other public or private lands in the county While there are mule deer in this proposed unit, approximately 75% of the deer that I have encountered in the area are white-tails. It is common to never see a mule deer during a whole season of hunting. All things considered, I just don't see how this proposed unit makes sense. It will greatly limit the opportunity of the hunters that draw a tag for this unit. It will also limit the public land available to other hunters in Units 36 and 59. While I am not in favor of this new unit, if it is to be established, I would like it to include all other public lands in the two counties. That would give hunters of this unit some options (But then I suppose those other public lands in the county will not be available to hunters who draw a tag for Unit 36 or Unit 59). All in all, I think this proposed unit is a bad idea. Throw in all the other implications with bow hunting and muzzle loading associated with this proposal, which I won't go into, this new unit in my opinion, is a bad idea. Proposed Changes to East River Snaring on Public Lands I agree that snares pose a risk to bird dogs during the pheasant season. If I trap an area that might have bird hunters, I only use dog proof traps. However, at the request of the state, I have snared problem beaver that were causing considerable damage to a state park. Snares set on beaver dams, slides or in water are necessary for damage control and have little potential to capture a bird dog. I believe that any new restrictions on snaring should exempt beaver snares set in this manner (i.e. in water, on dams, on slides). I appreciate your time. Please contact me if you have any questions or need some clarification about my comments”

West River Deer Hunting Season

No verbal comments were received.

Austin Falkingham, Tea, SD, emailed "Hello, I reviewed your agenda and minutes from the commission meeting on April 5-6, 2018. Upon review, I noticed a change to the west river deer season that will have an adverse negative effect on my hunting in 2018 and I wanted to clarify if it was an omission or if there is an actual change proposed. The west river season dates list Gregory County only in the split season for west river deer. In past years, Mellette county was also included. Based on the March 2018 commission meeting and there being no date changes proposed to the west river deer season, my group and I booked a hunting lodge for the early season in Mellette county. These lodges fill up very fast and the last several years we have not been able to get a spot as we've waited until the season dates were finalized. This year, we had enough preference points where we were not worried about not drawing a license and since there were no date changes proposed to the west river deer season we booked the trip. Again, I'm hoping that Mellette county was just omitted from the minutes by accident, but if you could please clarify this for me I would appreciate it."

Muzzleloader Deer Hunting Season

No oral comments were received.

Charles Fink, Marion, SD, emailed "Dear Commission I would like to respond to the proposal to shorten the muzzleloader , archery and youth seasons . I am opposed to the proposal due to that fact that between weather conditions and the holidays I many times do not get to go antlerless deer hunting until after the first of the year. Thank you for considering my comments."

Kody Pataky Beresford, SD, emailed To Whom it May Concern, I wanted to express my opposition to the proposed changes in the season dates for the east river deer a muzzleloader deer seasons. Having rifle antlerless and muzzle deer at the same time is not fair for Muzzleloader hunters. Normally they whole muzzleloader season is free from rifles, only bow hunters are also in the field. That makes for a fairly level playing field since both methods require additional skill not required for rifle hunting. Now if you mix in antlerless rifle into the mix, you make it much more difficult for the other hunters in the field since now we have to complete with more hunters, especially those who hunt on public ground, and we have to compete with someone who can shoot much further distances than a muzzleloader or a bow can. Last point I'd like to make: some hunters prefer muzzleloader due to safety concerns. You are much less likely to get hit by a stray muzzleloader bullet than you are by one fired from a rifle, so by overlapping the seasons as you have proposed you take the ability to feel a little bit safer away Leave the seasons they were last year so that it is both safe and fair for all hunters."

Archery Deer Hunting Season

No verbal comments were received.

Matt Drzal, Lansing, MI, emailed "Hello, My name is Matt Drzal and my residence is East Lansing, Michigan. I am writing in regards to limiting Archery access permits in unit 27L to 4 non-residents and moving to a lottery draw. My friends and I have rented the Hill ranch for the last 3 years and hunted the property before that. We currently have the Ranch house rented for this year. We will be very disappointed if we are forced to cancel our reservations, as this has become a tradition of sorts. We have purchased over 17 archery tags over the past 4 years there, and have filled them only twice. Both successes

were from the 2017 archery season, which interestingly enough was the best year in terms of deer numbers seen by our group since we started hunting this area. Both the numbers and quality of Mule deer and whitetail, last year alone, were the best we have seen. I ask that you please vote down the proposal to limit the number of access permits to 4 non-residents. It seems overly restrictive and unnecessary to have such limits on an already very difficult hunt.”

Patrick Groom, DeWitt, MI, emailed “Hello My name is Patrick Groom, and I am a resident of DeWitt Mi. The last 3 years I have joined a small group of friends for an archery hunt in South Dakota. On our first visit, we ended up spending some time hunting on the Hill Ranch. Based on our experiences that year, we have rented the Hill Ranch the last 2 years, and currently have the Ranch House rented again this year. I appreciate that the management decisions you make play a large part in maintaining the quality hunting experience we are willing to drive to South Dakota to enjoy. Based on my experience over the last 3 years however, DMU 27L currently offers excellent hunting opportunities for both resident and non-resident hunters. Our group observes many good deer a day, both WT and MD, but with our limited time has only filled 2 of 16 tags we have purchased. Others may be more efficient at filling tags, but our group has had very little impact on the deer herd (embarrassingly little impact actually). In addition to the strong deer herd, the most attractive aspect of this hunt for us is the excellent location of the Hill Ranch Cabin that we rent annually. The prime location and quality of the accommodations makes the app \$2000.00 rent a worthwhile investment. Obviously that only applies if you are allowed to hunt the surrounding land. The Hill Ranch is a perfect destination for out of state hunters who choose to spend the money to stay at the Hill Ranch Cabin. If you feel you need to limit the non-resident bow hunters in DMU 27L consider allocating access permits to patrons who rent the Hill Ranch Cabin and nobody else. This would serve to limit the pressure while maintaining a strong likelihood that there will be rental interest in the Hill Ranch. Thanks for your consideration.”

Jason Fettig, Ottawa Lake, MI, emailed “Hello, My name is Jason Fettig and my residence is Ottawa Lake, Michigan. I am writing regarding limiting Archery access permits in unit 27L to 4 non residents and having a lottery draw. My friends and I have rented the Hill ranch for the last 3 years and hunted the property before that. We currently have it rented for this year. We will be very disappointed to cancel our reservations as this had become a tradition of sorts. We have purchased over 17 archery tags over the past 4 years there, and have filled them only twice. Both of our successes were from last year - which interestingly enough was the best year in terms of deer numbers since we started hunting there. Both the numbers of Mule deer and whitetail and quality, last year alone, were the best we have seen. Please vote down the proposal to limit the number of access permits to 4 non residents. It seems overly restrictive and unnecessary to have such limits on an already very difficult hunt.”

Chris A. Mayer, Edgemont, SD, emailed “I am responding to express my concerns regarding the proposed change and additional requirement for bowhunters to obtain and possess a “free permit” while bowhunting. I have two concerns with this proposal. The first is the additional/undue layering of GFP regulation(s) placed upon South Dakota Sportsmen. I realize this proposed “new requirement” is simple in nature however; unintentional failure to comply will ultimately result in some type of civil penalty to the sportsman. It is my understanding the purpose of the proposed change is to “better manage” the mule deer herd in and around the Blackhills. Specifically, the impact nonresidents archery hunters play in the mule deer harvest and hunter density in several key areas of the Blackhills/Blackhills Management Area. If nonresident archery mule deer

harvest is the true concern, SD GFP should consider “limited” nonresident archery mule deer tags as they do the rifle tags for the Blackhills unit(s). Attempts at managing specified/specific areas through the mandatory requirement of “free access” permits for the entire Blackhills is unacceptable. Again, limit nonresident archery access to targeted area(s) and species, not the entire Blackhills. Do not burden resident hunters. My second area of concern is the term “free access” permit. In my experience “free” ultimately come with monetary cost(s) at some point. The example I will give is are Federal and State HIP permits. First, they were free, then Federal and State agencies created additional revenue streams from this “free/mandatory” permit. Additionally, they added another layer of regulatory burden for the sportsman with civil penalties for noncompliance. After serving 20+ years in the military and returning to South Dakota. I and was excited about the hunting prospects. I bought property 23 miles west of Custer SD and have been blessed with the opportunity to own and hunt my property which is adjacent to National Forest. It is very aggravating to now think that potentially, after fulfilling all other requirements to archery hunt in the state, a new regulation may now require a “free access” permit to hunt my property and adjacent National Forest property. Additionally, it is my understanding the National Forrest adjacent to my property is not the targeted management area of concern for “nonresident mule deer hunter densities and harvest”. In closing, I reiterate, if the concern of SD GFP is nonresident archery mule deer harvest and nonresident hunter densities in targeted areas; manage tags and accessibility/opportunities for nonresident archery hunters as you already manage nonresident rifle hunters. Place the regulatory requirement and cost upon nonresident hunters. Do not take or limit opportunities away from SD resident archery hunters.”

Trent Koistinen, Hayti, SD, emailed “I would like to see the Archery deer season begin one weekend sooner than it normally has. I support the decision to close all deer seasons on or before January 1st.”

Arnold Veen, Milbank, SD, emailed “Hello, I was a little disappointed that you took no action on the Limited Access Unit archery permit allocation proposal. I believe this was a good proposal that would limit residents and non residents access our public lands improving the hunting experience. In the past hunting season on the Custer national forest land in Harding county it was mostly out of state archers hunting in that area when we entered that area. Due to the increased pressure by out of state archers we left for other areas. I talked to other SD archers that also had the same experience who where very disappointed by the number of Non-residents in these areas. According to the GFP out of state hunters made up almost half of the Archery hunters in 2017 (3800 SD archery hunters compared to 2990 non-residents). Compared to other GFP licenses in the State which limits non-residents to about 8% of total licenses the Limited access proposal was a step in the right direction to allow more residents the opportunity to access our public lands and improving on the hunting experience. I would encourage you to support this proposal, it does have the support of almost all of the South Dakota Archers that I have talked to locally and across the state. Another issue I would like to address is the cost of Non-residents State wide Archery licenses which is currently \$286. In other states such as Iowa non-residents pay over \$500 to hunt as a non-residents and that is to get single zone license. Compare that to our state wide archery permit and our is a bargain. I would hope you would investigate a proposal raising the South Dakota non-resident fees to be more in line with our adjoining states and maybe putting a cap on non-resident archery hunters.”

Jon Olson, SD, emailed “I am very upset with your inaction yesterday on nonresident archer issue. An 8% cap and license increase will go a long ways to remedy this problem. SD is the only state NR can purchase OCT mule deer tags. I, myself have

had several incidents with NR on public lands. This needs to happen just for better management of resource. I will be very interested in your response.-“

Bud Shearer, Sioux Falls, SD, emailed “I do not believe it is at all necessary to have an automatic access permit for the black hill. Just have the Archery license be the access permit.”

Deer hunting Season Dates

No verbal comments were received.

Loren Moak, Selby, SD, emailed “Hello South Dakota Game Commission, I would like to comment on the deer seasons that you are setting up. First off I don't like the idea of shortening the Muzzleloader and Youth seasons. The reason I'm stating this is some years when we get into January and the cold is here and the snow piles up, we have problem deer. Meaning they are bunched up and hitting farmers hay yards and silage piles etc. There have been numerous times I've had neighbors and friends call me and ask "You have any deer tags yet" When I say yes they invite me over to harvest a deer. Or if they are having a late harvest of row crops they invite me to their field. As you can imagine I just have to sit in the hay yard, or go to the corn field, and wait for them to show up. On these hunts I have taken youth hunters and some by myself using my muzzleloader. The nice thing is the people are thankful that some deer have been eliminated as they are doing damage to their feed supply. I have used my antlerless tags as well on these but, I see you have moved the dates for that season already. Another reason for a longer season is January is not quite as busy as December. Because in December we have Christmas and Christmas Parties, Concerts, the required shopping, and Church events.”

Robert Dinger, Brookings, SD, emailed “Dear Commissioners, I have two comments on the upcoming proposals. 1.) please keep the antlerless deer season after Christmas. This is the only time folks in my line of work get off to hunt with family for does. 2.) please keep unit 59 the same it has always been. If this is made into a limited area, the only thing that will occur is that the people that normally hunt that area will be pushed to other public land in the nearby area and then people will be complaining those areas are overcrowded. Most public land here is only accessible by boat so the number of hunters is already limited because not everyone has access to a boat. When I hunt public land I expect to see some people hunting it too, we all paid for it so let everyone enjoy it. Thank you for your time,”

Tim Brudelic, Hanska, MN, emailed “I would like to enter a vote of leave the late season as is. With the proposed change to the dates the season will be in the middle of the holidays. I don't think this is fair to hunters or their families. The season as is makes a nice after holiday break and I think should be left alone. Again, Thanks for a job well done,”

James Helsper, Sioux Falls, SD, emailed “To whom it may concern: In reference to reinstate extra time to shoot Doe west river believe, in my opinion it is not needed. Myself and a hunting friend have been hunting west river for up ward to fifty years in that time good times for deer have come and gone and comeback again. But at the present time last season I noticed a rapid decline in the doe population in Harding and surrounding counties. For example my friend and I with the exception of last year had seen a good population of both buck and doe deer. But last year where we hunt my friend seen two and I seen none with the exception on private land and even there the numbers were way down. In my viewing of what goes on with extra time to kill does is that peoples have a lax

time that time of year so they go for a little target practice and doe are the choice of species not so much they want them to feed their family but for the sport then they give them to feeding the hungry which in my opinion is a waste of our wild life resources. Not to mention the cost you as G.F put out for extra processing those people with exception of the people on the reservation don't even eat the meat they take because it is given to them then they give it to the neighbor and he throws it in the dumpster. If you really want to feed hungry people take it to the Indian people. My suggestion would be if you think you have to kill the doe make the extension a muzzle loader only, make the ones that think they want to hunt put out a little effort to kill then we will see how many out there are sport hunters. I believe if there is a good population of deer out there you are not much of a hunter if you so desire to fill a couple of tags you surely should be able to get that done in ten days, you just have to get out of the pickup and walk. Thank you for your time and a opportunity to voice my opinion”

Jason Bunney, Rapid City, SD emailed “To whom it may concern As a west river hunting family, we would like to have the antler-less season reinstated. Thank you for your time. “

Public Land Access Permits for Deer Hunting

No verbal or written comments were received.

Depredation Hunts

No verbal or written comments were received.

Apprentice Hunter Deer License

No verbal or written comments were received.

Custer State Park Non –Trophy Bison Harvest

No verbal or written comments were received.

Custer State Park Trophy Bison Harvest

No verbal or written comments were received.

The public Hearing concluded at 2:03 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Kelly R. Hepler, Department Secretary