From: Thomas Wickstrom
To: GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject: [EXT] Trapping Prohibitions, Chapter 41:08:02
Date: Wednesday, April 18, 2018 10:55:13 AM

I encourage you to leave the Trapping Prohibitions, Chapter 41:08:02 as is. Why would the G.F.& P. Commission want to restrict the people of South Dakota from being able to enjoy our public lands?

Trapping of furbearers is an important way of controlling egg eating predators that prey on ground nesting birds. In my nearly 40 years of being an upland game bird hunter, I have encountered a trappers snare once. This snare was easily removed from my dog without incidence.

Why take away a valuable tool for predator management?

I highly encourage you not to change the dates that Public Lands may be utilized by trappers.

Thank you,
Thomas Wickstrom
Roslyn, SD. 57261

Sent from my Verizon 4G LTE Droid

From: Miller, LouAnn
To: GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject: FW: [EXT] Archery deer proposal
Date: Friday, April 06, 2018 11:09:26 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: Arnie Veen [mailto:arnieveen@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, April 06, 2018 10:40 AM
To: Jensen, Barry
Subject: [EXT] Archery deer proposal

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.

Arnold Veen
14789 482 ave.
Milbank, South Dakota 57252

From:	Miller, LouAnn
To:	GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject:	FW: [EXT] Black Hills Access Permit
Date:	Tuesday, April 10, 2018 10:54:31 AM

From: shearer@sio.midco.net [mailto:shearer@sio.midco.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2018 10:26 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] Black Hills Access Permit

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.

Bud Shearer
908 S Kinser
Sioux Falls SD

Phone 605-929-7675

From:	Miller, LouAnn
To:	GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject:	FW: [EXT] Comments RE: Proposal to Create New ERD Limited Access Unit 59L
Date:	Tuesday, April 17, 2018 9:33:12 AM

From: Terry Dosch [mailto:tladosch@dakota2k.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2018 9:30 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] Comments RE: Proposal to Create New ERD Limited Access Unit 59L

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.

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.

Sincerely,
Terrance L. Dosch
908 N. Madison Avenue
Pierre, South Dakota 57501-2323
Phone: 605-280-0410 (Cell)
E-mail: tladosch@dakota2k.net

From:	Miller, LouAnn
To:	GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject:	FW: [EXT] Deer Hunting Proposal
Date:	Tuesday, April 17, 2018 7:55:22 AM

From: bob dinger [mailto:bobcat57456@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2018 9:20 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] Deer Hunting Proposal

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,

Robert Dinger
Brookings, South Dakota

From:	Miller, LouAnn
To:	GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject:	FW: [EXT] Deer License Lottery
Date:	Wednesday, April 11, 2018 10:37:25 AM

From: Gary Ledbetter [mailto:garenole@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2018 10:11 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] Deer License Lottery

I am writing to comment on the proposal on new deer lottery system. I wish for GFP to keep the lottery as is. I believe it works fine. I like to hunt in the Black Hills as well as East and West River and believe the preference system works just fine.

Therefore I do not wish to see it changed to what is being proposed as I understand it as a one only 1st choice.

Gary Ledbetter
112 Acorn Drive
Yankton, SD 57078

From: Miller, LouAnn
To: GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject: FW: [EXT] Deer Season Proposal
Date: Thursday, April 12, 2018 7:55:27 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: Trent Koistinen [mailto:koistinent@mail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2018 10:34 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] Deer Season Proposal

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.

Trent Koistinen
Hayti, SD

Sent from my iPhone

From: Miller, LouAnn
To: GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject: FW: [EXT] Deer Seasons
Date: Monday, April 30, 2018 7:46:58 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: Nyla & Loren [mailto:maverick10@venturecomm.net]
Sent: Saturday, April 28, 2018 8:15 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] Deer Seasons

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 the 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.

Thank You,

Loren Moak

Selby, South Dakota

From:	Miller, LouAnn
To:	GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject:	FW: [EXT] Deer seasons
Date:	Thursday, April 12, 2018 7:55:08 AM

From: mcfink [mailto:mcfink@goldenwest.net]
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2018 5:31 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] Deer seasons

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.

Sincerely

Charles Fink
503E 1st Street
Marion SD 57043

From: Cary, Joe
To: GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject: FW: [EXT] DMU 27L Access Permits
Date: Monday, April 23, 2018 9:53:37 AM

Thank you,
Joe Cary | *Secretary*
South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks
20641 SD Highway 1806 | Fort Pierre, SD 57532
605.223.7683 | Joe.Cary@state.sd.us

From: Patrick G [mailto:patrick@lauxconstruction.com]
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2018 8:52 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] DMU 27L Access Permits

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 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 wile maintaining a strong likelihood that there will be rental interest in the Hill Ranch.

Thanks for your consideration.

Patrick Groom
Laux Construction
517-449-4390

From:	Miller, LouAnn
To:	GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject:	FW: [EXT] East River Deer Proposal and Muzzleloader Proposal
Date:	Wednesday, April 11, 2018 7:54:34 AM

From: Kody Pataky [mailto:kodypataky@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2018 7:02 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] East River Deer Proposal and Muzzleloader Proposal

To Whom it May Concern,

I wanted to express my opposition to the proposed changes in the season dates for the east river deer and 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.

Thank you,

Kody Pataky
Beresford SD

From:	Miller, LouAnn
To:	GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject:	FW: [EXT] EAST RIVER DEER SEASON - BRULE COUNTY
Date:	Tuesday, April 10, 2018 10:54:48 AM

From: Jeff Flood [mailto:jflood@hickorytech.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2018 10:32 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] EAST RIVER DEER SEASON - BRULE COUNTY

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,

Jeffrey Flood
52944 Deerwood Trail
No. Mankato, MN 56003
507-380-7529

From: Miller, LouAnn
To: GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject: FW: [EXT] Extra deays to hunt doe
Date: Monday, April 16, 2018 8:23:07 AM

From: James Helsper [mailto:james.helsper@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 4:59 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] Extra deays to hunt doe

To whom it may concern:
My name is James Helsper I live in Sioux falls ,SD.
In reference to reinstate extra time to shoot Doe west river I 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 an doe are the choice of species not so much they want them to feed there 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 t 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.
Best regards Jim Helsper.

From:	Miller, LouAnn
To:	GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject:	FW: [EXT] GFP Commission proposed snaring and trapping changes!
Date:	Monday, April 30, 2018 7:47:31 AM

From: rodneymendel@outlook.com [mailto:rodneymendel@outlook.com]
Sent: Saturday, April 28, 2018 1:09 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] GFP Commission proposed snaring and trapping changes!

I am a hunter,fisherman,trapper and a snareman.I am neutral on the trap and snare tag part of the proposal. I am very much against the rest of the proposal.I would suggest the commission ban the use of snares with kill springs equipped with a trigger device that fires after the animal pulls the snare tight.Prior to the closing of pheasant season on Game Production areas and Waterfowl Production Areas. Thankyou, Rodney Ray Mendel,Sioux Falls.

From: Miller, LouAnn
To: GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject: FW: [EXT] GFP Snaring Proposal
Date: Monday, April 30, 2018 7:47:10 AM

From: Jack [mailto:jackcatron@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, April 28, 2018 12:04 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] GFP Snaring Proposal

GFP Commissioners,

I am a life long resident and recreational outdoorsman from Hanson County. I am writing you today to oppose the proposal in front of you to ban snaring on all public lands east of the Missouri River. The proposal in front of you is a result of protecting hunting dogs. As we know, hunting dogs are on public lands for pheasant hunting. I strongly believe if you ban snaring, thus allowing numerous raccoons, skunks, opossums, red fox, and coyotes to thrive in these areas, the end result will be less pheasants. I believe the current restrictions in place are satisfactory and I encourage you to oppose the proposal.

Respectfully submitted,
Jack Catron
Emery, SD 57332
605-449-4378

I kindly ask for a response to my email to ensure my email will be provided to all commissioners and a part of the record. Thank you.

From:	Miller, LouAnn
To:	GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject:	FW: [EXT] Opposition to New Snaring Rules
Date:	Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:57:50 AM

From: Merris Miller [mailto:coyotedoc3@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:50 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] Opposition to New Snaring Rules

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to express my concern and opposition to the newly proposed snaring rules eliminating the use of snares on public land in road rights-of-way. As well as my opposition to the proposal to require trap tags on all traps and snares.

I realize that there will be occasions when a hunting dog may encounter snares set in road ditches. This is inevitable when sportsman are sharing a resource. Although these occurrences are unfortunate, the likelihood of a negative outcome is very minimal. The most likely outcome is a minor inconvenience for the bird hunter. Snares are a very safe and efficient way to take predators and the majority are alive when caught. The odds of a snare killing an unintentional catch are very low. It is just not how they work. Typically, hunting dogs are somewhat collar/leash trained and the ones I have encountered that were caught in snares will stop and wait for the owner to release them.

This proposed rule seems to be misguided solution to non-problem. It seems that is being proposed to eliminate a couple instances a year and punishing hundreds of trappers. I do care about pets/hunting dogs and other domestics and don't want to see any harm done, but I also don't want to see new rules imposed just to avoid a couple times a year a bird hunter in inconvenienced. Sportsman need to remember....public land is a SHARED resource. These are the type of things that pit sportsman against sportsman, and the only winners end up being non-sportsman.

As a side note--which I doubt was taken into consideration by whomever proposed this law--eliminating snaring in road rights-of-way and public land will have a negative impact on the very resource they are trying to use (pheasants). Trappers play an integral part in managing predators which in turn helps improve the pheasant population. By eliminating options for trappers....it decreases trapping success; therefore, allowing more predators to survive. It has been my thoughts over the past 30 years--and brought to the of attention of some GF&P officials--that the snaring date should be moved the other way....to the first of November. This avoids the first two weekends of pheasant season, but would also allow trappers to harvest predators (mainly raccoon) during a time period when harvest success is greatest. By

waiting till later in the month of November, the weather changes and gets significantly colder and raccoon patterns change. There are many years in South Dakota the by the time a trapper can legally use snares on public ground, the raccoon are starting to hibernate at night, or at the very least restrict their movement.

Thanks for taking this into consideration and if you have any questions, feel free to give me a call.

Merris Miller
Lennox, SD
Trapper & Pheasant Hunter
605-360-6150

From:	Miller, LouAnn
To:	GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject:	FW: [EXT] Proposal for limited access unit in Sully county
Date:	Tuesday, April 10, 2018 12:17:03 PM

From: Michael Kroger [mailto:krogermi@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2018 11:47 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] Proposal for limited access unit in Sully county

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. Forgranted 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.

Thanks,
Michael Kroger

From:	Miller, LouAnn
To:	GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject:	FW: [EXT] Proposed changes in Snare law.
Date:	Wednesday, April 18, 2018 7:53:43 AM

From: Adrian Laurendeau [mailto:stumper_1300@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2018 9:11 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] Proposed changes in Snare law.

Dear Commissioner,

I am contacting you today to let you know that I'm my opinion this change in dates is not a good one. Snares are a very cost efficient and effective way to control predator numbers. Changing the dates will basically eliminate a popular way to control the predators that are putting a hurt on our pheasant numbers. IF a change needs to be made to protect dogs being used on public property, then eliminate the use of snares equipped with kill springs. It is pretty common for dogs that are caught in a snare to just sit and wait for their owners to release them in standard snares. I hope you will consider the number of predators that will not be taken if this law is changed. This period of time is a very productive time of the yr for those that use snares and cover a lot of ground. Thank you for your time.

Adrian Laurendeau
Mitchell SD

From: Cary, Joe
To: GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject: FW: [EXT] Proposed Changes to Access Permits to hunt public land unit 27L
Date: Monday, April 23, 2018 9:05:14 AM

Thank you,
Joe Cary | Secretary
South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks
20641 SD Highway 1806 | Fort Pierre, SD 57532
605.223.7683 | Joe.Cary@state.sd.us

-----Original Message-----
From: avery [mailto:jasonf1234@hotmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, April 21, 2018 6:59 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Cc: thom.smith@philips.com; mattd@berger.ca; Patrick Groom
Subject: Re: [EXT] Proposed Changes to Access Permits to hunt public land unit 27L

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.

Thank you,

Jason Fettig
Ottawa Lake, MI

From:	Miller, LouAnn
To:	GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject:	FW: [EXT] Proposed Deer License Drawing Alternatives
Date:	Wednesday, April 11, 2018 10:08:53 AM

From: Justin Murphy [mailto:justintmurphy@outlook.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2018 9:57 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] Proposed Deer License Drawing Alternatives

SD GFP Commission,

I am reaching out to the Commission to inform you of my stance on the proposed deer license drawing alternatives. I am firmly against the proposed changes to the deer license drawing process. I feel that the current system in place is the best option. The purpose of applying is to enter a lottery, not a guarantee. There is no sense in preventing sportsmen from drawing multiple tags. I spend the money to apply and purchase preference points just like the next person. I take the time to research units that I have a chance of successfully drawing a tag with the preference points I have. You can't please everyone. I signed up for a focus group but wasn't selected so this is my only avenue of voicing my opinion at the moment. I strongly urge you to take a closer look at the downsides of the proposed changes. Highly sought after units are still going to be difficult to draw and will only lead to more leftover tags. Thank you for reading my opinion.

Justin Murphy
Crooks, SD

From: Miller, LouAnn
To: GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject: FW: [EXT] proposed season changes
Date: Monday, April 16, 2018 8:24:06 AM

From: Tim Brudelie [mailto:tbrudelie@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 9:11 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] proposed season changes

As I forgot to include my address on my last email I am re-sending my message:
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, Tim Brudelie 21950 County Road 20 Hanska,MN 56041

From:	Miller, LouAnn
To:	GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject:	FW: [EXT] Proposed Snaring and Trapping Changes
Date:	Wednesday, April 18, 2018 7:53:53 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: Jason Vollmer [mailto:jason.vollmer@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2018 9:11 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] Proposed Snaring and Trapping Changes

I would like the following added to the public record for the public hearing on the proposed snaring and trapping changes.
Jason Vollmer
45125 Hawk Drive
Montrose, SD 57048

I am concerned about restrictions on the use of public hunting land. There are many competing interests for the land and for one group (pheasant hunters) to be able to control the land over the use of other lawful sportsman is socially irresponsible and borderline criminal. Prohibiting the use of snares until the end of pheasant hunting takes away the prime November and December trapping months.

Additionally it makes no sense to limit the use of water snares during pheasant hunting season. I see no reason why snaring beaver on public lands should have an impact on pheasant season. This leads me to believe there was little thought put into the proposed changes, or at least little input by someone familiar with trapping.

The use of trap tags solves nothing, it only puts a burden on the law abiding trapper.

I archery hunt public land for deer and frequently have my hunts interrupted by pheasant hunters, and duck hunters. If pheasant hunters and duck hunters were not able to use public hunting lands during archery deer season it would benefit me unfairly, This is not different than what is being proposed.

A few years ago there was an outcry from the antis about the use of body grip traps and the trappers suffered additional regulations as a result of this. There needs to be give and take so maybe this time the pheasant hunters could do the giving up of rights and privileges with additional regulations to solve the problem. I have some suggestions on how to accomplish this-
1. Close public lands to pheasant hunting from November 1st to January 31st.
2. Require all pheasant hunters to have proof of a trapping competency course so they know how to safely remove their dogs from traps.
3. Require all dogs on public lands to be on a leash to ensure they are 100% under control.
4. The fine for tampering with a trap or animal caught in a trap should be no less than $1,000.

These lands are for public hunting and trapping and I demand they stay that way. Our lands should not be set aside for the use of a special interest group. GF&P should be encouraging trapping and giving citizens a reason to get off the couch and out enjoying the sport.

Most public lands east river don't hold many birds and I wonder if trapping is restricted as proposed what the increased predator population will do to the pheasant populations in these areas?
An increased raccoon, skunk, fox, coyote population on public lands will be the direct result of these rule changes. More trapping=more pheasants!!!

Please realize pheasant hunters do NOT own the public lands. The public hunting lands are for the use of all

sportsman.

Jason Vollmer

From:	Miller, LouAnn
To:	GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject:	FW: [EXT] Proposed snaring seasons and tagging of traps
Date:	Wednesday, April 18, 2018 7:54:06 AM

From: Jon Sorensen [mailto:sorensen5000@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:20 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] Proposed snaring seasons and tagging of traps

Hi
I was just notified by a local trapping shop that the board is considering a new rule to snaring on public lands.
I am a trapper for many years now. Most of the land I get to trap is public land.
For many reasons I have to trap these lands because of previous trappers not doing there part in checking there traps and not doing what is suppose to be done.
I just go ahead and say it. Kids and young adults. They have no respect for the trapping world and if they were taught correctly then they would understand what it takes to be a Law abiding, and ethical, and responsible trapper.

So getting permission on most land in todays world has been ruined by who ever for what ever reason. Let alone the fact that most people take trapping as a bad thing, when in fact its was long used before guns were founded to make clothing and to feed family's.

Now as for Public grounds like WFP and Other lands funded by the state and GFP, If we start taking away more and more when will it stop? First snares then, leg hold, etc etc.

I for one can not and will not stand by and watch more and more things to be taken away from trappers. We live in a world with nothing but laws and rules and If the GFP and the state of South Dakota will not take the time to Teach the younger generation to abide laws set forth and to Learn the way of a trapper then you can not expect it to get any better. Classes for Guns, Bows are required. Ages set forth for such as well. Maybe something needs to be done for new trappers now.

I know there is a threat to dogs in the fields. But a ethical trapper wouldn't be setting snares on public grounds like these if he was taught the do's and don'ts of the trapping world. Many people utilize the ground for many reasons. Fishing, hunting, trapping and recreation. You cant single out one for another.

For example: I'm on a waterfowl production area enjoying my duck hunting and a bunch of pheasant hunters decide to hunt this area as well. By taking away the snaring rights of our trappers on these public lands you just as well tell pheasant hunters they can not hunt pheasant's in them either and same for Game production areas that I hunt deer on. I don't want pheasant hunter interfering with my deer hunting! See how this works?

Trust me when I say I understand the concerns, but catering to one sport and defying the next is just

plain wrong and unjust.

Public land is just that. PUBLIC. Open to all kinds of hunting, fishing and trapping rights. No board, or law governing institution can say other wise unless you start changing it all for what the areas were intended to be used for.

Like I've said I know all about the dogs getting snared and other animals. But I also think the people who are the future of this great state should be given the chance to learn from classes and learn the responiablitys needed before there given the license in the first place!

I also see the GFP wants people to mark there stuff now with tags. This I will go along with as long as the marks are name and license number only. No addresses or phone numbers. As for snare dates that is just not going to work for 99% of the trappers using them since most snaring is a limit time as it is with our winters.

Please consider every aspect of this because I for one do not want to lose what I have left .

Thanks
Jon Sorensen
3205 N Lewis Ave. Apt 1
Sioux Falls, SD 57104
605-941-3920

This same email has also been sent to location commissioners and other GFP emails for the same purpose as intended! My opinion of the said proposal's of said adoptions of Tagging,Public land use sage of snares and seasons set for snares.

RE: GFP Commission Proposes Snaring and Trapping Changes
PIERRE, S.D. – A proposal from the South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks (GFP) Commission would require individuals who trap or snare on public lands and improved road rights-of-way to mark their equipment with their name and address or a personal identification number.
The proposed rule would apply to all public lands and improved rights-of-way, statewide. If an individual would choose to use a personal identification number, GFP would generate and issue one unique number per individual.
The Commission has also proposed changing the date when snares are allowed to be used on public lands and improved road rights-of-way east of the Missouri River. Currently snares cannot be used on these properties until after November 13. The proposal would change that date to the first Sunday of January – the end of the pheasant hunting season. This proposal would also remove the date restrictions for snare use on public lands and improved road rights-of-way west of the Missouri River and allow snares to be used year-round.

From: Cary, Joe
To: GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject: FW: [EXT] Proposed Unit 59L
Date: Monday, April 23, 2018 9:48:26 AM

Thank you,
Joe Cary | *Secretary*
South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks
20641 SD Highway 1806 | Fort Pierre, SD 57532
605.223.7683 | Joe.Cary@state.sd.us

From: laurie gregg [mailto:outlook_C072460D82C8B2F3@outlook.com] **On Behalf Of** laurie gregg
Sent: Sunday, April 22, 2018 10:27 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] Proposed Unit 59L

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,

Scott Gregg
Pierre SD

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From:	Miller, LouAnn
To:	GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject:	FW: [EXT] Proposed unit 59L
Date:	Wednesday, April 25, 2018 7:51:40 AM

From: Jill and Jim Hyde [mailto:j3m2hyde@pie.midco.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2018 8:58 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] Proposed unit 59L

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.
Thanks for listening.
Jim Hyde
1995 Deer Park Place
Pierre, SD 57501

From:	Miller, LouAnn
To:	GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject:	FW: [EXT] Public Comment for Proposed Archery Regulation Change
Date:	Thursday, April 19, 2018 3:35:35 PM
Attachments:	Chris Mayer .pdf

From: Chris Mayer [mailto:retafrx@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 3:34 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] Public Comment for Proposed Archery Regulation Change

Please see attached letter. It is my response to proposed change/requirement for bowhunters i.e. "free access permit" while bowhunting within the Blackhills.
Unfortunately, I have training that day and cannot make it to the public hearing (Custer State Park, 3 May 2018)

Thanks, Chris

Chris A. Mayer
Cell # 307.630.1125
Home # 605.749.2214
retafrx@gmail.com

19 April 2018

From: Chris A. Mayer
25595 Moonlight Dr.
Edgemont, SD, 57735

To: SD Game, Fish & Parks

Subject: Public Notice Released 10 April 2018, titled: "Deer Hunting Seasons Proposed | Small Game Seasons Finalized: (**page 4 of release**)

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.

CHRIS A. MAYER, MSgt(r), USAF
Home# 605.749.2214
Cell# 307.630.1125
Email: retafrx@gmail.com

From:	Miller, LouAnn
To:	GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject:	FW: [EXT] Snare identification is something the State should have required years ago. I am in favor of this action.
Date:	Thursday, April 19, 2018 9:11:19 AM

From: Jim Viergets [mailto:jlviergets@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 8:25 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] Snare identification is something the State should have required years ago. I am in favor of this action.

Jim Viergets
19572 Old Belle RD
Spearfish, SD
605 642 2040

Sent from my LG Phoenix 3, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone

From: Miller, LouAnn
To: GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject: FW: [EXT] snares on public lands
Date: Monday, April 16, 2018 8:50:27 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: Wildbill [mailto:wildbill@venturecomm.net]
Sent: Saturday, April 14, 2018 1:16 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] snares on public lands

hello, I recently read an article by Kevin Woster relating a story of his hunting dog ensnared on public hunting land. I've had the same experience, and suspect others have also, without complaining.
don't know if a decision has been made by your department, but I would urge you to ban such devices on public lands. ALSO steel leg hold traps, I've also had to release my lab from one of those. There was some discussion of snares being "humane". really, strangling to death??
these things have a "stop" on them, the harder an animal pulls, the tighter they get. Kevin's dog didn't struggle, mine did, and was not able to breath...luckily I was not too far away. Trappers have countless other places to set snares and traps, other than where there are likely to be dogs.
Bill Rosin, Selby

From:	Miller, LouAnn
To:	GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject:	FW: [EXT] Trapping regulations.
Date:	Tuesday, April 10, 2018 3:38:31 PM

From: David Mines [mailto:davidmines4831@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2018 3:38 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] Trapping regulations.

I am writing because I am very concerned about the recent news stories about some public lands being closed to trapping east river. Although I am not a trapper I can't believe your department would even consider such a stupid proposal. Those public lands, state and federal were bought and paid for with sportsman's dollars. NOT just phesant hunters. It is outrageous to even think you would consider this. What would be next? No deer hunting on public ground because it might scare a phesant? Traps do not pose a threat to hunting dogs. We need trappers to control varmit populations so maybe we can have a few phesants.

David Mines
104 Robin St
Yankton SD 57078

From: Cary, Joe
To: GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject: FW: [EXT] Vote NO Unit 27L Proposal
Date: Monday, April 23, 2018 12:09:32 PM

Thank you,
Joe Cary | *Secretary*
South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks
20641 SD Highway 1806 | Fort Pierre, SD 57532
605.223.7683 | Joe.Cary@state.sd.us

From: Matt Drzal [mailto:matt.drzal@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2018 11:52 AM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] Vote NO Unit 27L Proposal

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.

Thank you,

Matt Drzal

From: Miller, LouAnn
To: GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject: FW: [EXT] West River Deer Season Comments
Date: Tuesday, April 10, 2018 7:54:08 AM

From: Austin F [mailto:afalkingham@adamsthermal.com]
Sent: Monday, April 09, 2018 5:05 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] West River Deer Season Comments

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.

9C

GAME, FISH, AND PARKS COMMISSION ACTION
PROPOSAL

West River Deer Hunting Season
Chapter 41:06:20

Commission Meeting Dates:	**Proposal**	**April 5-6, 2018**	**Rapid City**
	Public Hearing	**May 3, 2018**	**Custer State Park**
	Finalization	**May 3-4, 2018**	**Custer State Park**

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION

Duration of Recommendation: 2018 hunting season

Season Dates:	Unit 30A (Gregory):	November 3-6 and November 19-25, 2018
	All Other Units:	November 10-25, 2018
	Antlerless Deer Tags:	As proposed by Commission

Regards,

Austin Falkingham
620 S Prairie Ave
Tea, SD 57064
605-351-4914

From: Miller, LouAnn
To: GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject: FW: [EXT] West river deer seasons
Date: Wednesday, April 11, 2018 7:51:32 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: Jason Bunney [mailto:j_bunney@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2018 10:54 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: [EXT] West river deer seasons

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.

Jason Bunney
Rapid City

From:	Miller, LouAnn
To:	GFP Commission Public Comments
Subject:	FW: Limited Access Unit 59L
Date:	Tuesday, April 10, 2018 3:07:06 PM

From: Schiefelbein, Derek
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2018 2:43 PM
To: GFP Wild Info
Subject: Limited Access Unit 59L

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.

Regards,
Derek Schiefelbein
Pierre
605.280.2519