

Public Comments

Custer State Park Airport Decommissioning

Phil Berggren

Hill City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I am a South Dakota native. While my permanent address is now Colorado, I own and rent (long term) a cabin in Hill City. I usually spend one to three weeks in the area twice a year. I have flown into and camped at the CSP airstrip, but have not been able to for a few years. I drove in yesterday and saw the hangar roof is gone. I understand there are expensive maintenance issues there, but to my (untrained) eye the runway looks to be in good shape. I strongly support keeping the airstrip in service, and hope you may extend the public comment period. This is my second comment . Thank you.

Dan T

San Diego CA

Position: oppose

Comment:

Oppose closing the airport. With some maintenance/updates, the airport could be a destination location for many pilots. Our country needs to maintain the fragile national airspace system of airports as they tend to be pleasure and cash generators. Thank you.

Nonresident One-Day Fishing License

John Blomfield

Corpus Christi TX

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Alexander Weigart

Fort Worth TX

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Weston Bich

Fort Thompson SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The fishing industry in this state which is a large boost to our economy relies on one day fishing. Most people come fishing for a day. Killing the one day fishing license would be a mistake. I'm a fishing guide and I rely on the 1 day fishing license for my clients.

Dan Stier

Mina SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Ryan Harman

Erie CO

Position: oppose

Comment:

To Whom It May Concern,

I write to express my strong disagreement with the South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks Department's proposal to eliminate the one-day fishing license in favor of offering only a three-day license. I believe that this change would be detrimental to local businesses and the economy, as well as counterintuitive to the interests of promoting the sport of fishing in our state.

The one-day fishing license serves as a crucial entry point for those who may be new to fishing or who only have the time for a brief outing. By eliminating this option, we discourage casual or first-time anglers from participating, thereby reducing foot traffic to businesses that rely on fishing tourism, such as bait and tackle shops, boat rentals, and other related services.

Moreover, it's worth considering that not everyone who fishes is a seasoned angler looking to spend multiple days on the water. Day-trippers, tourists, and families often opt for the convenience of a one-day license. Cutting this option limits their engagement with the sport and with the businesses that facilitate it.

I strongly urge the South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks Department to reconsider this proposal, keeping in mind the broader economic implications and the interests of the entire fishing community in our state.

Sincerely

Ace Weigart

Fort Worth SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Marlies Warren

Corpus Christi TX

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Duane Cunningham

Sturgis SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I only need to fish for one weekend a year. You will loose money on out of state fishermen

Ashley Weigart

Fort Worth TX

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Richard Weigart

Fort Worth TX

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please keep the one day fishing license option available for non-residents.

Joshua Kirschner

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

This is going to hurt our economy, less people are going to be purchasing them because of cost barriers and start fishing illegally.

Vaun Weigart

Fort Worth TX

Position: oppose

Comment:

No comment text provided.

Kalen Marra

Blaine MN

Position: oppose

Comment:

There have been many days I bought a one day out of state license and hired a guide for a day near Pierre. I almost never fish 2-3 days in a row. Making us pay for something we don't need will make some of us just stop fishing.

Jon Sailer

Belle Fourche SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I fully oppose elimination of the 1 day non-resident fishing license. I think its a terrible idea. Keep the available options for non residents to choose from. People visiting SD that may only want to fish a few hours, half the day. Why make them purchase a 3 day license. If its just about trying to make more money, you will find out having more options will make you more money.

Carmen Schramm

Utica SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

From personal experience with friends who come in from out of state - they are here for a short time and wish to fish for only one day. Plus, with our location on the Missouri River my fear is that those license would end up being purchased for Nebraska one day. Thank you and submitted respectfully, Carmen

Kasi Haberman

Yankton SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

As the Executive Director of the Southeast South Dakota Tourism Association, I wish to bring forth a pressing concern that has the potential to profoundly affect our region's tourism industry. The proposal to discontinue the availability of 1-day fishing licenses warrants serious attention due to the significant adverse effects it could generate.

A specific focal point of concern is centered around Lewis and Clark Lake and the Missouri River in the Yankton area, both of which constitute pivotal tourist destinations in our region. The suggested removal of 1-day fishing licenses poses a substantial threat to the tourism sector in this area. It is highly probable that numerous visitors with an interest in fishing activities will opt to obtain 1-day permits from neighboring Nebraska instead, effectively bypassing our local offerings.

In addition to this, we must also take into account the substantial contributions made by our local fishing guides operating on Lewis and Clark Lake and the Missouri National Recreational River. These dedicated guides consistently facilitate the purchase of more than 200 1-day permits each year for their customers. The potential removal of this option not only jeopardizes the livelihoods of these guides but also places local businesses that sell fishing permits and tackle in a precarious position. This, in turn, threatens our ongoing efforts to stimulate growth within the tourism industry and bolster visitation to South Dakota.

I urge you to exercise careful deliberation in assessing the ramifications associated with the discontinuation of 1-day fishing licenses, particularly in light of its repercussions on local businesses that rely on the sale of permits and tackle.

Preserving and enhancing our tourism offerings is imperative to sustain our competitive position within the industry and to maintain our productive partnerships with fellow tourism entities in our region. It is only through such collaborative and considerate actions that we can safeguard the vitality of our tourism sector.

Brian Bashore

Sioux Falls SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I strongly oppose this proposal to remove the 1-day Non-res fishing license. As a fishing guide that supports tourism in SD, this would be very harmful not only to all the fishing guides but also to the communities along the rivers and lakes. I alone contribute to over 150, 1 day non-resident fishing licenses a year which in turn truly equals 1 night of lodging, food, and other expenses per night in Southeast South Dakota. As most of my business takes place on Lewis and Clark Lake which is boundary water whereas a Nebraska fishing license is acceptable (\$14.50, 1-day non-res permit) Those 150+ non-resident will now be referred to NGPC to purchase their license vs the SDGFP site. These individuals do NOT convert to a 3-day license where they are also required to purchase the \$25 habitat stamp. South Dakota is already the highest-priced fishing license in surrounding states. This change will ensure anglers will travel to different destinations such as ND, MN, and WI where the fishing is as good if not better depending on the target species. It also makes no sense to have a 2-day possession limit if non-residents are required to buy a 3-day permit. It doesn't appear that there has been much thought or research put into an avenue to find additional funding to make up for some shortfalls. I can assure you there are plenty of other avenues to increase revenue other than this thoughtless attempt to keep non-residents out of South Dakota. Commissioners please hold GFP accountable for this recommendation to ensure all other options have been brought to the table prior to moving forward on this recommendation. There is always an answer and this is not the one.

Nickie Adams

Pierre SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

My parents are retired and from out of state. Don't take away the one day licenses it is easier for them depending on how weather is etc while they are here visiting. You took away the spouses annual license which they used to get. Now they get the one day. You should also have a senior rate for non residents like you do for residents.

Public Comments

Nonresident One-Day Fishing License

Francis Drab Iv

Rapid City SD

Position: other

Comment:

As someone who is able to sell license through my work place, I see both residents and non residents "working around" the 1 day license. If you vote to do away the the 1 day license, than it should be for both residents and non residents.

Mark Smedsrud

Hartford SD

Position: support

Comment:

I support eliminating the 1 day NR fishing license option for non-residents. They should have to purchase the Habitat Stamp and help fund projects just like everyone else. I also support a fee increase for the 3 day and season long non-resident fishing license. The price of an annual nonresident fishing license should be on par with the price of a NR hunting license (\$100). South Dakota has a lot of fishing pressure from nonresidents. It adds to crowding at boat ramps. If I want to fish at Chamberlain in April or May, I better be at the boat ramp by 7am or I wont get a parking spot on a lot of days. Well over half of the vehicles there are nonresidents. They need to pay their fair share so we can continue to fund expansion of access facilities.

Eric Emery

Rosebud SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

The state of South Dakota boasts an abundance of natural resources, including its pristine lakes and rivers, which have long been a destination for residents and nonresidents seeking recreational fishing opportunities. However, there is a proposal to remove the 1-Day Nonresident Fishing License option, which would significantly impact the state's tourism industry and harm the revenue generated from nonresident anglers. My position argues against removing the 1-Day Nonresident Fishing License option and emphasizes its importance for South Dakota's economy and conservation efforts. Preserving the 1-Day Nonresident Fishing License option in South Dakota is essential for the state's economic vitality, conservation efforts, and inclusivity. By maintaining this option, South Dakota can continue attracting nonresident anglers, generating revenue, and promoting responsible fishing practices while showcasing the state's natural beauty to a diverse group of visitors. Removing this option would harm the state's economy, natural resources, and overall tourism experience, making it crucial to retain this valuable fishing license option.

Eric E. Emery - Representative
State House of Representatives, District 26A

John Stahl

Aberdeen SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

I have 3 college age grandchildren that I enjoy taking fishing when they come to visit. By eliminating one day fishing license would add considerable cost to me as they do not have money to purchase license. I AM OPPOSED, please keep one day nonresident fishing licenses as is.

[EXT] One day Fishing Livense

Mike Allen <sdwalleyeguide@gmail.com>

Thu 10/12/2023 2:44 PM

To: Rissler, Stephanie <Stephanie.Rissler@state.sd.us>; Bies, Travis <Travis.Bies@state.sd.us>; Locken, Jon <Jon.Locken@state.sd.us>; Whitmyre, Robert <Robert.Whitmyre@state.sd.us>; Spring, Charles <Charles.Spring@state.sd.us>; Bartling, Julie A (GFP) <JulieA.Bartling@state.sd.us>; White, Jim <Jim.White@state.sd.us>; Cull, Bruce <Bruce.Cull@state.sd.us>

Cc: Robling, Kevin (GFP) <Kevin.Robling@state.sd.us>; Kierl, Liz <Liz.Kierl@state.sd.us>

Sending this edit to a email I sent earlier. (My browser did not save the email for whatever reason)

Edit is change to one day license is to be \$16 to \$20 and then add a \$5.00 habitat for \$25. Just to clarify what I said at the commission meeting. Thanks again for reading the email. And considering our proposal.

First I would like to thank the commission for allowing me to speak at the meeting. Appreciate the opportunity to state our views.

Couple views that I noticed at the meeting. #1 thing is Agency should of made more people aware of a change that could have such a big impact on businesses. Yes the change was buried in the list of agenda. And most people are so busy this time of year with their business, fishing-hunting-or getting ready for hunting season that they or we missed it. #2 thing is Tom was very uneasy and maybe irritated once he seen that his proposal was going to get tabled (which all of us appreciated). Facial expressions made me feel his was trying to sneak this proposal in. It may not be true, but it very much looked like it.

So on the financial side which I stated on an earlier email.

So a family of 4, all over 18 want to come out fishing. On their own, during Thanksgiving while they are home with family. Costs \$184 extra for a license to fish a few hours. So they decide to go do something else instead. Loss of license revenue of \$80. Only 1 family. Same scenario with Family driving in to fish one day. Loss of License \$80. Loss of gas revenue \$60, Loss of bait and tackle sales \$50, loss of dining \$50. 9% sales would be \$15.00. Now they are hiring a guide \$575. Sales tax is \$51.75. So now in sales tax revenue and license revenue alone Just under \$150. That is not counting loss of business to all these businesses and more.

Scenario above is only 1 group. So Allen's Missouri River Guide Service does 1300 to 1500 trips per year. 30% of our groups are 1 day trips. So let's say 420 trips are 1 day trips. Just loss in tax revenue. In our guide service alone you are risking losing \$63000 in tax revenue. This also affects our fishing guides, some motel business, food business, convenience store, and many other businesses. With 30% less business people in the fishing business will have less money to spend. There will be a big ripple effect. Is this worth the risk? I feel it isn't.

I feel groups would have no problem spending an extra \$4 to \$5 per person (create a 1 day habitat stamp). Not \$46 per person. This would more than justify the 1 day fishing license.

The Commission has a tough job and all of us understand it.

Thanks again for your time.

Mike Allen-6056801054

Allen's Missouri River Guide Service and Hillside Motel

FW: [EXT] Custer state park airport

Eagle, Antoinette <Antoinette.Eagle@state.sd.us>

Mon 10/16/2023 8:17 AM

To: VanMeeteren, Jeff <Jeff.VanMeeteren@state.sd.us>; Nedved, Al <Al.Nedved@state.sd.us>; Kierl, Liz <Liz.Kierl@state.sd.us>

From: Otto Knottnerus <oknottnerus@harvardcorp.com>

Sent: Sunday, October 15, 2023 5:18 PM

To: GFP Park Info <ParkInfo@state.sd.us>

Subject: [EXT] Custer state park airport

I have been made aware that there is a move to close the Custer state park airport. I would request that the airport remain open as it has been a way for some of my out of town friends to meet at the lodge close by. We like to fly into airports for the weekend, and this one is a frequent favorite. There are several things like hiking that we can do along with nice rooms, good meals, and gift shop.

It seems that the runway is still very usable and the parking area is good. Although, there seems to a building that needs repair, I would ask that the airport not be closed down just do to that. This airport is very useful to small planes that many of us use, and would like to add my voice to those of us that leave money at your park, and support the economy.

If this is not the correct person to contact, please forward this to the appropriate person.

Thanks for your attention to this matter,

Otto G. Knottnerus
605-891 5960 personal cell
608-449-8664 cell

Public Comments

Other

Warren Schatz

Ipswich SD

Position: other

Comment:

when are you going to control deer populations? they cause millions of dollars damage to vehicles crops etc. they are not even native to this part of the state. Maybe the citizens should take legal action to recover loses.

Public Comments

Other

Trevor Schmidt

Rapid City SD

Position: other

Comment:

Keep open

Tyler Weaver

Rapid City SD

Position: oppose

Comment:

Please keep this amazing airport open!!!

Jay Schmitz

Herrick SD

Position: other

Comment:

I understand that the comment period and decision making have passed on Mountain Lion Hunting changes although as a life long owner/operator rancher in Gregory County and life long hunter and and wildlife advocate I feel the current rules and regulations are appropriate and don't need to be changed. As wise people understand with changes in rules and regulations come unwanted unintended consequences. I believe in simplicity and the moto: If it's not broke don't fix it. Thank you, your consideration and time are appreciated.

Nancy Hilding

Black Hawk SD

Position: other

Comment:

Nancy Hilding
6300 West Elm
Black Hawk, SD 57718
605-787-6466

Dear Commission,

I have visited the SDGFP Commission's "Current Meeting" web site again today, Sunday, Oct 29th, at 5:39 pm MT. There is still no agenda published.

By statute we must submit written comments 72 hours before the day the meeting will be held on, which is Midnight CT today. But no agenda.

If the State of SD requires us the public to submit comments 72 hours before the day of the meeting, the Agency should at least have a draft agenda published 48 hours before the comment deadline. You could always revise the agenda 24 hours before the meeting, which I think statute allows, but some draft should be available before the comment deadline.

I am not even sure if this meeting has another finalization hearing on the "one-day" fishing permit revocation as I think the hearing was continued from October meeting. That should be clear on the "Current Meeting" web site, if this is the second finalization hearing on "one-day" fishing for all those who did not go to the October meeting ..