

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Please on my and other South Dakotans leave things as they are. I and many others oppose the proposal you folk are considering on June 4th. Thank you for your time and efforts. Stephen J. Foster 101 17th St. SE Watertown, SD 57201-3932. 605-868-6538

**From:** Stephen Foster [<mailto:1972foster@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 02, 2015 7:28 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:**

Please on my and other South Dakotans leave things as they are. I and many others oppose the proposal you folk are considering on June 4th. Thank you for your time and efforts.

Stephen J. Foster 101 17th St. SE Watertown, SD 57201-3932. 605-868-6538

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**To:** seancoykendall@outlook.com  
**Subject:** FW: Change in Hunting License

**From:** Sean Coykendall [<mailto:seancoykendall@outlook.com>]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 29, 2015 9:45 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info; GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Change in Hunting License

Dear Commission,

My name is Sean Coykendall and I'm from Beulah, MI. I am 24 years old and grew up hunting with my dad here in Michigan. We have been going to South Dakota hunting for 7 years. The trip we take to South Dakota usually last between 8 and 14 days. Now that I don't live at home anymore, the hunting trip we take is the only chance we get to spend an extended period of time together. We spend between \$5,000 - \$7,000 each year hunting in South Dakota.

If you go ahead with the changing of the season, my dad and I will be forced to choose a different state to hunt. We enjoy South Dakota and want to keep hunting your state. But if you decrease the number of licenses and change the season, my dad and I will be forced to take our money and hunting experiences elsewhere. We usually go out there with 3 to 6 other hunters. If you force us to leave, they would follow us to a different state. That means in just our group that you would be removing between \$15,000 - \$24,000 per year from your economy. This doesn't include the other hunters we encourage to go out there because of our experiences.

I hope you consider my personal experiences in your decision.

Respectively,

Sean Coykendall  
[seancoykendall@outlook.com](mailto:seancoykendall@outlook.com)  
(231) 631-0903

Sent from Windows Mail

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Input

**From:** John Simpson [<mailto:jrsimpson@pie.midco.net>]

**Sent:** Friday, May 29, 2015 4:04 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Input

For the record I would like to express opposition to 2 proposals up for consideration at the upcoming GF&P Commission meeting:

1 – I'm not convinced the special antlerless season after Christmas needs to be eliminated statewide. Perhaps antlerless deer numbers in some units could still justify a season. Would suggest taking a strong look at this option.

2 – Regarding nonresident waterfowl licenses, for reasons far too numerous to list here I strongly oppose item #'s 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 unless licenses come from present allocation, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12. Hope to provide background in personal testimony.

Pierre, SD

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**From:** pie.midco.net, jengbrecht  
**Sent:** Monday, June 01, 2015 2:13 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Non resident waterfowl licenses

*2nd*

As a very concerned and informed sportman here in South Dakota I am very alarmed at any desire by anybody to increase or even redo non resident waterfowl opportunities. Hunting Waterfowl is the last opportunity us as South Dakota residents have left. Pheasant hunting and now deer hunting have both gone the way of commercial or pay hunting. Too be honest most of us think there should be no non resident waterfowl hunting allowed at all. Why ruin a great thing just so commercial hunting can take over. I honestly can't understand why this is even being considered. The only reason we are even talking about this is so a few rich people can get richer. Please don't change anything and please consider not allowing ANY non resident waterfowl hunting.

Jason Engbrecht

*Pierre SD*

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Proposed Changes in NR Waterfowl Licenses in South Dakota

-----Original Message-----

From: John Solberg [<mailto:flew4dux@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, June 02, 2015 2:30 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Proposed Changes in NR Waterfowl Licenses in South Dakota

Dear Commissioners,

I have been a passionate waterfowl hunter for 50 years in numerous states and Canada. I worked as a professional waterfowl biologist for 30 years (now retired) and reside in North Dakota. I have been fortunate enough to travel to South Dakota a few times for the fantastic waterfowl hunting that SD offers. It is imperative that you maintain and protect the quality of your waterfowl hunting!! EVEN AS A NON-RESIDENT, I STRONGLY OPPOSE ANY NON-RESIDENT LICENSE ALLOTMENT INCREASE OR REDISTRIBUTION OF THE "SHORT TERM" LICENSES." If anything, you folks should consider a 10% - 20% reduction in the number of non-resident waterfowl licenses.

North Dakota went through much of what you are considering just a few years ago. Its all MONEY DRIVEN with major forces being commercial interests (guiding, outfitting, pay for access) and the tourism department. Those are the WRONG "forces" making the WRONG decisions for the WRONG reasons! Its sad, only over the past couple of decades has hunting become a "business." Up here, our politicians "sold out" the residents. By doing so, land access quickly diminished, hunting quality is terrible compared to what it was, and quite a few residents have even stopped hunting! I have friends in SD that tell me they can tell when ND "opens up" to non-residents by the surge/influx of birds (pressured out of ND) that arrive shortly thereafter in SD. Believe me.....its not fun here in ND to find a small bunch of birds to hunt and be competing with 5 - 10 other Suburbans to get to the land owner first. Think the landowners get tired of knocks at the door and telephone calls at all hours?? Or to arrive at a hunt in the morning that you had secured, only to find that someone else spent the night "camped" on it. I've seen this first hand here in ND.....as a result of the increased hunting pressure, waterfowling has been ruined in ND for residents and non-residents alike.

Personally, I'd rather draw a South Dakota NR waterfowl license every other or every third year if it means keeping the quality in it. The fact is, I am considering moving to SD now that I'm retired. Your QUALITY WATERFOWLING is the primary reason I'd move there. If the waterfowl hunting quality degrades, why should I move to SD? You folks have the opportunity once again, to make the right decisions. Hold the line on this....for the sake of the majority of your residents and the lucky non-residents that come each year to enjoy your wonderful state and a high quality waterfowling experience. You can sustain high quality waterfowl hunting as long as you keep the greed out of the decision making process. Protect the majority of your residents first and South Dakota will remain a premier waterfowling destination. Its that simple.

Thank you for allowing me to comment,

John Solberg  
3356 Kent Drive  
Bismarck, North Dakota 58503

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Waterfowl license proposal

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Richardson [<mailto:walleyedr@aol.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, June 02, 2015 2:50 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Waterfowl license proposal

I am writing this email in opposition to the proposed waterfowl license increase for nonresidents. I have been an avid waterfowl Hunter in South Dakota since I was a kid. I grew up in eastern South Dakota near Sioux Falls. Waterfowl hunting for South Dakota residents has been very good for the past several decades. However, there has been an increase in out-of-state hunting pressure for waterfowl over the past several years. In north eastern South Dakota waterfowl hunting has gotten very tough in many places due to non-resident pressure. I truly believe that further increases in nonresident hunting opportunities will result in the leasing up of more hunting lands and the commercialization of waterfowl hunting in South Dakota as it was in the early 1900s. Waterfowl hunting is one of the last hunting opportunities South Dakota residents have without having to compete with commercial hunting operations. I have had several instances in the last couple of years where I have gotten permission from a local landowner to hunt ducks or geese and In a private field only to be harassed by a commercial Hunter with clients from out of state who also stated that they had permission for that field and demanded that I leave due to the fact that they were trying to make a living. I think this is completely wrong and that is exactly what has happened to other hunting opportunities for other species in our state. please do not sell out our resident hunters anymore.

Michael Richardson  
Fort Pierre SD  
Sent from my iPhone

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Waterfowl

-----Original Message-----

From: phillip lowe [<mailto:lowesttherapy@cs.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, June 02, 2015 6:07 AM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Waterfowl

Leave Potter County in the current lottery drawing. No not make this change.

Phillip Lowe  
Florence, SD

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Non Resident Waterfowl Licenses

**From:** Dan Thayer <[danthayer@hotmail.com](mailto:danthayer@hotmail.com)>

**Date:** May 30, 2015 at 8:31:06 AM CDT

**To:** "[jlcoop11@aol.com](mailto:jlcoop11@aol.com)" <[jlcoop11@aol.com](mailto:jlcoop11@aol.com)>, "[cathy.peterson@state.sd.us](mailto:cathy.peterson@state.sd.us)" <[cathy.peterson@state.sd.us](mailto:cathy.peterson@state.sd.us)>, "[hpd@nvc.net](mailto:hpd@nvc.net)" <[hpd@nvc.net](mailto:hpd@nvc.net)>, "[barryj@gwtc.net](mailto:barryj@gwtc.net)" <[barryj@gwtc.net](mailto:barryj@gwtc.net)>, "[gary.jensen@state.sd.us](mailto:gary.jensen@state.sd.us)" <[gary.jensen@state.sd.us](mailto:gary.jensen@state.sd.us)>, "[wscott.phillips@state.sd.us](mailto:wscott.phillips@state.sd.us)" <[wscott.phillips@state.sd.us](mailto:wscott.phillips@state.sd.us)>, "[duane.sather@state.sd.us](mailto:duane.sather@state.sd.us)" <[duane.sather@state.sd.us](mailto:duane.sather@state.sd.us)>, "[jim.spies@state.sd.us](mailto:jim.spies@state.sd.us)" <[jim.spies@state.sd.us](mailto:jim.spies@state.sd.us)>

**Subject: Non Resident Waterfowl Licenses**

Dear Commissioners,

June 4 is fast approaching and you have a major decision ahead of you, it will impact SD waterfowl hunting forever. I would request the following changes in what is currently being proposed:

1. A 10% decrease in the current number of non-resident licenses being issued. We are being crowded out!
2. Move the 500 3-day licenses back to the Missouri River area as was the original agreement. If they do not sell there, then the local chambers of commerce and commercial hunting outfits will have to spend some dollars on marketing and public relations.
3. I would not mind seeing some NR youth licenses so the youngsters could experience quality waterfowling with their parents or relatives.
4. Ink the deal for a minimum of 5 years, this has to be a majorly expensive endeavor each and every year not to mention the time for you folks as well as my fellow waterfowlers in SD.

In my opinion the work group did not heed the recommendations from the hundreds they recieved from resident and non-resident alike. Ninety percent of the resident comments and forty percent of the non resident comments were to follow the recommendations I have outlined above.

Please don't sacrifice our fine waterfowling heritage for a few more dollars. I have been hunting waterfowl here in SD for 50 years and I do not want to see it become a rich man's game! I think one of my non-resident hunting partners that has been returning here for over a quarter of a century put it best: **SOUTH DAKOTA WATERFOWLING SHOULD BE A PRIVILAGE AND NOT A PURCHASE!!**

Sincerely,

Dan Thayer  
127257 West Bridge Road  
Aberdeen, SD 57401

## Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** FW: Comment on : 2015 GFP May Proposals - June Finals

**From:** GFP Admin Rules  
**Sent:** Friday, May 29, 2015 9:57 AM  
**To:** GFP Admin Rules  
**Subject:** Comment on : 2015 GFP May Proposals - June Finals

Name: Cory

Address: 48069 260th street

City: Brandon

State: sd

Zip: 57005

Email: [idealcors@yahoo.com](mailto:idealcors@yahoo.com)

Comment: I have read many comments by the public and by the commission on the proposed elimination of the doe deer extended season. I did not realize that so many hunters use this extended season as a family and friends time of recreation and to harvest and deer for meat. I know, as a land owner and a deer hunter, that the deer population is down tremendously in many areas. I propose to shorten the season in November to a nine day season, which would cover two weekends and one week. Then leave the nine day doe only season, as it is, in late December/early January. This would accommodate both seasons and their respective hunters. Also, any unsuccessful any deer tags would convert to a doe only tag in the late season. Thanks Cory Hansen

**From:** Cory Hansen <[idealcors@yahoo.com](mailto:idealcors@yahoo.com)>  
**Date:** May 29, 2015 at 10:11:42 AM CDT  
Commissioners,

I have read nearly all the input on the proposed change to eliminate the late season doe only deer season. I did not realize that so many hunters use this late season for a time with families, friends, and to harvest deer for meat.

I would propose changing the regular season to a nine day season, with two weekends and one week in between. Then allowing the late "anterlerless" only season to remain as it is. Any unfilled "any" deer tags would then convert to a doe only.

I believe that this change would somewhat accommodate both groups of hunters. I do realize that some November hunting opportunities may be lost, but allowing those tags to be filled later might eliminate some negative feedback. I do not know how this would affect the GFP deer management plan, but I know that you have many very intelligent folks that would know.

When I grew up hunting many years ago in eastern south dakota there was a north half and a south half season, and that this season, I believe, was only for nine days respectfully.

Thanks for all you do, Cory Hansen, Brandon SD, 605-941-0065

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Nonresident Waterfowl Hunters

**From:** Todd VanMaanen [<mailto:ToddV@eaweb.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, June 01, 2015 4:11 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Nonresident Waterfowl Hunters

It is my understanding that the Commission is considering allowing more nonresident waterfowl hunting licenses again this year at your June 4<sup>th</sup> meeting. Hunting for the average South Dakotan continues to be a challenge due to limited access to quality hunting ground. We are not developing the next generation of hunter/conservationists in part to limited hunting opportunities. Allowing more money hunters into the state only continues to weaken South Dakota's hunting culture. I'd ask that you not to increase the number of out-of-state waterfowl hunting licenses. Thank you

Todd Van Maanen  
Yankton, SD  
605-660-1361

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**From:** Greg Hoftiezer <greghre@dailypost.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 01, 2015 4:54 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Non-resident waterfowl license

To whom it may concern,

I am an avid outdoorsman and although I don't hunt as often as I did a few years ago I recognize the importance of quality time spent outdoors hunting. My oldest son recently graduated from SDSU. He had job opportunities in other states and other parts of SD. He chose to come back to Watertown mainly because of the outdoor opportunities available in NE SD. I have to believe other young people make similar decisions based on the quality of the hunting opportunities we have. I would hate to see waterfowl hunting become as commercialized as pheasant hunting has. We may get some non-residents here for 3 day or 1 week hunts, but if the waterfowl opportunities become less appealing, or more crowded, to residents like my son or other young people they may choose other states in which to live and work. I understand the economics the other side presents as I am a business owner myself. I just think the big picture is more important than a few extra dollars in October and November. Thank you for your time.

Greg L Hoftiezer - Broker

Hoftiezer Real Estate

605-881-8678 Cell

605-886-3030 Office

605-886-3354 Fax

[www.hoftiezer-realestate.com](http://www.hoftiezer-realestate.com)

**Subject:** FW: In regards to GFP proposals june 2015 non residents

**From:** Mark Peterson <[peterson.mark@hotmail.com](mailto:peterson.mark@hotmail.com)>

**Date:** June 1, 2015 at 7:03:13 PM CDT

**To:** "[Emily.Kiel@state.sd.us](mailto:Emily.Kiel@state.sd.us)" <[emily.kiel@state.sd.us](mailto:emily.kiel@state.sd.us)>

**Subject:** In regards to GFP proposals june 2015 non residents

Hi my name is mark peterson and I have been an avid hunter all my life since birth. I am 28 years old and over the years of hunting since 12 years old for waterfowl. I have seen such a huge disappointment to the point where I and my fellow hunting partners have been discouraged to even want to buy a hunting license or hunt at all anymore. The bird numbers are down, though they say best hunting since grandparents, which I find hard to believe being that since 12 the hunting has gone down so bad. Access to hunting has turned into pay to play. The non-residents are making it more of a tourism department instead of Department of game fish and parks. Now we are department of tourism apparently. I stand to make no money of the deal other then more of the birds I hunt to be taken. It's sad there is literally no bonus to residents for hunting or fishing here in South Dakota. Other than license increases this past year. To provide more hunting ground for non-residents. Woop eee. This is our state, our birds, our future and we are going to hand it over to the non-residents? Only because of money. There is no other explanation than money money money. Frankly I am getting sick of it. I go out opener last season for duck and met in 3 different GPA by 3 or more vehicles in each one for hunting pressure. The public areas are overcrowded due to farmers not allowing hunting unless you want to follow suite with the PAY TO PLAY method. I would love for GFP to go around and make a list of farmers who will let us hunt. Keep reporting where there are fish biting, not have to rely on commercial bait shops who obviously will say hey they are biting everywhere, so I keep buying bait and traveling all over hell. I am sick of paying for a license that produces poor game numbers. Pheasants in this state are horrible, but thanks for that great weekend before of opener resident only hunting where the farmers all go and 4-wheeler the GPA to kick the pheasants out, I can't even road hunt. Best numbers are at preserves and guess what you have to pay to play. When I was 12 years old was best waterfowl hunting I had ever seen. We limited out just about every time My DAD, My brother went out. A South Dakota family spending time together enjoying hunting. Yes we got skunked and that sucked but not like it is now. I find it hard for a family to take their kids hunting now to go stare at open water and open dirt, when the kids can stay home and shoot crap on the TV. Hunting honestly needs to be shut down for a few years to restock. I am willing to see that, but God forbid we lose a few dollars for a few years. Leave this state to residents. Quit taking away from my family, quit trying to make money off of my benefit as a South Dakotan. I am avid hunter for years, if any of the ridiculous ideas of early season non-residents happens you can count my family out of hunting for rest of my life. It's not worth it to me; it's no longer fun to go out. Waste gas and money to go sit and fight over limited areas that are good to hunt. Because the good areas to hunt now are turning into commercialized hunting and it's transformed badly over the years. This is about our quality of life not the non-residents. Take a step back from department of tourism and Go back to managing and doing what you're supposed to do. [Sioux Falls, SD](#)

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**From:** robert j young <mudcreek@nrctv.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 01, 2015 8:18 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** no on proposed waterfowl changes

Once again the commercial waterfowl interests have the attention of the SDGFP. Will the interests of the citizen hunters of South Dakota be best served by the proposed changes in the waterfowl licensing? I think not. It seems it all comes down to the almighty dollar. Once the foot is in the door there will be no turning back and it will be a full on charge to unlimited waterfowl hunting for non residents.

Robert J. Young

Stratford, SD

## Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Darla Peterson <darlapeterson1@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 01, 2015 7:06 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** GFP proposed changes to Non-Resident Waterfowl Season and Special Canadian Goose Season

Game Fish and Parks is NOT department of Tourism. All Licensing should be measured by whatever game animals can sustain. The Main

people to benefit from this should be RESIDENTS of the State of South Dakota. No changes to the current 9 County NE Unit. No More NON-RRESIDENT Licenses or Access Period .No NON-RESIDENTS in SE Early Season. No NON-RESIDENT youths.

We do not need to invite anymore out of state money to the State of South Dakota, there has to be some benefit included in being a FULL TIME RESIDENT of the STATE of SOUTH DAKOTA. The hunting access gets worse every year now, and with more NON-RESIDENTS allowed ,this will only make access worse.

Comments on Handbooks such as better than your Grandfather seen, I believe are false. My grandparents seen a lot better Hunting than I or my Children have or will see in the Future.

Game Warden Reports should also be continued to be posted on the GFP Website for Hunting and Fishing , they were recently removed. In my opinion this has been good information. And is this site not to serve the PUBLIC.

Michael Peterson Age 61  
1018 North Holly Ave  
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57104

## Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Broome, Jack  
**Sent:** Monday, June 01, 2015 10:20 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Waterfowl License Proposal

South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks Commission

I am writing relative to the proposed changes in out-of state waterfowl licenses numbers/locations etc. I have hunted the Bennett Co. special goose season for over 20 years with a group of resident hunters. We have discussed the proposed changes and the group is strongly in favor of retaining the tagged system. We strongly feel that eliminating the tag hunts and simply including it another waterfowl unit will very quickly lead to a system of leased land barring the resident hunters the opportunity to hunt. We are strongly opposed to this change.

It is the belief of most residents that I have visited with relative to these changes that the proposals are driven by the tourism industry and guides/lodges who could care less about residents. We would hate to see our waterfowl hunting go the way of what has happened to pheasant hunting in SD over the last 20 years. Many, if not most of the pheasant hunters I know in our area, have given up pheasant hunting all together. There is very little pheasant hunting access for local hunters. When we see a Pheasant Forever banquet etc. we basically say, "Why should we support something that basically benefits out-of-staters?" Sadly, this is affecting our children and grandchildren also who no longer pheasant hunt and certainly won't support it down the road. License sales sadly reflect this. Due the lodges the pheasant opener has a minimal affect on many small town main streets. In the 50's and 60's we had a carnival like atmosphere in our little town the weekend of and opening week of pheasant season. On opening day, today, you see absolutely no difference than any other weekend.

If we locals want to spent time in the outdoors we are basically relegated to waterfowling and fishing, which we do a lot of! And the reservoirs are plenty crowded with out of state fisherman. We are most thankful for a number of our rancher friends, who let us ice fish and waterfowl hunt their many ponds, which are excellent fishing and can ~~also be excellent~~ duck and goose hunting. They tell us out-of staters will never wet a line or hunt waterfowl on their ponds ~~as they intend~~ to preserve them for their local friends!!!

Sincerely,  
Jack Broome  
Box 322  
Burke, SD

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**From:** Arnie and Lori Goldade <arnielori@abe.midco.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 01, 2015 10:51 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Waterfowl Comment

Dear Commissioners,

Please vote NO on June 4th for the proposed changes to the 2015 Non Resident waterfowl season. I was born in SD and stayed in SD because of the great hunting and fishing opportunities it has for it's residents.

South Dakota residents had the best pheasant hunting in the country, but now it is so commercialized residents have no place to hunt. Yes, we do have GPA's, WPA's, and WIA, for public hunting - but just go to any one of them during the pheasant season and they are surrounded with vehicles with nonresident license plates.

We are at the point right now that if you approve this new proposal for waterfowl hunting, we will have a repeat of what happened to our great pheasant hunting for SD residents.

Please vote NO on this new waterfowl proposal.

Thank You,  
Arnie Goldade  
12892 Fairfield Drive  
Aberdeen SD 57401

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: waterfowl

**From:** Dan & Amy Gooding [<mailto:dagooding@abe.midco.net>]

**Sent:** Monday, June 01, 2015 11:18 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** waterfowl

I would like you to consider the residents of South Dakota before you consider opening more doors for out of state waterfowl hunters. Over the years it become nearly impossible to get permission to pheasant hunt private land. On the other hand the last few years I have been enjoying Waterfowl hunting with several of my best hunting friends, I can't remember the last time we got turned away to shoot waterfowl. Please consider the people that live here and support SD year round rather than cater to the fast buck!

Dan and Amy Gooding  
Aberdeen, SD

## **Ascher, Debra**

---

**From:** jrud.sio.midco.net  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 02, 2015 12:12 AM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** No increase in nonresident waterfowl licenses!

To all SDGP commissioners. Any review of the public testimony and public comments received to date on this issue really leaves you no logical choice but to vote no on this issue.

Despite the lopsided representation on the working group the pro commercial waterfowl hunting crowd was able to generate little to no public support. A yes vote on this is directly against the vast majority of South Dakota waterfowl hunters as well as against recent legislators who turned the issue over to the commission to relieve them from hearing from their constituency. The increase in nonresident waterfowl licences couldn't get passed by the legislators simply because it had no support except for a few commercial interests. To vote yes on this is political crap of the highest order; would be against the vast majority of public comments and testimony, and would not stop the legislators from hearing from SD residents either. Vote no and save SD waterfowl from commercial hunting.

Waterfowl can't be stocked like pheasants and if commercial interests take over they will be asking to stock ducks just like Alex Falk tried to do a few years ago.

Jeff Rud  
Madison SD

## Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** abe.midco.net, jlorenz10  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 02, 2015 7:43 AM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** non resident waterfowl licenses

To whom it may concern: I will be unable to attend the meeting June 4 but would like to voice my opinion about increasing the nonresident waterfowl licenses.

I am strongly opposed to increasing the waterfowl licenses especially in northeastern South Dakota. If the number of licenses increases, more land will be leased to outfitters and nonresident hunters and make it almost impossible for the average person to gain permission from landowners. It is very difficult for the average person to hunt pheasants already. If the waterfowl hunting gets more difficult to gain permission, many South Dakotans will give up hunting altogether. Why can't we protect some of our resources for our own residents to enjoy? Let's protect the hunting for people who truly love the sport of hunting rather than the people that want to profit off of hunting?

Sincerely,

Jason Lorenz Aberdeen SD

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Nonresident Waterfowl Licenses

---

**From:** Mike [<mailto:mvstenson@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 02, 2015 1:45 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Nonresident Waterfowl Licenses

Members of the South Dakota Game Fish and Parks Commission-

I am writing this email to voice my opinion on the addition of nonresident waterfowl licenses in South Dakota. In short, I do not support any additional nonresident waterfowl licenses. I wrote emails to the "Work Group" and also attended their final meeting in Pierre. I was disappointed in the recommendations that emerged from that group and I feel the representatives from the South Dakota Waterfowl Association and South Dakota Wildlife Federation were ignored. These two representatives were the only member of the work group with any priority for resident hunters. They made it very clear that resident hunters already feel over pressured and in no way support additional licenses. These sentiments were absent from the group's recommendations.

From my many conversations with both residents and nonresidents that hunt waterfowl in South Dakota, it is overwhelmingly clear that none of them support increases in nonresident licenses. The low hunter densities in South Dakota are exactly why we have some of the best waterfowling in the nation. Nonresidents would rather have an unpressured successful hunt every other year, than be able to hunt every year and have to deal with increased pressure and decreased opportunity. I also believe that an increase in nonresident licenses will lead to an increased number of commercial outfitters. Commercial hunting operations have already begun to lease waterfowl land in prime areas at an alarming rate. Hunting access that could once be acquired with a handshake and a smile is now inaccessible to resident hunters.

I have no issue with the addition of 100 nonresident youth waterfowl licenses and feel encouraging youth participation is vital to the survival of hunting and fishing all across the United States.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter. I'm confident the response from resident and nonresident waterfowl hunters alike has been more than adequate for you to see they do not support additional nonresident waterfowl licenses.

Thanks,  
Mike Stenson  
2104 Waldron Street  
Fort Pierre, SD 57532

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: waterfowl licenses

**From:** Gary & Marlys Wickre <[gmwickre@venturecomm.net](mailto:gmwickre@venturecomm.net)>

**Date:** June 2, 2015 at 11:18:00 AM CDT

**To:** <[j1coop11@aol.com](mailto:j1coop11@aol.com)>, <[cathy.peterson@state.sd.us](mailto:cathy.peterson@state.sd.us)>, <[hpd@nvc.net](mailto:hpd@nvc.net)>, <[barryj@gwtc.net](mailto:barryj@gwtc.net)>, <[wscott.phillips@state.sd.us](mailto:wscott.phillips@state.sd.us)>, <[jim.spies@state.sd.us](mailto:jim.spies@state.sd.us)>, <[wildlinfo@state.sd.us](mailto:wildlinfo@state.sd.us)>, <[gary.jensen@state.sd.us](mailto:gary.jensen@state.sd.us)>, <[duane.sather@state.sd.us](mailto:duane.sather@state.sd.us)>

**Subject:** waterfowl licenses

We, as the Marshall Co. Sportsman's Club, strongly oppose any increase in the number of non-resident waterfowl licenses, or the transfer of non-resident waterfowl licenses from other areas of South Dakota to the NE region of SD. Waterfowl hunting sites in NE SD are heavily hunted now, and any increase in licenses will reduce the hunting experience for all hunters. We want to keep waterfowl hunting as we know it now.

Marshall Co. Sportsman's Club  
Gary Wickre, Secretary

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Non-resident waterfowl licenses

**From:** Mark Richardson [<mailto:Mark.Richardson@daktronics.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 02, 2015 11:53 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Non-resident waterfowl licenses

This is in regards to the proposal for Non-resident waterfowl licenses. One of the main reasons that I continue to live in SD is due to the hunting and fishing opportunities that are in the state. I have heard the stories about ND and MN waterfowl seasons, and the limited access hunters in those states have. I also like to pheasant hunt, and due to the pressure on pheasant hunting in the state and good opportunities, I stick to more waterfowl hunting. I would hate to see that change. We hunt mostly public land, so we already arrive a couple of hours before shooting time to ensure a spot. We have had times where we have drove 90 miles to a spot, and had to scramble to try to find a different spot to hunt quickly, so we bring multiple different canoes and boats to give us flexibility.

Thanks

**Mark Richardson** PCB Designer

Phone: [605-692-0200](tel:605-692-0200) ext. [56707](tel:56707)

Address: [201 Daktronics Dr. Brookings, SD 57006](#)

Web: [daktronics.com](http://daktronics.com) | [Facebook](#) [Twitter](#) [YouTube](#)



**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: goose hunting

**From:** Deena Heitmann [<mailto:adrianlynn@venturecomm.net>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 02, 2015 12:15 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** goose hunting

I am writing in regards to the purposed changes to the amount of licenses. I am not in favor of more out of state licenses. In the northesat where I live and hunted, it gets more difficult each year to find fields to goose hunt. We are seeing more and more guides tying up land that we used to hunt. With the limited number of small grain fields, the competition for these fields is high with just the hunters, especially in the early seasons. I am also afraid that as we get more out of state hunters in, they will start to buy up land just fore hunting purposes.Thanks for hearing me out.

Adrian Heitmann  
Lake City SD.  
605 448 5133 home  
605 290 5876 cell

## Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** FW: FW: out of state duck hunters

**From:** [bdiede@reagan.com](mailto:bdiede@reagan.com) [<mailto:bdiede@reagan.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 02, 2015 12:57 PM

**To:** Ascher, Debra

**Subject:** RE: FW: out of state duck hunters

Hi Debra

Barry Diede  
Moberly Missouri

**From:** [bdiede@reagan.com](mailto:bdiede@reagan.com) [<mailto:bdiede@reagan.com>]

**Sent:** Friday, May 29, 2015 4:21 PM

**To:** SDGFPINFO

**Subject:** out of state duck hunters

I hope that someone in the game and fish dept. will read this. My name is Barry Diede I'm a third generation land owner of land in South Dakota just out side of Eureka. I live down in Missouri and twice a year I mail large checks for taxes to SD for cyn-bar farms. I wish that as a tax payer and large land owner I could have the same opportunity to at the least hunt on my land as the locals. I would even except having to pay more for out of state permits. But at the least be able to hunt the same as locals do. I think at the least my family and I have earned that right by owning the land and paying taxes thous taxes go to state and schools and county project's that I don't use and I'm fine with paying in I would just like to have the same rights as my neighbor's do. Thank you for reading hopefully the laws could be changed some day.

Barry Diede  
660-651-5950

Dear SDGFP,

My name is Carter Knecht, I am 15 years old and water fowling is my passion. Hunting is the only thing I have ever truly ever been good at in my life. Nearly all the good memories I have in my life center around hunting, especially duck hunting. I have had these good experiences because the state of South Dakota has provided me and many others a good quality hunting experience, water fowling has been an enjoyable experience for me in this state because of how we run the licensing system. I fear greatly that if we change this system the way it has been proposed to change, that the hunting qualities and experiences will decrease remarkably. When I heard about the proposed idea to move nonresident waterfowl licenses from the Missouri river to the north central part of the state where I hunt waterfowl almost every weekend of the duck hunting season, I was frustrated to say the least. The fact alone that this idea has gotten these far scares me. There are a few different reasons why this idea scares me. First there are a limited amount of areas in this part of the state that hold hunt able amounts of waterfowl, and fewer places that have public access to these birds. I think if there were to be more hunters in this area the places to launch boats would be bogged down, and would be frustrating for everyone. These areas are muddy gravel ramps tucked in amongst the reeds. They can hardly keep up with the amount of traffic they are receiving right now. Second, as I said earlier there are few places with public access to a hunt able population of waterfowl in this part of the state. Simply said more hunters means more pressure that means that the hunting experience for all who do hunt here are going to decrease dramatically. I live and want to continue living in the great state of South Dakota because of the amazing hunting opportunities. If these hunting opportunities were to disappear like I think they will with this proposed idea, there would be no reason for me to stay in South Dakota. If any of the commissioners are thinking about the economic standpoint of this proposed idea, and they think that it will bring a few

more jobs and a bit more money to South Dakota, they are right it will, but the number of jobs created will be no match for the amount of jobs I think will leave. Many people live and work in this state because of the hunting opportunities, if those opportunities are impacted in a negative way, like I think they will, there will be no reason to live work and spend money here. There would be no reason for me and many others to stay. Thank you for this opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Sincerely,  
Carter Knecht  
Pierre, SD

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Waterfowl license proposal

**From:** treven\_57401 [mailto:treven\_57401@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 02, 2015 10:40 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Waterfowl license proposal

Dear sirs, I am concerned that this proposal is only for the Short Term benefit of a few commercial interests. Please keep the resident hunters in mind when you decide on this. What happened to the goose hunting in the Pierre area? Why don't we transfer the 500 three day licenses back to the river where they belong. That's where the extra access was bought. I've hunted ducks for a long time and its not always that great. Yes I Can Hunt The Entire Season But That Doesn't Do Much GOOD When The Ducks Are Only Here For A Short Time And That's Exactly When All Of The Hunters Are out. Please oppose this proposal.

**Thank you Timothy Even Aberdeen SD**

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S® 4 mini™, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: June 4, 2015 Waterfowl Proposal

**From:** Warren and Marilyn Jackson [<mailto:roscoedakota@mcisweb.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 02, 2015 10:31 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** June 4, 2015 Waterfowl Proposal

Game, Fish and Parks  
Wildlife Division  
Pierre, SD

I am writing to express my OPPOSITION to the non-resident waterfowl proposal that will be considered by the Commission when they meet June 4. It is not in the best interest of South Dakota sportsmen.

Sincerely,

Warren Jackson  
Egan, SD

**From:** Warren and Marilyn Jackson <[roscoedakota@mcisweb.com](mailto:roscoedakota@mcisweb.com)>

**Date:** June 2, 2015 at 11:47:22 AM CDT

**To:** <[cathy.peterson@state.sd.us](mailto:cathy.peterson@state.sd.us)>

**Subject:** June 4 NR Waterfowl Proposal

Cathy Peterson, Vice-Chair  
GFP Commission

Kathy:

I am opposed to the NR Waterfowl proposal that will be addressed by the Commission on June 4th. Consider the following:

Reduce the number of regular NR licenses; then add a FEW of the number being reduced for NR youth licenses to be valid during the same time as resident youth licenses are valid.

Remove 500 of the 3-day NR licenses in the NE area of South Dakota and return them to the Missouri River area where they were intended to be.

Do not address the NR Waterfowl regulations again for at least 3 years.

Sincerely,

Warren Jackson  
Egan, SD

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Nonresident waterfowl

**From:** Sheree and Rune Wold [<mailto:woldfamily@outlook.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 02, 2015 9:44 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Nonresident waterfowl

Dear Tony,

I realize GF&P is in a very difficult political position and if allowed to use known science would approach things differently.

This is my stance. Good luck!

The 100 youth nonresident waterfowl licenses is just to 'veil' the increase numbers for commercial hunting camps. What will the youth learn about hunting? The youth fly into an airport, picked up by the guide, transported to a 'plush' lodge, awoken to restaurant style breakfast, transported to a heated pit, told when to shoot, at the end of morning hunt poise with a limit of geese (does not matter if they fired their shotgun, hit a goose or shot everyone's limit), transported back to the lodge, dine on a fine meal while the guide cleans the geese, transported back to airport and flies back home with the frozen birds (if he decides to take them instead of leaving at the processing plant like many do). The youth have not learned the time involved finding where the geese are feeding, setting up the decoys into the night or rising early in the a.m. to set the decoys, waiting patiently in a cold hastily build blind only to have the geese fly too high for a shot, personally shoot their own geese, pick up the decoys, clean their geese and finally help prepared the goose dinner.

I am opposed to any increase nonresident waterfowl licenses as it will only continue to erode the opportunities for the hunters that are unable compete with 'Wall Street' hunters.

A better solution would be for the legislature to allow GF&Ps to purchase land for the South Dakota residence hunters. However, given the political climate I realize that money speaks. So, why not just allow unlimited numbers of nonresident licenses to speed up the eventually take over of 'big money' commercial hunting. Soon South Dakota hunting will be like medieval England where the King, Governor, controls all wildlife!

Gary Ladner

4418 Bellewood Dr.

Rapid City, SD 57702

Email - [gjladner@rushmore.com](mailto:gjladner@rushmore.com)

Cell- 605-786-3373

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Non-resident waterfowl licenses

**From:** [Cheryl](#)

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 02, 2015 9:19 AM

**To:** [jlcoop11@aol.com](mailto:jlcoop11@aol.com)

**Subject:** Non-resident waterfowl licenses

To: South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks Commission and associated staff of the department and Division of Wildlife:

I am a lifelong resident of South Dakota who chose to live here to enjoy all of the things our state has to offer, including hunting and fishing opportunities.

My request is that you listen to the sportsmen of South Dakota and act to limit non-resident waterfowl licenses.

Regards,

Bob Krutzfeldt  
1306 Wisconsin SW  
Huron, SD 57350

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: I would like to see Kingsbury county added to the northeast section of the non-resident waterfowl map. Thank You.

-----Original Message-----

From: Lee [<mailto:fishlee46@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, June 02, 2015 8:40 AM

To: Ascher, Debra

Subject: Re: I would like to see Kingsbury county added to the northeast section of the non-resident waterfowl map. Thank You.

Lee Fonken, Romance, Ar.

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Lee [<mailto:fishlee46@yahoo.com>]

> Sent: Saturday, May 30, 2015 10:15 PM

> To: GFP Wild Info

> Subject:

>

> I would like to see Kingsbury county added to the northeast section of the non-resident waterfowl map. Thank You.

>

>

>

> Sent from my iPhone

**Subject:**

FW: Bennett County Goose Tags

On Jun 1, 2015, at 9:56 PM, craig pugsley <[pugsley.craig@gmail.com](mailto:pugsley.craig@gmail.com)> wrote:

On behalf of myself I would like to offer the following comments about the proposal to eliminate the Bennett County Goose Tags.

I have hunted geese most of my life, starting with snow goose hunting around DeSmet and for the past 35 plus years hunting geese in Bennett County, the Shadehill Area, around Pierre, and from time to time in the NE part of the state. Bennett County offers the best of the best goose hunting I've experienced. I believe that is because of the current tag system that has been in place since they opened that season over 35 years ago.

The "tag system" regulates the hunting pressure, improves hunting access, and allows everyone to experience a quality goose hunting opportunity.

I have hunted geese on all sides of the Refuge and met many landowners throughout my years of knocking on doors and asking permission to hunt. I have never heard any of them state that the geese are causing them a problem. They seem to enjoy allowing most hunters the opportunity to hunt. Again, I believe the "tag system" facilitates this relationship between the hunter and the landowner.

If you look at the Pierre area for comparison most of the good goose hunting land is either leased, hunted commercially, or otherwise off limits to common "Joe" goose hunter. Every goose hunter in Bennett County has equal opportunity because the "tag system" regulates the number of geese one person can harvest and once those geese are harvested it opens the door for another goose hunter to have a truly great hunting experience. Years ago the State worked with landowners in the Pierre area and now the Department manages goose hunting fields and bluff shooting opportunities. The "tag system" regulates the pressure in Bennett County and keeps the majority of the private lands open to anyone who doesn't mind to knock on a door and seek permission.

LaCreek Refuge is a relatively small refuge that harbors tens of thousands of geese on a good year. These numbers would be enticing for those with the cash to approach landowners to lease their lands for goose hunting. If that happens the common hunter will once again be left out or sitting in the road ditch hoping to shoot a goose. If this happens conflicts may arise between goose hunters and landowners.

In January of each year the season is re-opened to anyone for 10 days and the hunters show up in droves. A friend of my hunted there two seasons ago and four different groups where in one field. Other years once we were set up another group would come set up in the same field stating we have permission too. I made a decision to just stay away during that time frame because of the number of hunters. I decided to go back this year as there was a couple who wanted to hunt geese so I thought why not give it another try. It was very similar to my past experiences, hunters in every field and lining the road ditches. Again you don't find that during the "tag system" as the tags help regulate numbers and provides for a great hunting opportunity.

I could go on and on but in summary the current system allows everyone an (equal chance) to apply for a tag, secure left over tags if they are available and provides everyone with an equal opportunity to hunt geese in this special unit. It has seemingly worked fine since its inception. Opening it up to unlimited hunting will only draw more goose hunters on a weekly basis, put more pressure on the landowners and certainly open the door for commercialization and leasing of lands. The common South Dakota goose hunter will be the loser should the "tag system" be changed.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts and I would be happy to discuss them further over the phone or in person. [Custer, SD](#)

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: non resident waterfowl licenses

**From:** Bill Koupal [<mailto:billk@koupal-communications.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, June 01, 2015 2:15 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** non resident waterfowl licenses

GFP,

I am writing because I oppose any increase in non-resident waterfowl hunters in South Dakota. Instead I urge you to reduce the number of non-resident licenses by 10 percent. Hunting pressure is too great compared to the places available to hunt.

he proposal to transfer three-day licenses from the lower Oahe unit to other parts of the state breaks faith with an essential component of the agreement that allowed me to support the original plan—increased public opportunity through the creation of the Lower Oahe Waterfowl area. Transferring these licenses would be a betrayal of those of us who publicly supported the Commission’s plan.

The Commission has a well-deserved reputation for basing its decisions on established standards. I am dismayed, however, that setting the number of non-resident waterfowl licenses is so arbitrary. We need a clear, science-based standard similar to the one used for non-resident big game licenses.

Respectfully,

William Koupal  
117 South Monroe Avenue  
Pierre, South Dakota 57501  
605-224-8567

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: waterfowl changes

---

**From:** Bill Willroth [<mailto:bill@dakotadecoy.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, June 01, 2015 2:36 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** waterfowl changes

I urge you to please oppose the proposed waterfowl proposal in June. This would be another instance of forcing residents of our great state out of already crowded fields and waters.

Thank you,  
Bill

**Bill Willroth**  
**Dakota Decoy**  
**24 Center St.**  
**Vermillion, SD 57069**  
**605-624-3825**

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Non Resident Waterfowl Hunters Issue

**From:** Steve Donovan [<mailto:sdonovan@ducks.org>]

**Sent:** Monday, June 01, 2015 3:28 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Non Resident Waterfowl Hunters Issue

I for one believe that waterfowl belong to all the people, not just a few. I believe that since waterfowl are a migratory species, and that duck hunters everywhere support waterfowl habitat conservation, including in South Dakota, then all duck hunters should have a reasonable opportunity to hunt ducks in South Dakota. I SUPPORT the expansion of non-resident waterfowl hunting licenses and opportunities. Thank you

S. Patrick Donovan  
Arlington, South Dakota

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: New Non-Resident Waterfowl Proposition

**From:** Charlie Moore [<mailto:moorecharlie70@yahoo.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, June 01, 2015 4:55 PM

**To:** Ascher, Debra

**Subject:** Re: New Non-Resident Waterfowl Proposition

Madison, South Dakota

Charlie Moore

---

On Jun 1, 2015, at 4:15 PM, Charlie Moore <[moorecharlie70@yahoo.com](mailto:moorecharlie70@yahoo.com)> wrote:

John,

I am writing you in regards to the non-resident waterfowl proposal hearing that is coming up June 4th.

These proposals for changes are to appease a select few who get personal benefit from the changes. Be it, paid hunting, lodges, and hotels. The reality of the proposal is that it is not founded on biology, conservation, or the voice of the majority of the outdoorsman and tax payers of this state.

We only need to look north one state to see the profound affects over hunting can have a great natural resource. We need to protect the wonderful duck hunting we have in our state. We are blessed with great waterfowl hunting and our goal should be to preserve that with the current regulations we have on limits and the number of license for non-residents.

I am opposed to these new proposals/ideas on raising the number of non-resident license. Our resource cannot handle the added pressure with the way our water ways are shrinking every year. Especially in Eastern South Dakota, where the number of wetlands just keeps decreasing.

Also, I have not heard non-residents complaining about our current license regulations. They seem happy with what it currently in place. Let's not put our natural resources in jeopardy to appease a few who want to utilize this to make more money, regardless of the toll it will take on the hunting our state.

Sincerely,

Charlie Moore

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Associates

**From:** Earl Graham [<mailto:earlg41@yahoo.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, June 01, 2015 4:43 PM

**To:** Ascher, Debra

**Subject:** Re: Associates

Earl Graham  
742 Hot Water Rd  
Tellico Plains TN 37385

---

**From:** Earl Graham [<mailto:earlg41@yahoo.com>]

**Sent:** Sunday, May 31, 2015 8:07 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Associates

Know having meeting on June 4&5 about non-resident duck permits  
have hunted as non-resident 13 of past 15 years and do not want to see system changed

DO NOT MESS UP THE GREAT EXPERIENCE OF DUCK HUNTING IN SD!!!!!!

If need more money--raise price of license--we will pay it!!!!

Change price of license to cover the preference point system--do not make us jump thru  
another hoop.

thanks for listening to and Old Duck Hunter

Earl Graham

## Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Jeff Clow <dj27193@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 31, 2015 7:52 AM  
**To:** jlcoop11@aol.com; Peterson, Cathy; hpd@nvc.net; barryj@gwtc.net;  
gary.jenses@state.sd.us; Phillips, W. Scott; Sather, Duane; Spies, Jim  
**Cc:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** NR Waterfowl Licenses

### Commission Members

Please leave the current number of NR waterfowl licenses alone and if you do anything do what the majority of residents want and reduce the number by at least 5 to 10%. Do not transfer licenses from the Missouri River to any were else in the state, the rest of the state has to many NR hunters now. Allowing some NR youth hunters with the resident youth season would be good as they are the future of waterfowl hunting. And please after you do what is right and limit NR license do not bring it up every year.

Thank You

Jeff Clow

Harrisburg, SD

[dj27193@gmail.com](mailto:dj27193@gmail.com)

## Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Dana Iverson <danai@alliedmidwest.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 31, 2015 9:20 AM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Canadian Goose season

Please consider the following to help alleviate the overpopulation of the Canadian Goose:  
Since the geese are not gender specific, allow hunters to harvest them ½ hour past sunset.  
Although geese are not classified under big game, this would give hunters additional time in the field at the prime opportunity when geese are moving back and forth from feeding to nesting.  
If a survey was done, I am fairly certain that you would find out that a much higher harvest rate could be accomplished by this simple adjustment.  
Thank you for your consideration.  
Dana Iverson  
47856 Atterbury Court  
Harrisburg, SD  
57032

## Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** GREGG <gkncrlaur@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 31, 2015 10:37 AM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** non resident waterfowl

My brother-in-law gave me the article from the Aberdeen paper with info for the waterfowl non resident hunting in South Dakota for non-residents. Our family members live in Campbell County . For 3 years we traveled out for waterfowl hunting in October when my license was drawn. We had some good times and my kids enjoyed coming along. Then I wasn't drawn and we haven't tried since. Now my kids are old enough to hunt but I'm not sure we will apply.

What would really get us to come back would be if there were 3 day licenses available for more areas of the state, i.e. Campbell Co in our case. If there were more 3 day licenses available especially in areas that aren't real hotbeds of waterfowl hunting perhaps SD would get more tourism dollars without putting too much non resident pressure on the waterfowl hunting as people would travel in, spend money, get some hunting in, and then go home. In our case we have the added benefit on some quality time with the relatives.

I had considered going to North Dakota this year since I was disgusted with the situation with the SD licenses. It gets expensive to buy the full price on youth licenses for only 2 or 3 days of hunting. It adds up for a family. I believe ND gives the traditional youth discounts.

Gregg Laurence  
Willmar, MN  
320 235-3237  
[gkncrlaur@msn.com](mailto:gkncrlaur@msn.com)

## Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** John Fuglsang <john\_fuglsang@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 31, 2015 11:58 AM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Nonresident Waterfowl

Dear SDGFP Commission

I am writing you to voice my opposition to the current proposal for non resident waterfowl licenses. I am not in favor of any of the proposed changes. These proposed changes will add additional hunting pressure to some hunting areas, including areas that I hunt. As you are aware, waterfowl do not take much hunting pressure before they move. I have heard comments from some saying that they drive by some of these public hunting areas and they don't see anyone present so they seem to think that we could allow more hunters. Many of the public hunting areas are not that large and can only accept one or at most two hunting groups and if they are hunted the birds are pushed off of them and the hunting may not be good for several days after.

I was born and raised in South Dakota. I went to college in the state earning a degree where I could have gone to work most anywhere in the world. I decided to stay in South Dakota. One of the major reasons for this decision was the outdoor activities that were available. I am friends with many individuals who made the same choice I made. As hunting and fishing opportunities slowly degrade through time, South Dakota will lose this unique calling card that keeps many citizens from relocating to other states. I view the proposed changes to the non resident waterfowl licenses as another step in the degradation of the high quality waterfowl hunting that we currently have.

I am not sure who the small minority of people you are trying to appease with this proposal are but this is certainly not what the vast majority of South Dakota outdoorsman want. I have also heard that a large number of nonresident waterfowl hunters also do not want our system to change as they too do not want to deal with additional increases in hunting pressure.

Thank you,  
John Fuglsang  
Pierre, SD

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**From:** GREGORY J LOCY <mgaklocy@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 31, 2015 12:36 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Public comment on GAME, FISH AND PARKS COMMISSION ACTION PROPOSAL  
Nonresident Waterfowl Licenses

Public comment on GAME, FISH AND PARKS COMMISSION ACTION PROPOSAL Nonresident Waterfowl Licenses Chapters 41:06:02:03, 41:06:16 and 41:06:49

5/31/2015

First I would like to thank you for allowing the non residents a voice with the issue of non resident waterfowl licensing. As a regular yearly visitor to South Dakota in the summers and fall since the late 1980's I have developed many long traditions with relatives and hunting and fishing friends over the years because I was able to partake in the vast fishing and hunting opportunities in the great state of South Dakota.

The Workgroup proposal regarding the allocation of 2,000 10-day licenses for the NE SD license unit sounds ok on the surface, but since most are likely wanting to hunt in that area the new allocation would additionally limit the chances of getting drawn for the area that we regularly hunt. I would also favor a 5 day license in lieu of 10 day licenses (or make the 3 day a 5 day license?), this could potentially increase the potential hunters by keeping the total potential non resident hunting days the same but give more faithful hunters opportunity to hunt.

The following study: <http://gfp.sd.gov/hunting/waterfowl/docs/future-of-waterfowl-hunting-summary.pdf> shows a dramatic decrease in resident waterfowl hunting. but assume the downward trend is continuing. even though the study is from 2008. Isn't the waterfowl hunting tradition one that we want to keep alive in the state of South Dakota regardless of the residency status of an individual? With the enormous amount of both federal and state hunting land to include CRP and CREP lands in the state the proper management of these lands includes fair usage and opportunity. I'm not sure that it is being achieved at this point.

I do also not understand why allocations have not increased in many years but demand (or number of entries into the lottery) has? If my memory serves me correct the non resident success rate was well over 92-95% just 15 or so years ago. Last year's statewide results: (only a 71% success rate after preference points)

NonResident / 00B86				
Nonresident Waterfowl license	Licenses Available to	Number of	Licenses	
	Preference Group	Applications	Issued	Remaining Licenses
1+preference points	3725	853	853	2872
W0+	2872	4049	2872	0

I can purchase a nonresident small game/pheasant and fishing licenses in any Walmart yet for waterfowl we use the lottery. Not sure I fully understand the logic here but more importantly if you want to put a limit on the number of hunters ok but the allocation for the number issued has remained relatively flat. I hope the new proposals can help to keep our traditions alive and not limit the future of the sport and its heritage.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,

Gregory Locy  
111 Amber Woods Drive  
Canonsburg, PA 15317  
(412) 877-0290

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**From:** Chris Hesla <sdwf@mncomm.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 31, 2015 3:57 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Nonresident waterfowl

Please do not change anything to do with current NR Waterfowl licenses. If you do want to do something REDUCE THEM!!!!

Chris Hesla  
PO Box 361  
Pierre, SD 57501

Dear South Dakota Game and Fish Commissioners:

My name is Bobby Cox and I have lived in South Dakota since 2002. I moved here from North Dakota for one reason and one reason only---to enjoy quality duck hunting. Quality duck hunting is determined by the ratio of the number of ducks and accessible land on which to hunt them *relative* to the number of duck hunters. Duck hunting quality is greatest in places with lots of ducks and few hunters, and poorest in places with few ducks and lots of hunters. South Dakota has among the best duck habitat remaining in the US, which is good for ducks, and South Dakota has a sparse human population and a long history of restricting non-resident hunters, which has limited non-resident and commercial duck hunting interests to this point.

Duck hunting is not like a lot of other outdoor activities that people enjoy in that adding participants detracts from the experience of those already engaged in the activity. You can double the size of a football stadium and the corresponding seating capacity without seriously detracting from the experience enjoyed by those who already had season tickets. Yes, the parking becomes more crowded and more limited, the lines become longer, etc., but having more people seated at a football game doesn't really detract from the game itself being played. And the additional people can actually add to the experience when cheering for the home team. As you add duck hunters while keeping everything else equal, the ducks become more skittish and they actually *change their behavior* and become more secretive, more nocturnal, and if given enough disturbance from hunters, they will move dozens or hundreds of miles to relocate to areas where they aren't being harassed. So unlike the football game itself that doesn't change when the number of participants increases, the duck hunting game changes significantly for the worst when the number of participants increases. I didn't make it that way, but I do recognize that that's just the way it is.

In case no one else has been bold enough to point this out to you, there's a big reason why South Dakota is the 17th largest state in the US in terms of area but it's only the 46th largest state in terms of human population. That reason is that there aren't a lot of reasons to live in South Dakota if you don't own a lot of land and farm. There's very little technology-based industry and associated jobs here, and it's also brutally cold in the winter. The goods and services available to the average South Dakota resident are much sparser and more expensive than they are to US citizens who live in more populated areas. I'm one of the few duck hunters who'll sacrifice all that other stuff to live in an area that has great duck hunting.

My wife and I started a business here in 2006 and we had up to 5 full-time employees at a time here. We went out of our way to buy a lot of goods and services for our business locally. We just retired from our business and sold it to a local businessman. We've just completely remodelled our home and we are perfectly content to live out our years here in South Dakota, IF the duck hunting quality remains high. And it really doesn't matter what anyone else thinks about what the quality of duck hunting is because beauty is in the eye of the beholder, and the only opinions that matter as to what the duck hunting quality is like are ours.

I strongly urge you not to do anything to further increase hunting pressure on ducks here in South

Dakota, but also to actually decrease some of the pressure that already exists. The current 1,500 3-day non-resident waterfowl licenses that are allowed in the northeastern part of the state were never intended to be moved there from the Missouri River area that extends north of Pierre. And the current proposal of exacerbating that situation by adding even more licenses and creating another area like it including Edmunds County where I live to increase hunting pressure in is totally unacceptable.

Sincerely,

Bobby and Kim Cox, Ipswich, SD

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Nonresident Waterfowl Permit Proposal

**From:** Tom and Theresa Curran [<mailto:tcurran3@yahoo.com>]

**Sent:** Sunday, May 31, 2015 6:54 PM

**To:** [jlcoop11@aol.com](mailto:jlcoop11@aol.com); Peterson, Cathy; [hpd@nvc.net](mailto:hpd@nvc.net); [barryj@gwtc.net](mailto:barryj@gwtc.net); Jensen, Gary; Phillips, W. Scott; Sather, Duane; Spies, Jim; GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Nonresident Waterfowl Permit Proposal

Dear Commissioner:

I am writing the South Dakota Game Fish and Parks Commission again to respectfully request that you not increase the number of nonresident waterfowl licenses in the most heavily hunted areas of our state. Available hunting areas in units 00Y and 00A in eastern South Dakota are consistently experiencing overcrowding due to the number of waterfowl hunters in these units. The competition for hunting opportunities is causing stress among hunters resulting in arguments and worse. Drought conditions, waterfowl guides, and commercialism of wildlife resources are putting pressure on hunting areas that negatively impact the average hunter. Also, loss of habitat further negatively impacts the situation by concentrating waterfowl and hunters into fewer and fewer areas. I want people from other states to have an opportunity to hunt South Dakota, just as I appreciate being able to hunt other states. Every year nonresident hunters come hunt waterfowl with me. I am sure you have received many comments from resident and nonresident hunters that explain how an increase in licenses to the eastern part of South Dakota will hurt the quality of waterfowl hunting opportunities in that part of our state. Please save our waterfowling tradition.

I have hunted the Springfield area on the Missouri River for over 20 years. I am a 3 time Nebraska state duck calling champion. I have organized, ran, and volunteered at over 20 world sanctioned state and regional duck and goose calling contests. I have taught duck calling classes. I have taken youth on mentored waterfowl hunts. I have volunteered at the SD GF&P Step Outside program in Armour ever since they started 7 years ago and the Scotland, SD program last year, teaching close to 100 kids each year age 6 to 16 about waterfowl hunting, decoys, and both duck and goose calling. I have also volunteered at several other events providing waterfowling and calling instruction to over 100 kids.

I mention these activities to demonstrate that I am very passionate about waterfowl hunting and about sharing and encouraging others, especially young people, to take up this sport. A person needs to be passionate to hunt waterfowl. The investment in time, money and effort is larger than almost any other hunting sport – when you consider boats, decoys, guns, waders, all sorts of foul weather gear, special shotgun shells, dogs, trailers, calls, and a lot of time scouting and participating.

I understand this is a difficult issue with many social and financial aspects. I respectfully request that no changes to the current license distribution be made, unless they are decreased. This should include nonresident youth licenses as well. Adding youth licenses is an attempt to free up more lottery licenses and therefore is another increase in licenses. Please consider the overwhelming majority of hunter inputs from our state and do not increase the number of nonresident licenses to eastern South Dakota by moving them from the central part of our state.

Thank you for your hard work and consideration on this issue.

Sincerely, Tom Curran, Yankton, SD

## Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Collin Knudson <knudsoco@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 29, 2015 9:51 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Non-resident waterfowl

To SDGFP,

I have concerns with the non-resident waterfowl proposal. I fear, that like pheasant hunting, waterfowl hunting in the state will become 'commercialized'. I am adamantly against increasing licenses and opening doors to increased traffic to the state of South Dakota's wonderful waterfowl opportunities.

I'd prefer to start a strong youth campaign and grow economy through increased South Dakota hunters.

I typically don't hunt the northeast, where the proposed increase is greatest, but I feel the state in general should look into other options to make up for the lost revenue of decreased pheasant hunting opportunities. I'd be willing to share my thoughts in person at any time.

Thanks.

Collin Knudson  
Tea, S.D.

## Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** RICHARD ROVANG <ricrov@abe.midco.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 29, 2015 10:24 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Proposed changes to 2015 nonresident waterfowl season

Submitted to Secretary of the Department of GF&P

I am against the proposed changes to the 2015 nonresident waterfowl season, particularly changes that allow an increase in nonresident licenses for the northeast unit.

First, I am more than disappointed in our State legislature for passing the responsibility for setting waterfowl license limits for nonresident hunters to GF&P. This legislation has the fingerprints of small but powerful special interest groups all over it. If a vote came up in the South Dakota legislature to increase the number of nonresident waterfowl licenses it would be defeated because our representatives know that a large majority of their constituents are against it. In passing the responsibility to GF&P our representatives think they are "washing their hands" of the issue while satisfying the special interest groups and letting GF&P take the heat. Paraphrasing Winston Churchill with respect to how the legislature handled this issue, "I could carve a more substantial backbone out of a banana".

In trying to understand the motivation for the proposed changes to the nonresident waterfowl rules, I looked at what GF&P officially stated which is: "Provide nonresident waterfowl hunting opportunity consistent with wildlife management objectives". Not being able to figure out what that meant, I looked at who is supporting these proposed changes and found it to be hotel groups and guide services with the argument of how much money and the jobs it will bring to South Dakota. This may hold true for a very small segment of the South Dakota population but when looked at from a larger, state-wide perspective, the proposed changes will, in the long run, hurt the State economy. What makes an economy grow and prosper? A major factor is the people. What enables a state to retain and attract individuals? It's the quality of life. For many people contemplating relocation to South Dakota, the superb hunting opportunities are a major attraction. In talking to an individual involved in recruiting people to the Aberdeen area, she affirmed that quality hunting was a big plus. And by "quality hunting" I mean a non-commercial opportunity to pursue waterfowl (or other game) in an area with reasonable game populations, little interference from other hunters, using your own wits and skills to attain your hunting goals. If all you want to do is shoot birds and don't mind shoulder to shoulder hunting on a time table, and paying big bucks, states like Texas and California can give you all the hunting you want. How much real wealth do a few hundred or even thousands of nonresident hunters, who come for a few days or weeks during prime hunting, bring to the State compared to the people that live here? To prosper, it's more important to focus on making and keeping South Dakota a great place to live than just a good place to visit. Ruining waterfowl hunting for us residents and those that might come, is not the way to do that.

Rich Rovang  
Aberdeen, SD

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**To:** carlson578@gmail.com  
**Subject:** FW: glenn carlson lake andes sd

**From:** Glenn Carlson [<mailto:carlson578@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 30, 2015 9:11 AM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** glenn carlson lake andes sd

I don't think we need any additional zones set up for non resident waterfowl. I think the new north east zone is going to see more outfitters leasing up land because of the out of state hunters like whats happened over the years by the river with the goose hunting.

## Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Richard <richard@lmccalls.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 30, 2015 9:23 AM  
**To:** jlcoop11@aol.com; Peterson, Cathy; hpd@nvc.net; barryj@gwtc.net; Jensen, Gary; Phillips, W. Scott; Sather, Duane; Spies, Jim; GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** NR Waterfowl Licenses

Good Morning, there is some serious concern about this topic as a whole and how it is being handled.

Thousands of comments and public testimony are against any increase and some support a decrease, yet you guys still suggest an increase? how is that possible? is that fair for the State and its people?

The workgroup was heavily weighted with commercial interests and not about the people as a whole. The thousands of waterfowl hunters (resident and non resident) that are being represented, only two members are on the board. Conversely, there are five members on the board who represented their own commercial interests or a few commercial hunting operations. Of 101 state legislators, only two were primary sponsors of bills to increase licenses in 2014. Yet, these legislators were two of the three legislators on the board. From hundreds of comments received by the Workgroup, over 90% of resident waterfowl hunters as well as 40% of non-resident hunters wanted a reduction or at least no increase in the number of hunters.

Please read the above paragraph again, very important info there.

The public testimony was also heavily leaning towards leaving licenses as is or lowering....When is the GFP going to do what the majority of the people want and not what a few commercial operations want?

Tell me how the above makes sense? I am a very reasonable person, and nothing about this process is fair. Now, you see where the people of South Dakota are disappointed, GFP is ignoring hundreds of comments of the people (who the GFP should be representing) and are helping commercial interests instead....What is the point of a workgroup if its all one sided? shouldn't a workgroup have equal involvement from both sides, so that a fair conclusion can be drawn?

### **Here are my suggestions:**

- **There MUST be a 5-10% decrease in all non-resident licenses.**
- **Need to remove 500 of the 3-day licenses in NE SD and have them returned to the Missouri River area.**
- **Some NR youth licenses should be added for the same time frame as the resident youth season.**
- **These rules should stay in effect for 3-5 years so we don't have this consternation every year.**

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

### **Richard Visker**

Pro-Staff Manager

Lynch Mob Calls

[www.lynchmobcalls.com](http://www.lynchmobcalls.com)

Sioux Falls, SD | 605-351-7373

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Non-resident waterfowl changes

On May 29, 2015, at 1:13 PM, Dave Jacobson <[djacobson@pie.midco.net](mailto:djacobson@pie.midco.net)> wrote:

Dear Chairman Cooper:

I'm writing to comment on the Commission's upcoming decision regarding non-resident waterfowl license changes. Please do NOT APPROVE the changes proposed by the Governor's Work Group. I know you personally have a lot of knowledge about this issue. Although you weren't born and raised here, you have the experience to know that the type of waterfowl hunting we have here in South Dakota (available to people of all means) is a heritage and tradition worth keeping. I will freely admit my bias as I'm a third generation South Dakota waterfowler now 57 years old and newly retired from State employment, who still has a passion for duck and goose hunting both in eastern SD and around Pierre.

You know that as an example, as a result of commercialization, waterfowl hunting in the Pierre area before the Lower Oahe program, was largely limited to right of ways and occasionally to a few public areas which were crowded when productive. After we opened the gate to out of staters, I believe you were part of the team which came up with the a solution that provided all the public with places to hunt.

I don't see anything like that in the proposal before you now. It seems totally one sided in providing profit to a few tourism industry proponents (which includes the commercial hunters) while the general public pays the bill in lost opportunity. Seems like a total lack of equity. Of course that might be expected from a group so lopsided in favor of further commercial exploitation of the public's wildlife. The Governor should be ashamed of how he so obviously loaded this Work Group with commercial proponents and the Work Group should be ashamed of their disregard and disrespect for the public comments they received.

You know all of the reasons the resident hunting public is concerned about this so I won't repeat all the arguments against the Work Group proposal, such as the difference between waterfowl hunting and pheasant hunting, excessive pressure being detrimental to migratory waterfowl hunting, out of state ownership of the best hunting areas, commercial hunters coming to the legislature every year to attack public opportunity etc. etc.

I know you are a busy guy so I'll let you go. Thanks for considering my comment.

David Jacobson

216 W. 8<sup>th</sup> Street

Pierre, SD 57501

## Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Dave Jacobson <djacobson@pie.midco.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 30, 2015 11:52 AM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** June 4 Commission meeting waterfowl licensing comments

Dear Sirs:

Please add the following comments to your public record regarding the Commission's June 4 decision on non-resident waterfowl licensing.

Please do NOT APPROVE the changes proposed by the Governor's Work Group. The type of waterfowl hunting we have here in South Dakota (still largely available to people of all means) is a heritage and tradition worth keeping. The proposal put before you created by the Governor's Work Group, works directly against this principle of providing opportunity to all of the public. Further commercial takeover of waterfowl hunting in South Dakota will absolutely result in lost opportunity and availability for people who reside here and obviously support their communities year round.

Most South Dakotans cannot compete economically with many out of state hunters if hunting goes to the highest bidder. The vast majority of South Dakota residents don't live here to become rich. They live here because of the quality of life, which includes unique opportunities including waterfowl hunting. For many of us, this is a tradition and heritage enjoyed for generations and we want to preserve this. How many of the general public make six figure incomes or can afford expensive leases, commercial memberships or guiding services costing hundreds if not thousands of dollars for each hunt. Please understand that low and mid income hunters are not only those working at lower paying jobs but are also comprised of elderly on fixed incomes, who have paid for licenses for decades, and also youth who have not yet entered the job market. Even those with higher paying jobs but with multiple kids cannot afford commercial hunting. This is the primary threat posed by increased non-resident licenses.

Some other points to consider.

> Waterfowl are not like pheasants. You cannot just order up another truck load of birds to be scattered out for a new party of hunters. Waterfowl are found in a limited number of places and will leave when over pressured. Right now there is a higher than normal number of wetlands to hunt waterfowl. This will certainly change with inevitable drought at some point in the future. Pressure will be compounded.

> Increased licenses have and will result in increased non-resident ownership of land. Not only does this leave the resident fewer places to hunt, these owners do not support local communities and pay taxes year round. There is no shortage people from other states who can pay any price and drive up prices for land they consider a speculative investment and recreational property. There are many negative consequences when land prices rise because of this.

> In Pierre, where the non-resident issue has long been debated, residents of modest means were forced to hunt either right of ways, or public areas that were overcrowded when productive. When commercial interests went to the legislature to get more non-resident licenses, the agreements that were struck contained a degree of fairness in that both commercial interests and the public benefited.

For example, when increasing numbers of non-resident licenses were granted in the Pierre area, the Lower Oahe program was created to offset the added competition from non-residents. I don't see anything like that in the proposal before you now. It seems totally one sided in providing profit to a few tourism industry proponents (which includes the commercial hunters) while the general public pays the bill in lost opportunity. Of course that might be expected from a group so lopsided in favor of further commercial exploitation of the public's wildlife. The Governor should be ashamed of how he so obviously loaded this Work Group with commercial proponents and the Work Group should be ashamed of their disregard and disrespect for the public comments they received.

Thank you for considering my comments and the welfare of all of the public.

David Jacobson

216 W. 8<sup>th</sup> Street

Pierre, SD 57501

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Non-resident Waterfowl License

On May 29, 2015, at 9:18 PM, Arnie and Lori Goldade <[arnielori@abe.midco.net](mailto:arnielori@abe.midco.net)> wrote:

Dear Commissioners,

So who do you suppose started this mess of mixing money with recreation? Was it the hunter who offered the landowner money to exclusive hunting rights on his property, or was it the landowner who asked for money to hunt? Whoever it was, it ticks me off that it ever happened, or that it was allowed to happen.

We all saw what happened to residents and pheasant hunting. Will the same thing happen to residents and waterfowl hunting? Norb Barrie believes the small towns need Non Resident (NR) hunters to survive. I don't doubt that NR's are a boost in the bank accounts for small town businesses, but I also know that resident hunters boost the small town economy as much or more. My son, who is now 30, and his buddies, chose to stay in SD for the hunting opportunities. They are graduates from a small school in a small town, many of them live in the larger SD towns now, but they still go back to their home turf to hunt the weekends during the season. They live here, work here, pay taxes, raise families, etc. All good things for SD!

Please keep these young residents, and the next generation they bring into SD, in mind when you vote for the NR Waterfowl Licenses. Believe me, the number of young residents who stay here far outnumber the folks who want to take money from the NR hunters. Let's keep the access open for our young waterfowl hunters by not changing the regulations we already have in place.

Fortunately for me I have been a HuntSAFE Instructor for the past 10+ years, and I also coach in our local youth trapshooting league, so I get to know a lot of these young people and I can't begin to tell you how happy I am when these youngsters migrate back to my home ground after they've received their higher education.

I have nothing against NR hunters, as I look forward to having my own NR friends and relatives come to hunt. They enjoy the quality of hunting in SD more than anyplace else, and they accept the "Unsuccessful" draw they get every once in a while for the waterfowl hunting.

Thank you for your time and consideration!

May your day be all that you are hunting for,

Lori Goldade

12892 Fairfield Drive

Aberdeen SD 57401

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: FW: Non resident waterfowl

**From:** Andrew Richwalski [<mailto:richwal317@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Friday, May 29, 2015 8:47 PM

**To:** Ascher, Debra

**Subject:** Re: FW: Non resident waterfowl

Pollock South Dakota

**From:** Andrew Richwalski [<mailto:richwal317@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 27, 2015 8:49 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Non resident waterfowl

Its very simple.... Leave the non resident waterfowl licenses the way it is.

Dear Members of the SD Game Commission:

The SD Waterfowl Association is a group of over 500 waterfowl hunters from SD and around the country and we represent the 30,000 hunters that purchased a migratory bird certification last year in South Dakota. Our governing board has a wealth of waterfowl experience and our primary goal is to preserve the quality of waterfowl hunting that we enjoy in South Dakota for future generations.

I was asked to be on the NR Workgroup and approached this opportunity with an open mind. While serving on the Workgroup it was obvious that the make-up of the group was unbalanced. For example, our organization along with the SD Wildlife Federation represents thousands of hunters, yet we only had 2 seats on the Workgroup. There are numerous other sportsman organizations which could have been on the Workgroup as well.

On the other hand, there were 5 members on the Workgroup with commercial ties representing themselves or only a few. Of 101 state legislators, only 2 were primary sponsors of bills to increase licenses in 2014. Yet, these legislators were 2 of the 3 legislators on the Workgroup. These members do not speak for waterfowl hunters.

The current proposal was supposedly a "consensus" that came from the Workgroup. There was no consensus on anything. The only members that supported this proposal were the 5 commercial members. The other 4 members of the Workgroup did not support this proposal. Recommendations of the SDWA were not part of the "proposal" and in fact were not given any serious consideration by the commercial interests on the Workgroup. It seems the final recommendation to increase the number of nonresident waterfowl hunters was a forgone conclusion intended to assist those who want to profit from a public resource.

Here are some important facts:

1. The majority of comments were against raising the number of non-resident hunters as 90-95% of residents who identified themselves as waterfowl hunters wanted a **reduction** or no increase in NR hunters.
2. The few residents that wanted more licenses were either commercial hunters or businesses.
3. Comments from Non-residents indicated that 40% were against any increase in NR hunters.

**Therefore, the SDWA does not support the current proposal.**

There is nothing beneficial to resident waterfowl hunters in the current proposal. In order to improve the hunting experience, we propose the following changes to help resident hunters and improve hunting for everyone.

1. Reduce the number of all types of non-resident waterfowl licenses by 10%.
2. Move the 500 non-resident 3-day licenses in northeast SD back to the Pierre area. These licenses should not have been moved in the first place.
3. Reduce hunting pressure by spreading NR hunters out spatially or temporally, using zones or specified time frames. For example, the NE zone which was part of the proposal could work if the numbers were further reduced.
4. We support the creation of 100 NR youth licenses to run concurrently with the resident youth season which was our only recommendation that is in the current proposal.

Chuck Dieter, President, SDWA  
*Chuck Dieter*

Governing Board

Spencer Vaa  
Bobbi Cox  
Carl Madsen  
Bill Antonides  
John Simpson  
Spencer Hawley  
Tom Yseth

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: non resident waterfowl licenses

**From:** Terry Nemitz [<mailto:terry@teamoutlaw.com>]

**Sent:** Friday, May 29, 2015 5:24 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** non resident waterfowl licenses

I would strongly urge the board to consider the following for criteria in allocating non-resident waterfowl licenses:

Request a 5-10% *decrease* in all non-resident licenses.

Request removal of the 500 3-day licenses in NE SD and have them returned to the Missouri River area.

Allow some NR youth licenses for the same time frame as the resident youth season.

Request that rules stay in effect for 3-5 years so we don't have this consternation every year.

Thank you for your consideration and please don't let the minority group of outfitters and board members make a policy that effects our great states waterfowl hunting. This board is letting the minority make the rules for the majority and needs to listen to their constituents.

Terry Nemitz, Brookings, SD 605-692-9857

[Website](#)

[Facebook](#)

## Ascher, Debra

---

**From:** Hettick, Dave  
**Sent:** Friday, May 29, 2015 5:46 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Bennett County Special Canada Goose

Dear Commissioners,

Please keep the Bennett County Special Canada Goose Season. While adding Bennett County to Unit 2 might temporarily provide more people hunting opportunity, it wouldn't last because LaCreek Refuge, where the geese stay, is such a small area. The same thing that happens in January when you open the area up to unlimited hunting will occur in November. The geese get enough pressure they just move to the Platte River a few miles south in Nebraska.

Right now it is a quality hunt. The geese stay all season unless it gets really cold. The limited amount of hunters haven't alienated landowners, it's unusual to find one that won't let you hunt if you make the effort to ask. The hunting hasn't been commercialized. Some people like myself just go there more to watch the migration spectacle than to kill a goose. All of this will change if you move the area into the general waterfowl season of Unit 2. Surely it can't be that much of an inconvenience for GF&P to keep this area limited draw, can it?

Thank you for your consideration.

David M Hettick  
PO box 301  
Hot Springs, SD 57747



Greater Dacotah Chapter-SCI  
PO Box 9455  
Rapid City, SD 57709

GFP Commission  
523 East Capitol Avenue  
Pierre, SD 57501

The Greater Dacotah Chapter of SCI would like to express their support for continuing with the special Canada goose hunting season in Bennett County (ARSD 41:06:16). We believe that the goose tags provide for an excellent hunting opportunity in western South Dakota where we have a very limited goose hunting opportunity unlike the Missouri River and the wetlands of eastern South Dakota. With the hunting opportunities afforded by the WIA program, and the LaCreek National Wildlife Refuge as both a protected and staging area for Canada geese there is no other area in western South Dakota that has these unique options for both hunters and waterfowl.

This is one area of western South Dakota that resident hunters have the opportunity to apply for Canada goose tags, and have a very successful "Do it Yourself" hunt. The removal of the tag season will increase hunter numbers in this unique area and have a negative impact on hunt quality for resident hunters. The WIA program has been very successful in this county for waterfowl, small game, and big game hunting for both residents and nonresident hunters. It is very possible that individuals and outfitters could lease up the lands that are in the WIA program as well as other private lands in the area and the opportunities for the do-it-yourself (DIY) hunter will be lost or severely limited.

The Greater Dacotah Chapter is a leader in hunter conservation in South Dakota and provides funding for a variety of wildlife conservation projects to increase hunter opportunity and wildlife conservation. If you need more information on GDC-SCI please visit our website at <http://greaterdacotahchapter-sci.org/main/>

Thanks again for the opportunity to express our concerns for this change in management direction.

Dennie Mann

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Dennie Mann".

President of GDC-SCI

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Waterfowl non- resident license

**From:** Matt Nofziger [<mailto:nofzmatt@showplacewood.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, June 01, 2015 1:36 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Waterfowl non- resident license

Please do not increase the amount of waterfowl licenses. We don't need any more out of state hunters.

Matt Nofziger

Materials Manager

Showplace Wood Products

Ph: 605-743-2200 ext. 5968

[nofzmatt@showplacewood.com](mailto:nofzmatt@showplacewood.com)

Harrisburg, SD

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Non-resident waterfowl license.

**From:** Mark Stults [<mailto:908eureka@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, June 01, 2015 1:34 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Non-resident waterfowl license.

Please leave non-resident waterfowl license requirements as they are.

Mark Stults

Spearfish, SD.

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Non Resident Waterfowl Hunting

**From:** tom black [<mailto:tomblackinspector@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, June 01, 2015 1:55 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Non Resident Waterfowl Hunting

Local hunters are the back bone of this state. If outsiders want to hunt here they should move here and fill our thousands of jobs that our employers need filled.

Do not allow the hotel industry and the private pay for hunting operations ruin waterfowl hunting like they did the pheasant hunting in our beloved state.

Do not allow for expansion of the number of nonresident waterfowl hunters.

They will fixate on the migrating flocks and hoard the wildlife, this will push out local hunters.

You can not plant pen raised ducks like you can pheasants. They are not same animal and they can not be hunted the same way.

Protect at least one resource for the local hunters.

Tom Black  
1420 N Main  
Aberdeen, SD

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: please leave nonresident waterfowl the way it is

---

**From:** Colette Hesla [<mailto:colettehesla@mncomm.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, June 01, 2015 11:28 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:**

please leave nonresident waterfowl the way it is

Thank you

Colette

Colette Hesla RN, MBA

Strategic Health Consulting, LLC

[colettehesla@mncomm.com](mailto:colettehesla@mncomm.com)

605 222-9071

Fort Pierre, SD

## Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** FW: FW: waterfowl lic

-----Original Message-----

From: Bickner Electric [<mailto:bickner@midstatesd.net>]

Sent: Saturday, May 30, 2015 2:59 PM

To: Ascher, Debra

Subject: Re: FW: waterfowl lic

Kimball, South Dakota

thank you

Harold

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Bickner Electric [<mailto:bickner@midstatesd.net>]

> Sent: Friday, May 29, 2015 2:51 PM

> To: GFP Wild Info

> Subject: waterfowl lic

>

> Gentlemen

> Without hearing the arguments for shifting license's around I cannot  
> make an informed opinion. However I would oppose any increase in the  
> amount of out of state licenses or any increase in the amount of days  
> allowed to hunt.

> I listened to a speech by Supreme Justice Scalia in which he warned  
> about letting hunting become only for the aristocrats as it is in  
> Europe. I feel this will eventually lead to money controlling the  
> duck hunting. thank you for considering my thoughts on this subject.

>

> Respectfully

> Harold R. Bickner

>

>

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:**

FW: NON-RESIDENT WATERFOWL PROPOSAL

On May 30, 2015, at 1:50 PM, Jesse Weeks <[gooseman1981@yahoo.com](mailto:gooseman1981@yahoo.com)> wrote:

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to voice my concerns regarding the proposed increase in non-resident hunting privileges in South Dakota. I have been hunting all varieties of game in this state for 22 years, and this passion is one of the main reasons I choose to remain in this state. Over the years it has become increasingly difficult to secure land suitable for hunting, and an increase in the number of non-resident licenses will only make it more difficult for those of us who live here.

I understand the concept of bringing out of state dollars in to South Dakota, but based on my own personal experience in recent years, the dollars of our residents are being spent in neighboring states and Canada due to over-crowding on public and private land. I also understand we need to offer non-resident hunters the opportunity to enjoy our state, and I have several friends who do spend much time here. I propose you vote to slightly decrease the number of non-resident licenses if you want to keep us from traveling elsewhere to find suitable hunting opportunities, or to keep us from giving up the hobby out of frustration.

I would like to give you an example of a conversation I recently had with a group of friends who travel here from North Dakota to hunt. They have basically given up trying to hunt at home, because North Dakota opened hunting in that state to anyone and everyone. I believe offering more licenses here will have the same effect in South Dakota.

Thank you for allowing me to voice my concerns, and I hope you seriously consider the points I have addressed. Once a decision is made on this matter, I hope you vote to implement it for a period of 3-5 years to avoid having to address this every year.

Jesse Weeks  
1009 7th Avenue NE  
Watertown, SD 57201

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: Non-Resident Waterfowl Hunting

On May 29, 2015, at 6:05 PM, Ben Burris <[bburris1@yahoo.com](mailto:bburris1@yahoo.com)> wrote:

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in strong opposition of the newly formed proposal for non-resident waterfowl hunting in our great state. The sport of waterfowling was once a great opportunity for South Dakotans and visitors to enjoy the outdoors with family and friends. The sport has progressed into something completely different, fueled by commercialization of the resource, greed, and outside influences. Many residents of our state have simply quit waterfowling, as the hunting pressure and ability to find a location to hunt has become too difficult. The sport/past-time is simply not as enjoyable as it was once, and it will only get worse with increased pressure from additional non-resident hunters.

I'm just speculating but would wager that the majority of folks contacting you about this proposal are in strong opposition as well. I have several non-resident family and friends that apply for waterfowl licenses in South Dakota each year, and they all enjoy the current system and the opportunity it provides when they successfully obtain a license. They mention that our waterfowling heritage will die if we open the floodgates to additional non-resident waterfowl hunters. I agree.

I kindly ask you to fight for the vast majority of South Dakotans and help preserve our strong waterfowling heritage for years to come for both resident and non-resident hunters alike. Thanks for considering my thoughts.

Ben Burris  
*1602 Windermere Way*  
*Brookings, SD 57006*

## Ascher, Debra

---

**Subject:** FW: Non-Resident Waterfowl Proposal

**From:** Eric Paulson [epaulson@nvc.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 31, 2015 10:54 AM  
**To:** Jensen, Gary  
**Subject:** Non-Resident Waterfowl Proposal

Commissioner Jensen,

My name is Eric Paulson and I live in Pierre, SD. I'm writing in regard to the non-resident proposal to be in front of the commission on June 4<sup>th</sup> for decision. To start, let me say the proposal put together by the working group is very disappointing. From looking at the proposal and reading through some of the comments and listening to the meetings the working group didn't take one bit of care to listen to the majority of South Dakota residents.

That last line leads right into my next point, "majority of South Dakota residents". The following is a direct quote from the GFP website on the Commission Information page, "Acting within its legislative mandates, the commission serves as the advocate and liaison between the South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks and its stakeholders – the people of South Dakota." The non-resident work group's recommendation is a slap in the face to YOUR stakeholders. Your stakeholders wrote numerous letters in opposition of any increase or redistribution of the licenses. As noted by Chuck Dieter and stated in the May meeting materials, he counted the public comments and found that 90% of residents, the commission's stakeholders, wanted a reduction or no increase. To me that is an overwhelming majority who are opposed. I'm not sure how the work group could come up with their recommendation if they were truly unbiased and looking out for the hunting heritage of South Dakota for not only the resident hunters but for the non-resident hunters who are able to come to South Dakota and hunt in a world class hunting environment. This proposal, if approved, could start down the slippery slope that changes all of that.

Based on what I've read in comments and heard from meetings a reduction of 5-10% is more along the lines of what needs to be done. Quality of hunting needs to be placed higher on the totem pole than quantity of hunters. If you have poor quality, people will stop coming. If people stop hunting, you lose business.

The "reallocation" of 500 licenses from the Missouri River area to the Northeast is just absurd. Let's call it what it is, it is an increase in the Northeast, where the pay to hunt outfits want more hunters and a reduction in the Missouri area where out of state hunters don't really want to hunt. I could go into why out of state hunters don't want to hunt the river but that is a whole different argument in itself on what commercialization has done, so I won't even go there. This increase to the Northeast needs to be stricken right from the get go and not even considered.

One concession to no increases or even a decrease I think people would be willing to accept would be to add some youth licenses for the youth season. It's always good to get the younger kids involved in hunting. I personally think any licenses give to youth should be taken out of the general non-resident license pool but would be alright with keeping the non-resident allocations and numbers as is and then add in some licenses if and only if they are for youth hunters under the age of 16.

If the commission is concerned with revenues and making more money, than instead of increasing the number of non-resident hunters why don't we just get our non-resident license fees more in line with other states around us? If I did my math correctly and included all of the necessary fees, North Dakota is at \$137 to \$187 for a non-resident license. Minnesota is at around \$127 for a non-resident license. South Dakota is at \$101 for NE SD and \$136 for statewide. Hunting quality is South Dakota is way higher, in my opinion, than Minnesota. And because we are about in line with Minnesota costs and well below in the northeast, that justifies and increase in itself. South Dakota is well below North

Dakota in terms of costs. Currently hunting in South Dakota is just as good if not better than North Dakota, in my opinion. Now I have never hunted out of state, so my judgements are based on reading stories online and in papers and talking to friends who live out of state who are originally from South Dakota. But just based on the level of our fees and the fees of our neighbors, the commission could very easily justify and increase in non-resident fees if they are concerned with revenues. (Take my numbers with a grain of salt, I don't plan to hunt out of state and am a resident of SD therefore spend little time looking at NR fees, therefore they could be off but should be close. I didn't spend hours researching every detail so I just tried to get my best guess based on easily accessible information.)

Just so that we don't have to put up with all of this nonsense every single spring, a moratorium of around 5 years should be put in place. Too many monetary and time resources will be expended if this fight happens every year. At that point money will talk because the ones with the most money will be the ones able to fight this year in and year out. And it seems a majority of the time the money talkers are guides, tourism folks, hotel managers, etc. who's livelihoods are benefitted by increased out of state hunters and will go to great lengths to get more and more the ability to come to South Dakota.

Thank you for your time and I strongly encourage you do vote down the recommendation before you created by the NR Work Group as it is really a punch in the face to the Commission's stakeholders, the residents of South Dakota. And I encourage you to strongly consider a decrease in licenses by 5-10%, but at the very worst I would be ok with a "left as is" at this point in time. It's time to save the great quality of hunting we have in South Dakota and this decision before you will have a significant impact on that quality for years to come.

Thanks,  
Eric Paulson  
2412 E 4<sup>th</sup> St. Apt 217  
Pierre, SD 57501

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: waterfowl license

On May 31, 2015, at 5:42 PM, rick and dee dannen <[ricdee@sio.midco.net](mailto:ricdee@sio.midco.net)> wrote:

I would like to take a moment and express our views on the non resident waterfowl licenses. We feel, my wife and I, that they should stay the same and here's why; with the loss of many CRP acres and the drain tiling of many wetlands there are few places to hunt. I also hunt public land, but they get crowded and now we have a daughter who completed hunter safety and is ready to go. By adding more hunters, changing license allocation, and along with fewer places to go this proposal is not good for anyone. Please listen to the average hunters and keep things the way they are, and not ruin a good thing.

Thank you,

Rick & Dee Dannen  
[Sioux Falls, SD](#)

**Ascher, Debra**

---

**Subject:** FW: change in out of state licenses

**From:** [lodema@midco.net](mailto:lodema@midco.net) [mailto:[lodema@midco.net](mailto:lodema@midco.net)]

**Sent:** Monday, June 01, 2015 10:38 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** change in out of state licenses

Sirs,

Writing in opposition to any changes to increase . Many years back when I was growing up, much land and water was leased and impossible to hunt. This proposed change will take us back to those times. Weigh the benefit of money coming in to SD against our quality of life. I can not give anyone a number of people that are in SD now, but I will assume that it will be high , that are here because of hunting and fishing for our residents. I am sure that for many professionals this is the case. When I graduated for college in 1959, I stayed here for that reason. I could have gone to any neighboring states for at least 20 % more money. When it is so difficult to find teachers an doctors that will stay in SD, we must give then incentive to stay. Do not allow more licenses. Thank you,

Everett Randall

p.o. box 150

Redfield, SD 57469 Phone 605-472-0584

# Center of the Nation Sportsman's Club

PO Box 251 • Belle Fourche, SD 57717



RECEIVED

JUN - 1 2015

Dept. of Game, Fish & Parks  
Pierre, SD 57501

South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks Commissioners,

May 28, 2015

523 East Capitol

Pierre, SD 57501

To Game, Fish and Parks and the Commission,

We are writing to voice our disapproval of the proposal to repeal the Special Canada Goose season in Bennett County. This season has allowed for a very high quality goose hunting opportunity for the residents of the state of South Dakota.

We request that the commission vote not to adopt the following proposals:

- 1) Absorb the current Bennett County 10-day license into the unit comprised of that part of the state not included in the NE and SE units.
- 2) In addition, the Commission proposed to repeal the special Canada goose hunting season for Bennett County and place into Unit 2 of the regular goose hunting season.

As the opportunities for resident hunter in this state continue to decline we need to protect the ones we have and this is a very important one. The removal of the Special Canada goose season will not only negatively affect the goose hunters in Bennett County but will affect the hunting of all game (deer, pheasants, grouse, ducks, etc.) in that county. There will be individuals and outfitters that will lease up the lands that are in the WIA program as well as other private lands in the area and the opportunities especially for the do-it-yourself (DIY) hunters will be lost forever.

We continue to talk about maintaining or getting more individuals involved in hunting because our numbers are decreasing well this is a high quality place that new waterfowl hunters can be taken where there is less competition and a good opportunity for success. In addition to this, there is no biological reason for changing the seasons.

This club of 450 members is opposed to eliminating the current special Canada goose season in Bennett County.

A Very Concerned Sportmen's Club,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Rik Bartels', written in a cursive style.

Rik Bartels,

President