

**Black Hills Streams and Reservoirs Plans**  
**Public Input Received**  
**February 26 - April 26, 2015**

Tue 02/24/2015 11:00 AM

Ron Moehring called at 10:55am with comments on Black Hills management plans. Beef up AIS information in both plans, especially reservoirs.

Geno Adams  
Fisheries Program Administrator  
South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks  
Ft. Pierre District Office  
20641 SD Hwy 1806  
Ft. Pierre, SD 57532  
Office: 605.223.7701  
Work Cell: 605.295.0971  
Fax: 605.223.7717

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

From: Robert Wood [<mailto:ripfletching@gmail.com>]  
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2015 11:00 AM  
To: GFP Wild Info  
Subject: Fisheries

Thank you for the opportunity to voice our opinion on the management of wildlife in South Dakota as I have helped many people in the past stock farm ponds and manage their waters I have found it advantageous to stock older fish versus fingerlings their survival rate is much greater you can achieve this through donated ponds in which you allow fish to grow to a more mature age before releasing. Also you can release fingerlings at stream heads such as walleye before they enter the lake as the fish matures it works its way down stream into the lake both wiser and more mature than hatchery fish your survival rate of fish introduced at stream heads is much greater than fingerlings released from a hatchery Sent from my iPhone this is just a couple of ideas that you might put into practice. bait fish can also be raised in this manner in which donated ponds are used to brood baitfish and then released in bulk to bodies of water to help maintain quality fish and lower predation on the game fish

**From:** lonny kracht  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 24, 2015 2:13 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Comments on Black Hills lakes fishing oportunities

I always have a hard time making it to your public meetings concerning public comment on what direction the GFP should take when it comes to what species to stock in which Black Hills lakes. Here are my personal thoughts on that issue.

1. I am so glad there are Northern pike in both Sheridan and Pactola lakes. I like to eat what I catch and Northern pike is awesome on the table. I have lived my entire life in the Black Hills and it seems that trout have been shoved down our throats through stockings since I can remember (the 1960's). Having a fish specie that is good to eat like Northerns has renewed my interest in fishing in Pactola again. I literally gave up fishing this lake for twenty years as I was sick of catching trout. In my opinion trout are not good table fare. I focused all my fishing (especially ice fishing) to Orman dam due to there being walleye there. I wish the GFP would look at stocking walleyes in Pactola too. I used to fish in a spring trout fishing tournament at Pactola every year back in the 1980's and one year there was a fisheries biologist at the weigh in and someone asked him why they don't stock something else besides trout (like walleyes) in Pactola and his answer was that Pactola was too cold to sustain a catchable population of walleyes for people to catch. I always wondered in my mind how walleyes can do well in canadian lakes but wouldn't sustain themselves at Pactola?

In a nut shell I guess what I am saying is I really enjoy being able to catch something else besides trout. Northerns, perch, crappie, and bass are welcome species in my eyes. Hopefully the GFP will someday look at stocking walleyes in Sheridan, Pactola, and Deerfield as a predator to help reduce the rock bass population and provide another fish specie for anglers to target.

Thank-you  
Lonny Kracht  
Sturgis SD

PS... please don't consider doing anything that would reduce the number of northerns in Pactola. I really enjoy fishing for them and eating them.

**From:** Brad Bies [<mailto:bradbies@hotmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 24, 2015 2:41 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Black Hills Fisheries Management Plan Comments

I strongly support efforts to manage the fisheries in the Black Hills to allow for both memorable fish catches as well as steady angling. My wife and I enjoy fishing in more remote sections of the Hills and also support stocking of more remote sections of streams and smaller more isolated smaller impoundments.

I have noticed a reduction in the amount of brown trout I find. I would advocate for more efforts to support the brook and brown population alongside the rainbow. Given the relatively small range of trout in South Dakota I would prioritize trout population diversity and strength over other fish species in stocking and habitat decisions.

If limits need to be modified I'd support BH wide regulation rather than difficult to understand and implement regulation by watershed or area. I've fished other western states and found it challenging to know if I was abiding by the law, especially if I fished more than one lake or stream in a single day.

I also support efforts to republish the Guide to Black Hills Fishing Waters. It was valuable to me when I started fishing in the Black Hills. While I won't use it, a new cohort of anglers will.

Brad Bies  
Yankton

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

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

Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2015 8:06 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Comments on fishing management plan

Hi, you guys do a good job so I only have a few concerns. I've always wondered about the slot limits like at Belle on walleyes. For the longest time it was over 14 then under 15 and all you catch are fish 1/4" from legal. Why don't you just cut the limit to keep populations where you want them? My other beef is the trout size limit at Sheridan. I don't know how many came floating up last year that we had to throw back. You must have stocked a ton of big, dumb hatchery fish that swallow the hook every time and were over the size limit. It is such a sad waste to see them float up 100' away. And my last request is related to trout. I think there is too much focus on them. We like perch and bass the best. Two years ago Sheridan was great and last year all we could catch were those stupid, too big trout. It totally ruined the fishing there. Thanks for listening!

**From:** Lambert [<mailto:cliff64kay@rap.midco.net>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 25, 2015 2:41 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** survey/plan

your assessment of stockade lake is so wrong. the lake is sick,sick,sick. bass are sluggish, sores on their skin, and not many of them. the water is of poor quality in the summer with algae and much of the lake is weed choked due to silt. my bass club no longer fishes it. those nice fat rainbows no longer exist. someone needs to pay attention to the lake.-----cliff lambert

**From:** Avery Olson [<mailto:averyk@rams.colostate.edu>]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 27, 2015 12:41 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Strange kind of management plan

Hi there!

I am a university student from South Dakota and passionate about my home fisheries and management. First of all, I would like to say I appreciate all efforts toward habitat rehabilitation and conservation. I also would like to say that I agree with John Lott that a fisheries management plan is long overdue. Second, my main complaint is that this "management plan" isn't much of a plan at all. It is more of a history lesson focused little on the actual data (especially for the Black Hills region). There should be a thorough explanation of each problem with our current fisheries based on facts with a distinct plan on how to combat those problems.

Mostly, just remove a large portion of the history, add more concrete data, and add a conclusion for those who want to get an idea of the plans main goals without reading the entire thing for EVERY plan... just some thoughts from an undergraduate student.

I hope that this is somewhat useful feedback and that the proposed plan will help to establish sustainable, healthy fisheries in South Dakota.

-Avery

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

From: Tim Storbeck [<mailto:tstorbeck@knology.net>]

Sent: Monday, March 02, 2015 8:29 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Black hills fisheries management plan

3/2/15

I read the bhfmp. I think it's a great starting point for future management. I look forward to seeing the results.

Thanks

Tim Storbeck

1005 City Springs Rd

Rapid City, SD 57702

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [SZeke1@aol.com](mailto:SZeke1@aol.com) [<mailto:SZeke1@aol.com>]

**Sent:** Sunday, March 08, 2015 11:52 AM

**To:** [gjensen@blackhillslaw.com](mailto:gjensen@blackhillslaw.com)

**Cc:** [evhoyt@rap.midco.net](mailto:evhoyt@rap.midco.net); [hansrc@gmail.com](mailto:hansrc@gmail.com); [roycem@sio.midco.net](mailto:roycem@sio.midco.net); GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Re: Management plan - Gfp

Hi Gary:

Here are my thoughts on Draft Fisheries Management Plan for Black Hills Streams 2015-2019 which I will be passing on to GF&P:

1) I agree that the 1993 SM Plan affords a good basis for a more detailed, strategic and operational plan going forward. This time we need to **do** what the plan recommends.

2) Emphasis for improvement of Black Hills fisheries should be on a "water shed" basis encompassing tributaries which contribute to wild fish propagation and recruitment.

3) Therefore, emphasis, planning an execution of the "new" Stream Management Plan should concentrate on the Rapid Creek, Spearfish Creek AND Castle Creek water sheds (drainages), simultaneously. if possible.

4) Priorities for habitat improvement/ preservation should be the Class 1 and Class 2 stream reaches in the Black Hills, especially the ones with existing (baseline) shocking data.

5) Re: Page 14

a) Objective 1 **is not a large enough "minimum" goal.** "Protect or enhance at least one-half mile of coldwater stream habitat annually." My suggestion would be to add: "In a minimum of three separate water sheds."

b) Objective 2 is unrealistic. June 2017 as a deadline for stream habitat improvement "proposals" for funding, is, in my opinion, **too little, too late.** It encourages "reinventing the wheel" while delaying

real, badly needed stream work. **Smaller "fast track" habitat improvement projects should be identified, prioritized, funded and completed in both 2015 and 2016. At least three large stream habitat improvement projects should be identified, designed and funded by January 2017.**

6) Re; Page 16

a) 1. Natural Yield (NY)- Most other states that manage streams for "Natural Yield" ALSO can and do apply restrictions on terminal gear **as appropriate and necessary**. Example: Madison River in Montana and Henry's Fork of the Snake River in Idaho. There are many others, of course.

b) 4. Improvement (I)- "May use stocking of hatchery trout in wild fish management reaches to provide increased catch rates of adult trout" **is a self-defeating option**. This practice is detrimental to wild fish reproduction and has created or may create further damage to the areas and fish populations where larger stocked fish have been planted and thereafter publicized. Current examples are Rapid Creek above Canyon Lake and above Pactola Reservoir at Silver City.

7) A "Stream Habitat Improvement Specialist" should be hired by GF&P and stationed in Rapid City to specifically coordinate all coldwater habitat projects.

8) Alternate funding mechanisms should be developed and implemented to help fund coldwater stream habitat improvement such as: an optional or mandatory "trout stamp" for license holders using Black Hills waters. Many other states do this, Colorado being the one I am currently most familiar with.

9) Detrimental invasive species should be removed from all Black Hills streams. If poisoning is required, so be it. Example: Northern Pike and Sun Fish in Spring Creek.

10) Habitat improvement projects should be prioritized for areas where public access or the potential for increased public access is greatest. Examples: Both Rapid Creek in Rapid City (14 miles of stream) and Spearfish Creek in Spearfish (approx. 3 miles of stream) should be evaluated immediately for cost-effective habitat improvement projects (as simple as in-stream boulder placements). This could be accomplished in 1/2-mile increments quickly over several years.

11) Stream habitat improvement projects on private property should only be accomplished if year-around access is guaranteed and no stocking is necessary.

12) The current 1-mile "special regulation area" on Spearfish Creek between Homestake Hydro #2 and the Maurice Intake Pond **needs the highest priority** assigned for fish sampling, water quality sampling and a complete evaluation of this section of stream for improved fish holding areas, removal of flood debris and habitat improvement. This area was, for over 15 years, one of, if not the premier, wild trout fishing areas in the Black Hills. Unfortunately it has been in a state of marked decline for almost 15 years. It needs attention **now**.

**These are my thoughts as a Black Hills fisherman for 39 years and as someone who has devoted much time and effort over the years to improve trout habitat.**

**I firmly believe in the axiom, "What's good for the fish, is good for the fisherman."**

Thanks for the opportunity and for listening!

Scott Zieske  
Rapid City

**From:** steve matheny [<mailto:smatheny@knology.net>]

**Sent:** Monday, March 09, 2015 3:15 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Fish management for B. H. lakes

Dear Gentleman,

I would like to keep our Black Hills lakes as trout fishery's. The only thing I would like to change, would be to include 2 over 14 inches in the daily limit.

Thanks

Steve Matheny

**From:** Lyle Casteel [<mailto:lyle.casteel@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Thursday, March 12, 2015 10:36 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Black hills fisheries management

Hello,

I would love to see a few lakes stocked with walleyes. By far the walleye is the most popular fish in the state and people will come from all corners to find quality fish. Just look at Orman dam, Angostora, and Oahe. Hundreds of boats on each lake daily all fishing for walleye.

Northern pike have flourished and walleye would too. Please stock walleye in a few black hills lakes.

Lyle Casteel

Black Hawk, SD

**From:** Ronald M. Koth [<mailto:RKoth@barr.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 24, 2015 12:29 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Black Hills Stream Plan

Congratulations on efforts to generate a new Black Hills Streams Management Area Plan. An update to the well-used 1993 Black Hills Stream Management Plan was in order.

A few items of note following a quick reading of the plan:

- 1) Based on the geographic description of the Black Hills Streams Management Area at least two major streams/stream segments appear missing.
  - Crow Creek
  - Spearfish Creek from I-90 to Redwater
- 2) I have a hard time understanding the map shown in Figure 1 with the multiple colors and lack of a map legend.
- 3) Is the descriptive text on pages 9 and 10 in the Habitat Enhancement and Access section and the tables that begin on page 65 for the Rapid or Spearfish watersheds a complete listing of the stream habitat work/investigations that have taken place during the period 1993-2015? If these sections are meant to portray the past efforts of GFP in the Black Hills it would be desirable to include all stream reaches that had habitat enhancement/improvement work conducted to provide the public with the scope and costs of past work. A tabular list with associated costs could help the public gain perspective on efforts pursued by GFP in conjunction with other partners.
- 4) Will there be watershed specific plans for other Black Hills watersheds as listed on page 63?
- 5) What basis did GFP use (frequency analysis, bankfull exceedance?) to state that the Spearfish Creek watershed has a changed hydrology from the past (page 75)? What data is available to support the text indicating that large amounts of bed sediment had been moved that created "substantial" stream morphology change? What does the work "substantial" mean?
- 6) I cannot find a discussion of the carbonate cementation (and associated studies funded by GFP) that is unique to Spearfish Creek in the Black Hills and how this factor relates to habitat conditions for fish or invertebrates; nor is there discussion of how groundwater influences the system. What is the "much higher" discharge in Spearfish Creek below Savoy and in Little Spearfish Creek as noted on page 75? What has caused this "much higher discharge"? There is also no note of the presence of long nose sucker; a state threatened species being present in Spearfish Creek north of I-90 in past samples.
- 7) The stream access discussion uses the term "navigable" without any description based on statute or case law. This may be confusing to many persons. SD has a very desirable access and use provision for streams based in statute and case law. The discussion here seems confusing and does not do justice to the issue. Is this issue germane to the fisheries management plan?

- 8) The objectives/strategies in the Rapid and Spearfish watersheds appear to be decoupled from potential future management actions in many cases. It appears that many studies are proposed with the result being transmittal of the information to the public but without a connection or discussion of potential management implications or measures of success of the study. For example; Objective 5 for the Spearfish watershed identifies the need to census the spawning and recruitment of Yates Pond without any connection to a future management action. It is well known where the redds are located in Yates Pond; this factor was a major determinant in how US Hwy 14 was designed and constructed including the walkway to allow visitors to walk along the edge of the pond to observe spawning fish using groundwater upwellings.
- 9) The literature cited sections of Rapid and Spearfish watersheds do not appear to include much of the collaborative work with SDSMT and others that has led to much of the increased understanding of elements such as bog iron, carbonate cementation, urban runoff etc. Why is this work not referenced as it relates to some of the objectives and future needs/management actions? Would it be informative to the public to include a listing of specific research conducted since 1993 for each watershed and a summary of the results to help the public gain perspective and frame future needs for action?
- 10) Why are brown and brook trout being considered for stocking in hatchery managed streams? What implications to hatchery disease potential and cost to anglers will accrue? What rationale will be used to determine appropriate species to stock?
- 11) Will GFP have adequate budget and staff to accomplish the wide range and numerous objectives for the listed watersheds during the period 2015-2019? Will there be primary objectives for each watershed that have broad impacts? How will decisions be made to pursue one listed objective over another?

Thanks for your continued work in the Black Hills area.

Ron

Ronald M. Koth

Senior Fisheries Ecologist

Bismarck office: 952.832.2815

cell: 605.390.0165

[RKoth@barr.com](mailto:RKoth@barr.com)

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

resourceful. naturally.



**From:** Rowles, Garrett William - SDSU Student [<mailto:garrett.rowles@jacks.sdstate.edu>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 24, 2015 7:00 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Proposed Black Hills Management Plans

To whom it may concern,

Concerning the proposed Black Hills Stream Management Plan, something need to be included about the cold water valve that feeds into Spring Creek below Sheridan Lake. Years ago, before the cold water valve was broken, this fishery supported a large population of large, healthy rainbow and some brown trout. Since the cold water outlet valve from Sheridan Lake was broken (now fixed but not being utilized) the fishery has suffered greatly in the warmer months of the year. In the spring when water temperatures are still cold enough for trout to thrive the fishing is great. Fish are big, there are many of them, and they are actively feeding, but when the water begins to become to warm for trout (usually beginning in early July) there is an extremely noticeable drop off in fish activity and numbers.

The main concern with turning on the cold water outlet valve is that it will drain Sheridan Lake below the threshold for a designated recreational lake. This can easily be avoided by only using the valve when it is needed in the warm months of July through October and only letting a small amount of water out. There is a gauging station on Spring Creek above Sheridan Lake, which could be used to monitor how much water is running into Sheridan Lake so as to not let too much out below Sheridan Lake, thus not drawing down Sheridan Lake. Even 5 cubic feet per second or less could benefit this fishery greatly in the warmer months of the year by keeping the water temperature in Spring Creek low enough to support an amazing year round, and possibly naturally reproducing (which would save some money on stocking if surveys were conducted to determine if this is happening) population of brown and rainbow trout.

I realize these type of things are not exactly a quick process, but there needs to be plan in place to restore this fishery to its former glory. Spring Creek used to be one of, if not the, best lotic trout fishery in South Dakota. There is a large number of people in the Black Hills that feel the same way and are very passionate about this fishery being restored, and it would not take much work or money to do.

Sincerely,  
Garrett Rowles

**From:** Wm J Wilkins [<mailto:wmjwilkins@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Friday, March 27, 2015 12:07 AM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Black Hills Fisheries Management 2015-2019 Draft comments

Hello,

I am writing to comment on your recent drafts regarding Black Hills fisheries management plans. While I understand the appeal of managing many streams and reservoirs for trout experiences, I feel like this ignores a large population of anglers who live in the Black Hills and would prefer to fish for other species, such as smallmouth bass or walleye.

Particularly in the Fall River watershed within Hot Springs city limits and Coldbrook Reservoir, I feel that one or both these species would provide great opportunities for helping children learn to fish for widely recognized game fish in an easily accessed stream. It would likely result in a small economic benefit to the city of Hot Springs as well, and potentially improve streamside conservation. This would be derived in the short term by improved reputation and respect for the river from current anglers, and in the long term via memories created by children fishing in this stream.

Additionally, these species are already present in the Cheyenne River downstream of this watershed, so should be relatively easy (biologically and potentially logistically) to bring to the Fall River. As species that function higher in the trophic chain, they may also help control exotic species (cichlids and goldfish) currently present in through the stream. Finally, these species should be capable of tolerating the warm waters and fast currents of the Fall River throughout the year.

This is just one example of how deviating from a trout centric management strategy could benefit both waters and communities. I hope that you will have and take the time to read, think about, and incorporate some or all of these ideas in your management plans for Black Hills fisheries.

William Justin Wilkins  
Hot Springs, SD

**From:** Andy Bartling [<mailto:bartlin2004@hotmail.com>]

**Sent:** Friday, March 27, 2015 2:52 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Black Hills Fisheries Management

I am in support of the Rooster's proposal for the management of the Black Hills fisheries. I believe it will provide greater diversity and more sport for the anglers. Their proposal says it better than I can and I've copied a portion of it below from their Facebook page:

Deerfield is a reservoir with current problems: over populated with rock bass, suckers, and stunted perch because the lake lacks a predator fish. GF&P wants to try splake (again). This has failed 3 times already.

We suggest the following.....

- Have GF&P stock 5,000-10,000 adult walleyes. (Only adult walleyes so this experiment has a chance to work). There is plenty of adult walleyes to do this in GF&P rearing ponds and Oahe. Last half dozen years has seen Oahe have so many walleyes that they were starving - to harvest limits of 14 walleyes a day.

-GF&P states that regulating and sustainability are issues and that the walleyes won't spawn.

-We suggest 1 walleye per day over 20". :This will give a type of Canadian walleye experience. This is the only Hills lake that has consistent ice every year. This lake is already a No live minnow lake so it could be an artificial lure experience lake. Deerfield is already a No wake lake so slow trolling anglers would not be affected by jet skis and power boat skiers.

If the experiment is a failure - let the walleyes get fished out.

Literally hundreds of anglers want walleyes to be tried in 1 or 2 or 3 Hills lakes. Trout are good but they have 100% of stream management now and basically all of the reservoir management. Trout are not native to the Black Hills and the GF&P has experimented with Cohos, Kokanee, Tiger trout, splake, Lake trout, steelhead, browns, rainbows, brookies, and now cutthroats. Some work - some don't. In the Missouri River they've tried Chinooks, Lakers, Rainbows, Whitefish, Smallmouth, and now Atlantic Salmon for angler diversity and opportunities.

It is hypocritical to not even try to give Black Hills anglers some diversity.

I also think small mouth bass would be a nice addition to Stockade Lake and I believe the daily limit on panfish should be higher for west river stock dams. Most of these small dams are only fishable for a short period in the summer before they become either too mossy to fish or the fish that are caught are not fit to eat. So, most of the fish that are taken are taken through the ice and if there aren't enough taken they become stunted and over populated.

I appreciate your consideration and all of your efforts to provide sportsmen of the Black Hills with the very best angling opportunities.

Thank you,

Andy Bartling

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

**From:** Rich Grable [<mailto:rich.grable@yahoo.com>]

**Sent:** Friday, March 27, 2015 2:55 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** BH Fishery

Please introduce predators (either Walleyes or Lake Trout) into Deerfield. This used to be the crown jewel of Black Hills lakes. Now the fish are stunted.

Rich Grable

**From:** Dale [<mailto:hdhouse2@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Friday, March 27, 2015 3:17 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Draft management plan

I would like to see walleye become available in Pactola and Deerfield and maybe Sheridan lake.

Dale Householder

Hill city, SD

**From:** [Tmartley@aol.com](mailto:Tmartley@aol.com) [<mailto:Tmartley@aol.com>]

**Sent:** Friday, March 27, 2015 3:45 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Walleye

Dear Game & Fish,

I think it would be great to have Walleye in Pactola. I have never talked to anyone that likes fishing that thinks otherwise. If cost is a concern, I would gladly pay extra for a license that included Walleye fishing in Pactola.

Thanks for your consideration.

Thomas Martley

Rapid City

**From:** [bobbyk@rap.midco.net](mailto:bobbyk@rap.midco.net) [<mailto:bobbyk@rap.midco.net>]

**Sent:** Friday, March 27, 2015 4:46 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** BH Fisheries management

I am one who believes GFP should manage BH reservoirs for walleye. Too limited with just Angostura and Orman. Also add Sheridan, Pactola and others as you judge the feasibility thereof.

Bob Koscak  
Rapid City, SD

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

**From:** jim nelson [<mailto:jimnelson@rap.midco.net>]

**Sent:** Friday, March 27, 2015 8:28 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Black Hills fish

Being raised East river with ample opportunity to be fishing most anytime, I find that there are no real good Walleye lakes close by except Orman Dam.. I would hope you would consider stocking Sheraton Lake which is close to Rapid City with Walleye. I use to catch all the Walleye and perch I need from East river lakes, not the Missouri.. Please consider this in the future. I don't fly fish and don't really care for trout. Thanks - jim

**From:** Louis Vaughn [<mailto:lnvaughn@rap.midco.net>]

**Sent:** Friday, March 27, 2015 8:39 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Black Hills Fisheries Plan

I think walleyes should be introduced to Pactola and Sheridan Lakes

Louis Vaughn  
Rapid City

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

From: Matt Brown [<mailto:matt-brown@hotmail.com>]

Sent: Saturday, March 28, 2015 9:56 AM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Walleyes in Sheridan Lake

Why doesn't the GFP stock Walleyes in Sheridan Lake?

Thanks.

Matt

Matt Brown

Rapid City

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** KEITH LAU [<mailto:khll1@msn.com>]

**Sent:** Saturday, March 28, 2015 7:30 AM

**To:** SDGFPINFO

**Subject:** RE: GFP News :: Black Hills Fisheries Management Plan Comment Period Remains Open through April 26

WHY SPEND SO MUCH ON TRYING GROW TROUT IN THE HILLS WHEN VERY FEW FISHERMAN LIKE TROUT? HOW ABOUT WALLEYE IN PACTOLA? WHY NOT. KEITH LAU

**From:** Guffey Scott [<mailto:scottg@pennco.org>]

**Sent:** Monday, March 30, 2015 9:40 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Public Comments on Fisheries Management Plan for BH Streams

Would like to see mention and or concern for the terrestrial riparian invasive weeds that pose a threat to stream flow and water quality to the BH streams in the Black Hills. Known riparian invasive weeds present in the Black Hills include Common Tansy (Spearfish Creek, Whitewood Creek, Bear Butte, Elk Creek, Box Elder, and Rapid Creek Watersheds); Purple Loosestrife (Rapid Creek in Rapid City); and Yellow-Flag Iris (Rapid Creek and Lime Creek in Rapid City).

Need to develop an Early Detection Rapid Response (EDRR) for invasive species that pose a threat to BH streams.

*Scott Guffey*

*Pennington County Weed & Pest Director*

*3607 Cambell Street*

*Rapid City. SD 57701*

*(605) 394-5320*

*(605) 391-1926*

*[scottg@pennco.org](mailto:scottg@pennco.org)*

**From:** Clark, Michael [<mailto:MCClark@newcorp.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 07, 2015 12:42 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Black Hills reservoir management plan  
**Importance:** High

I am Michael C. Clark and I live in Pennington County, city of Box Elder SD

I would like to voice my opinion and show some facts to persuade the GF&P to consider the management plan they are proposing now.

What the majority of anglers in the Hills reservoirs enjoy most is perch, crappie, bluegills, bass, and pike and trout is 'not' a preferred species (except for Lake Trout). And the number 1 hope is that walleyes would at least be tried in the Hills.

The arguments that the GF&P states are as follows:

#1 - Too cold of water - yet Canadian walleyes do great.

#2 - Walleyes can't coexist with trout yet GF&P stocks thousands of trout in the Missouri River walleye waters every year.

#3 - The Hills lakes are too small yet the GF&P stock thousands of walleyes in smaller lakes: Sorum, Tisdale, Hayes, Brakke and others.

#4 - Walleyes won't adapt to Hills waters yet perch do wonderful - perch and walleyes are from the same fish family and they both coexist in every S.D. lake.

I am sure you realize that every 11" trout the GF&P releases cost \$3.00 each or more. Say for instance a non-resident buys a 3 day license for \$37.00, that his 15 trout limit cost GF&P \$45.00. This is not sustainable and does not make any common sense.

The pan fish and pike populations are self sustaining and have grown with zero, nadda, nothing, nill, negative support or enhancement from our GF&P

What the people want is self sustaining and is growing our sport yet gets no support and hatchery trout is a financial fiasco and not a desired species for most anglers yet gets the full efforts and attention of GF&P.

What the sportsmen and women of Western So.Dak. want, is the GF&P to recognize gamefish "other than hatchery trout" and make efforts to enhance and manage these resources and add walleyes.

Thank you for your time and please consider what the people want.

**Michael Clark**

**From:** Colin Pearson [<mailto:cpearson1285@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 07, 2015 2:21 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Walleye in the hills

My name is Colin Pearson

I live in Rapid City SD

I would like to see walleye introduced in the hills. Even just at a lake, it would be nice to have other options. Almost every lake has trout in it. I don't understand why it can't be attempted on even one lake.

Colin Pearson

**From:** Kristi Myhrer [<mailto:kmyhrer@syversontile.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 07, 2015 4:06 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Walleye in the Black Hills

I'm writing in support of stocking walleye in the lakes of the Black Hills. Please consider at least "testing" a few lakes before dismissing the idea completely. We are a family that loves to camp and fish in the black hills (ice fishing included) – and would LOVE to see more walleye. We don't eat trout (so we catch and release). We love to teach our children the concept of "eating what you shoot" while hunting and "keeping only what you'll eat" for fishing – w/in the limits of the law. Walleye would be an fantastic addition to our wonderful lakes and outdoor recreation in the Black Hills in general! We can also keep those fisherman from traveling East River or to Minnesota/North Dakota for walleye fishing if it is available here!

Thanks for your time.

Sincerely,

Kristi Myhrer  
Branch Manager  
774 Industrial Ave.  
Rapid City, SD 57702  
Ph: 605.348.6003  
Fax: 605.348.6005  
[kmyhrer@syversontile.com](mailto:kmyhrer@syversontile.com)  
[www.syversontile.com](http://www.syversontile.com)

**SYVERSON**  
TILE & STONE

**Confidentiality Notice:** The information included in this e-mail, *including any attachments*, is for the sole use of the intended recipient and may contain information that is confidential and protected. Any unauthorized review, use, distribution or similar action is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies of the original message immediately.

***"Coming together is a beginning. Keeping together is progress.  
Working together is success." --Henry Ford***

**From:** Mike Kriz [<mailto:mike.kriz@midco.net>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 07, 2015 5:36 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Black Hills Fisheries Management

I'd like to lend my support to stocking walleyes and other non trout game species in the black hills management area. I have copied and pasted some relevant information presented recently in Brookings and seriously would like your response to these arguments as they honestly do have merit and make sense!

The arguments that the GF&P states are as follows:

#1 - To cold of water - yet Canadian walleyes do great.

#2 - Walleyes can't coexist with trout yet GF&P stocks thousands of trout in the Missouri River walleye waters every year.

#3 - The Hills lakes are too small yet the GF&P stock thousands of walleyes in smaller lakes: Sorum, Tisdale, Hayes, Brakke and others.

#4 - Walleyes won't adapt to Hills waters yet perch do wonderful - perch and walleyes are from the same fish family and they both coexist in every S.D. lake.

Mike Kriz  
18 Nebraska ST  
Rapid City, SD 57701  
Cell: 6052097530

**From:** Doug Ruffedt [<mailto:druffedt@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 07, 2015 7:29 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Walleye in Black Hills

I'm an avid angler who lives in Rapid City. Although i don't mind driving to Angostura to fish I'd much rather do it in the beautiful black hills. The things im hearing about how walleye wouldn't thrive in the hills really makes no sense! Please listen to us 'locals'. We are the ones your supposed to be benefiting. Thank you.

Douglas Ruffedt  
3009 Cadillac Dr.  
Rapid City, SD 57703

**From:** Ascher, Debra  
**Sent:** Monday, March 30, 2015 10:24 AM  
**To:** Leif, Tony; Lott, John  
**Subject:** FW: Comment on : GFP 2015 March Proposals - 2015 April Finals

FYI – this letter has nothing to do with April Finalizations

**From:** GFP Admin Rules  
**Sent:** Friday, March 27, 2015 11:03 PM  
**To:** GFP Admin Rules  
**Subject:** Comment on : GFP 2015 March Proposals - 2015 April Finals

Name: norm burleson  
Address: 22343 burleson lane  
City: lead  
State: sd  
Zip: 57754  
Email: [burleson@wildblue.net](mailto:burleson@wildblue.net)  
Phone: 6055843123

Comment: read the article in rapid city journal about the owner of the rooster getting a petition out to put walleye in Deerfield lake. Please consider leaving that lake alone. My family and my parents and many friends love that lake for the relaxing quiet time and can catch the trout we want for a meal. People have messed with pactola and Sheridan so put the walleye in there. The lake will fill up with boats and then you will here complaints constantly about improving the ramps. I can go on forever so I will quit now and just ask the commission to not consider this idea on Deerfield lake. thank you

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

From: Jerod Crandall [<mailto:jcrandall@eaglesales.org>]

Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2015 9:24 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Walleyes in the hills

My name is Jerod j Crandall and I would really like to see walleyes getting a chance in the hills I think there are a lot of big water wasted on trout.

Why do you stock much smaller lake east river with walleye and you won't try the hills

Why don't we have any say into what you stock

Please try walleyes in the hills thank you for reading

Jerod j Crandall  
2911 Benjamin st  
Rapid City SD 57703

Sent from my iPad

**From:** lonny kracht

**Sent:** Sunday, April 19, 2015 10:10 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Black Hills Lakes

SDGFP,

I would like to request that the SDGFP stock Walleyes, Northern, Perch, and Crappie in Deerfield, Pactola, and Sheridan lakes. I had virtually quit fishing the Black Hills lakes due to the fact that I am absolutely sick of catching trout. It seems the GFP has shoved trout down our throats ever since I was in high school back in the 1970's. I have once again started fishing Pactola ever since people started catching Northern pike. Northern pike are great table fare unlike trout. ENOUGH WITH THE TROUT!!! For years fishermen have wanted walleyes stocked in hills lakes. Please give the people that fund the GFP what they desire.

Thank-you  
Respectfully,  
Lonny Kracht  
Sturgis, SD

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

From: Mary [<mailto:bam7@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 1:48 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Walleyes in the Black Hills

My husband and i would like to see Walleye in the Black Hills. We hate Trout simply because they do not taste good and consider them a nuisance fish.

We don't see the need to shock all the good Northerns that we enjoy fishing for.

We prefer to ice fish for Walleyes. Due to our farming life style, the ice on Orman & Angostura lakes can not be trusted some winters. Plus these lakes are too busy in the summer time with boat recreation.

Mary & Bob Anderson

605-393-1221

Rapid Valley 57703

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** Byron Mutschelknaus [<mailto:bmutsch@hotmail.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, April 20, 2015 3:46 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Walleye in Black Hills - YES YES YES

My wife, two sons, 1 daughter and all 6 grandchildren all vote for State efforts to introduce Walleye into that black hills reservoirs.

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

From: [hevenctzn@yahoo.com](mailto:hevenctzn@yahoo.com) [<mailto:hevenctzn@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2015 9:15 AM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Lake management

Horse thief lake,Bismark lake,Lakota lakes need to have crappies in them,not trout.South Dakotans in the west need more places to catch them especially since the limit was lowered.Ice fishing in this area would be better too.

Sent from my iPad

**From:** Bonnie & Tim Bjork [<mailto:bjork10@pie.midco.net>]  
**Sent:** Friday, March 20, 2015 1:11 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** BH Stream Fisheries Management Plan comments

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Fisheries Management Plan for Black Hills Streams and for the chance to participate in the Black Hills Stream Management focus group. Your willingness to promote inclusive public involvement in the planning process is especially commendable and, ultimately, will be beneficial to the maintenance of a high-quality cold water fishery in the Black Hills of South Dakota.

Overall I believe the draft plan is more than adequate, although I do have some general comments that I would hope you would take into consideration as you finalize the plan.

First of all, I have several general comments:

- A few times throughout the manuscript the phrase “primary fisheries” is mentioned and, although some examples are proposed, the phrase is never really defined. I understand there are some comments in the Black Hills Fisheries Management Area Strategic Plan referring to primary waters but I am still not sure what “primary” refers to. I suggest a paragraph somewhere in the plan that defines “primary” or provides criteria to establish “primary” waters or fisheries.
- On the issue of “management to produce maximum angler satisfaction” mentioned in both this plan and the Strategic Plan, it is my opinion that complex and water-specific regulations seldom produce angler satisfaction. In fact, the phrases are mutually exclusive. If specific stream reaches do require specific management plans, these reaches need to be clearly marked and posted.
- I believe a section on the protection of water quality/pollution control needs to be inserted in the management objectives because without quality water there will not be a sustainable fishery. This could be accomplished in conjunction with the DENR, West River Water Development District or other agencies. At the very least, some discussion of cooperation among agencies to achieve water quality standards.
- Somewhere early in this plan there needs to be a discussion of the Strategic Plan so that the relationship of the two plans may be better understood. As an example; when the plan was published, the purpose of the plan and how it relates to the stream plan.

On more specific elements of the plan: I understand that, in Section IV “issues are issues” and just how they are phrased may be inconsequential, however;

- #5: “sensitive stream areas” needs to be defined or some other more generic phrase needs to be inserted. It’s too easy for us to concoct our own definition.
- #7: I’m not sure what this is supposed to say. Could just be a typo of some kind.
- #9: See general comments above.

## Section V.

- Objective 1:
  - What is the timeline to identify the locations?
  - What about habitat areas that “should or need to be” protected instead of “can” be protected?
  - Is it necessary to survey all 800 miles of streams to identify locations? Maybe look at Strategy 1.4 first and identify location based on the 2015 survey? That doesn’t mean the other areas are neglected but much of that is covered in the Strategic Plan, is it not?
  - In Strategy 1.3, is the phrase “relatively inexpensive” really necessary?
  - Strategy 1.7: how do the projects mentioned here relate to the project in Objective 2? There needs to be some kind of connection or an explanation of the difference.
- Objective 2:
  - How extensive is the stream habitat mapping? Do you plan to map the entire Black Hills Management Area?
  - Strategy 2.2: Should there be some discussion of pollution control here?

## Section VI.

### Management Guidelines:

- 3: Again, the discussion of “primary.”
- 7: Signage for specific regulations.
- 10: This guideline should talk about upgrading or creating holding, feeding and cover areas and maintaining water quality.

### Stream Sampling:

- What is the possibility of creating some type of ongoing, volunteer water quality sampling and/or mapping program? I realize managing volunteers is a difficult activity but it certainly would insure continued public involvement in the management process. Just a thought...
- “Primary streams” are mention again in the last paragraph of this section.

### And finally:

- Under the specific Rapid Creek and Spearfish Creek management sections, is it really necessary to prepare and release a map of specific redd sites? Seems that could cause more problems that it’s worth.

Thanks again for allowing the opportunity to comment on the Fisheries Management Plan for Black Hills Streams. And thanks for the time and effort all of you have put into making this a very workable plan.

Tim Bjork  
112 West Oak St.  
Pierre, SD 57501

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

From: John Wolf [<mailto:johnwolf1940@midco.net>]

Sent: Tuesday, March 31, 2015 11:19 AM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Fishing survey

Dear sirs: Please NO stocking of Walleye in Black hills lakes. They are available for local fishermen at both south and north lakes within 60 miles of Rapid City. Managing the Black hills lakes as a cold water habitat is effect and should continue to be managed that way. 20 years from now someone will want only trout stocked. Desires change with time. John Wolf,  
4626 Ridgewood, Rapid City, SD. 57702 605-415-9854 Thank you for your attention.

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

From: Jesse [<mailto:thasme@hotmail.com>]

Sent: Thursday, April 02, 2015 1:31 AM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Deerfield fish management

Please stock Deerfield with walleye.

Sent from my iPhone

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

From: Gordon Kotab [<mailto:gordon.kotab@gmail.com>]

Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 6:59 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Walleye in black Hills lakes

I am asking the commission to consider placing walleye in more Black Hills area lakes. I am especially interested in seeing walleye in Bear Butte Lake and Ft Meade Reservoir. Thank you for your consideration.

Gordon Kotab

Sturgis

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

From: Julie Altmann [<mailto:juliealtmann@icloud.com>]

Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 11:59 PM

To: GFP Wild Info

Subject: Walleyes in the hills

To whom it my concern,

Please give the Black Hills lakes a chance for walleyes. I would love to be able to stay closer to home, than drive an hour and a half to get skunked! I'm rather tired of catching trout when I really don't want too.

Thanks,

Julie M. Altmann

Rapid City, SD

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [toedr@midconetwork.com](mailto:toedr@midconetwork.com) [<mailto:toedr@midconetwork.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 21, 2015 7:18 AM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** fish diversity

Please consider adding walleye to black hills lakes as a diversity in the fishing opportunities. Thank you

**From:** Beatis [<mailto:beatis@aol.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 20, 2015 11:03 AM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** bh plan comments

I think they are late. I hope can still accept them

thanks much  
Jeff Olson

#### Comments on fisheries management plan for Black Hills Streams and Lakes

I appreciate the work that has gone into this process and hope we see large improvements in the resource after everything has been implemented based on public input. I do have concerns on how that input has been gathered and how useful it will be. For example, many of the survey questions asked to pick between 4 species of trout and northern pike. Most all trout fisherman fish for all the trout species. This question divided the trout fisherman in the survey and unfairly moves Pike up the list of preference. I found many survey questions to be ambiguous and misleading. There was some valuable info to be gained but most of it does not have much use for getting what the public wants to see in change of management of the fisheries resource.

The Management plan states the survey was to identify preferred watersheds. ("prioritize locations based on 2015 survey") .... what specific streams people fish and why? I did not see that as a survey question. Why do fisherman prefer fishing at Deerfield instead of Pactola. Why would a fly fisherman fish the spring creek drainage over Box elder creek for example? I think there is some very important data missing from the public on their fishing preferences and why.

-Survey seems to support more catch and release and I agree.....MORE special management areas.

-Stop over simplifying the tool box. That is an outdated thought process from Pierre. We need to give fisherman a little more credit. Each watershed should have its own regulations and possibly each stream within a watershed. Over simplified regulations may make it easier for the department and enforcement but the resource and the fisherman deserve better.

-Why just the four big lakes with a management plan? Small lakes must also be included.

-Why are there only two watersheds discussed in the stream plan? I feel all watersheds should have their own management plan also. The entire Black Hills should be covered not just Rapid Creek and Spearfish Creek.

- Why was the past strategic plan never fully operationalized? What will change with this new one? There are many good parts of the old plan.

-Goals objectives and strategies....."will be based on available funds". How will these funds be identified and used? Habitat trout stamp? Stream stamp? Clean water stamp? That would have been a good survey question.

- How precisely would the GFP work closely with the BHNF? Stream habitat is the number one issue here. Lots of habitat destruction that could be avoided with cooperation of the forest service.

- What is the SDGFP Capital Development Budget that the plan refers to? I realize money and resources are always an issue. We need more of both to implement this plan. Please note all the states represented in the survey. The Black Hills has become a big destination for fishing and needs to be managed so.

I feel every body of water in the Black Hills needs to have a separate management plan. What percentage of wild trout in the Black Hills do we want to manage for? What percentage will be put and take? Where should we complete the most habitat work and which spot should take priority. Certainly not good that all four big lakes are becoming warm water fisheries. Maybe manage two for warm and two for cold?

The proposed management plans have done a lot of talking about the history of what has been done and has a few good ideas on where to go, however it is lacking in specifics and details. The survey did not seem to do a good job in getting details on specific bodies of water. I feel there is a long way to go until this plan can be finalized. Please include all watersheds and lakes in this plan.

Have some lakes and ponds be warm water fish emphasis with the majority focusing on cold water. Have more special management areas. Have more detailed regulations throughout the Black Hills. Please get rid of simple minded tool box idea. Fish management...managing for the users and the species (habitat) is much more complicated than making management the same in the entire Black Hills. We are much too diverse of a user groups and ecosystem for one band aid fits all. Time to step up and give this resource the attention it deserves.

Jeff Olson  
Rapid City

**From:** Floyd and Janet [<mailto:kanodeklan@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 22, 2015 1:00 AM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** strategic plan black hills fisheries comment

This email is to provide comment on the Black Hills Fisheries Strategic Plan.

I am a Wyoming resident and would estimate I have purchased annual family or individual South Dakota fishing licenses for about 20 years. I primarily fish for trout, usually catch and release. Sometimes I fish for other species in reservoirs such as at Orman, but it is a small percentage of my fishing time. In South Dakota I mostly fish lakes and streams in the Black Hills, primarily Deerfield, Spearfish Creek, and to a lesser extent Rapid and Spring Creeks.

As you know, rock bass in Deerfield have multiplied over the years. The Wyoming Game and Fish has had success introducing tiger muskies in some waters in the state to help control some fish species. A comment from a Wyoming fisheries biologist about the tiger muskies introduction into lakes was "they are a really cool fish and they work, not everything works out the way you think it will". You have likely already looked at the possibility, and would know if this species was a viable option in a reservoir such as Deerfield, but mentioning this as it apparently has achieved the desired outcome from cost and management aspects where it is utilized in Wyoming.

Some fishermen would likely appreciate it if some areas of trout streams could be managed towards fewer but larger trout. There is a section on Spearfish Creek in the canyon managed as catch and release, possibly there could be more of this, if it results in larger trout.

I have been told, by an individual who fishes Spearfish Creek a lot more than I do, that the fish in Spearfish Creek have been impacted in recent years by runoff into the stream from a type of winter road treatment. This may be part of what you are referencing in your habitat part of the plan, but I didn't see it specifically. There are good trout streams in the Hills, and hopefully they can be sustained as such.

I don't know if there is a program where fisherman/hunters have the option to donate funds when purchasing a license that could be utilized for instance in improving fishing/hunting access opportunities on private land. Or, possibly funds could be raised this way for the improvement of fish or other wildlife habitat. Funding is usually tight, and seeking optional funding from the license buyers seems viable.

Not being a South Dakota resident my comments may not count, but anyway I appreciate the opportunity. My family has enjoyed a lot of fishing and camping in South Dakota over the years.

Thanks

Floyd Kanode  
Sundance WY

**From:** [GeorgeEccarius@aol.com](mailto:GeorgeEccarius@aol.com) [<mailto:GeorgeEccarius@aol.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 22, 2015 9:38 PM

**To:** GFP Wild Info

**Subject:** Walleyes in the Hills

South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks:

My name is George Eccarius. I am a 17 year old fisherman from Rapid City, SD, and I have been fishing in and around the Black Hills my whole life. I have been fishing less and less because I am getting tired of catching 10" Rainbow trout, and I am searching for new angling opportunities. I still love fishing (and I wouldn't be writing you this e-mail if I didn't), but when I fish in the Black Hills, I only ice fish for Lake Trout at Pactola, Panfish at Stockade, or cast for trophy northernns at Pactola. I, along with all members of my family, don't like the taste of hatchery raised trout, so I am a catch & release fisherman. However, I love the taste of walleye, and walleye being introduced into the hills would get me on the water more often.

I appreciate all the work you do for fisherman in South Dakota, but the majority of fisherman in Rapid City want walleyes tried in at least one lake in the hills. Before it was drained, Bismarck Lake held perch, small mouth, pike, and bullhead. I know this because I have caught all those species at the lake. Because the lake is currently drained and without fish, why not try walleyes in there? There are a dozen similarly sized lakes filled with 10" Rainbow trout. If not Bismarck or a smaller lake, how about Pactola? Pactola has become a tremendous Pike and Lake Trout fishery. I know for a fact that Walleye can co-exist with Pike and Lake Trout because I take a family trip to Lake of the Woods every few years, and it is a world class fishery for all three. I am not an expert, but it seems to me that rainbow trout can co-exist with walleye by simply examining your stocking records from the past few years. The research must show they co-exist because the SDGFP stocks thousands of rainbow trout into the Missouri River, Orman Dam, and Angostura every year. I'm sure you wouldn't throw away thousands of dollars stocking rainbow trout into waters where they wouldn't survive because of the presence of walleye. Pactola is big enough to hold these species; it has the forage base (smelt, bluegill, perch) to support walleye; it stays cold year round (just like Candadian lakes), and Lake Trout and Pike are already severely harming the trout population in the lake. From your point of view, I fail to understand why stocking 10" rainbow trout-which I'm sure are quite expensive the GFP- right into a lake filled with northern pike that eat them makes any sense. I understand your concern about walleye not being able to reproduce naturally, but trout can't in the Hills lakes either, so either way you will have to maintain a similar stocking effort with the walleyes that you already do with trout. There are literally hundreds of miles of trout streams in the Black Hills. That's plenty of area for trout anglers to focus on and catch trout in addition to the trout lakes in the hills. I think that your stocking efforts would be rewarded by a significant increase in fishing licenses and more money brought in from anglers in general.

Please, as a "youth" angler, I hope you consider my opinion and the wants of many anglers in the Rapid City area. I hope you experiment with walleye in at least one hills lake. If the experiment fails, what's the harm? I have caught hundreds of both trout and walleye, and I prefer walleye in every imaginable category. Once again, thank you for the work you have done for fishing in our state, but I hope you take into consideration the desires of the anglers of South Dakota.

Thanks,  
George Eccarius

**From:** Ev Hoyt [<mailto:evhoyt@rap.midco.net>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 22, 2015 2:50 PM  
**To:** Lott, John; GFP Wild Info  
**Cc:** Gary Jensen; Scott Zieske; Hans Stephenson  
**Subject:** Comments on GFP's Draft Mgmt Plans for BH streams and lakes

John, wildinfo, and all – attached are my comments on the GFP Draft Management Plans for Black Hills Fish Management Area Streams and Lakes, which are to be considered by the Commission on May 7, 2015 in Custer State Park.

I find myself repeating my comments with each iteration of GFP Plans – hoping that GFP will commit to stream rehab projects sooner rather than later, and that the Black Hills reservoirs will again be managed as coldwater fisheries (with support from the recent 2014 BH Angler Survey (Longmire) given the fact that two major warmwater reservoirs (Angostura and Orman/Belle Fourche) are just minutes from the arbitrary boundary line of the BHFMA. I hope to be able to attend the Commission meeting in CSP on May 7 to address the Commission in support of the Plans.

John, would you be so good as to make certain that these comments become a part of the Commission file, and send me an email to confirm that – and provide them as appropriate to GFP fisheries staff. Thanks very much. Ev Hoyt 605-430-2150

#### **Comments on SDGFP Draft Black Hills Fish Management Area Streams and Lakes Management Plans**

**by Everett E. Hoyt  
4422 Carriage Hills Drive  
Rapid City, SD 57702  
605-343-2707**

I would like to offer the following comments as a part of the proceedings by South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks (GFP) to adopt updated Management Plans for Black Hills Streams and Lakes. Specifically, the following comments are intended to be an effort to offer constructive suggestions to strengthen the Draft Management Plans issued by GFP for public comment. Adoption of the Management Plans is scheduled for the GFP Commission meeting in May, 2015.

I have appreciated the opportunity to participate in GFP focus group discussions concerning GFP management of Black Hills streams and lakes, and we hope that GFP staff has accepted angler concerns as valid and our suggestions as well-intended. While we believe that GFP's 1993 Black Hills Stream Management Plan is essentially a sound plan for management of Black Hills streams, after 22 years it is certainly time to update the Stream Management Plan.

The small streams of the Black Hills are a precious resource to be enjoyed by fishermen of all ages and talents. There is enough diversity in the streams to enable GFP to manage streams for fishermen of all interests and manner of fishing. Habitat improvements in the small streams can make a significant difference in the fishery, just as habitat is key to pheasant numbers and success in East River. As always, GFP management of the resource is key to success, and, unfortunately, Black Hills streams have suffered through an extended period of benign neglect. While fish numbers are counted annually, Black Hills streams have not been managed, improved, and maintained in recent years to achieve the optimum result. We are pleased, therefore, to see GFP take seriously the update of a management plan for Black Hills streams, and we hope that the plan will be implemented to bring the coldwater stream fishery closer to its potential.

## **COMMENTS ON GFP DRAFT BLACK HILLS STREAMS MANAGEMENT PLAN**

### **GFP's 1993 Stream Management Plan is a good plan, but has not been fully implemented**

We appreciate GFP staff recognizing and incorporating elements of the 1993 Black Hills Stream Management Plan (Erickson et al 1993) at p. 15 of the Draft Streams Plan, which we believe to be an essentially sound plan for management of Black Hills streams. Unfortunately, the elements of the 1993 Plan which called for one-half mile of stream habitat projects annually were not implemented as GFP focus and effort has been directed to construction of small ponds since about 1998. In addition, the 1993 Plan was based on the utilization of brown trout for stocking in Black Hills streams, but despite the 1993 Plan GFP changed its stocking practices to utilize rainbow trout stocking in Black Hills streams exclusively for many years, converting those streams stocked with rainbow trout to put-and-take fisheries rather than developing self-sustaining brown trout fisheries when possible, as anticipated in the 1993 Stream Management Plan.

p. 2 / 7

### **Reorganize, restructure, and realign the GFP Black Hills Fish Management Area staff and organization in the Black Hills to provide more effective management of the unique coldwater fishery in the streams and lakes of the Black Hills Fish Management Area.**

At the present time, responsibility for management of the fishery in the Black Hills Fish Management Area is bifurcated between GFP Region One staff and GFP Pierre fisheries staff. GFP Region One encompasses the Black Hills and a large chunk of West River South Dakota. Responsibilities of Region staff are probably more diverse than any other GFP Region, in that big game management (elk, sheep, deer, turkey, mountain lion) is a more important responsibility of Region One management than in other regions in the State, and the fishery managed by Region One fisheries staff has both warmwater lakes and the only coldwater streams and lakes in South Dakota (outside the Missouri River lakes). In short, Region One has responsibilities typical of other GFP regions, but Region One staff has additional management responsibility for unique big game and unique coldwater lakes and streams, both of which require expertise specific to those unique areas.

We strongly suggest and recommend that for more effective and coordinated GFP management of the unique Black Hills coldwater lakes and streams, responsibility and leadership for implementation of GFP Black Hills streams and lakes management plans, and for direction and supervision of GFP fisheries employees involved, should be placed **in one GFP senior level coldwater fisheries biologist/manager who would report directly to the GFP Wildlife Division Director or to the Chief of Aquatic Resources**, with performance review to be based on implementation of GFP Black Hills streams and lakes management plans. Present bifurcated responsibility between Pierre staff and Region One staff for management of Black Hills coldwater lakes and streams can lead to a “who’s in charge” and “who is responsible” and “who makes the call” situation. I believe that if a single senior coldwater fisheries

biologist had been responsible for implementation of the 1993 GFP Stream Management Plan, the milestones in the 1993 Plan would have been accomplished.

While we advocate that responsibility for unique coldwater lakes and streams of the Black Hills be placed in a senior coldwater expert reporting to Pierre GFP staff as proposed above, I would suggest that the Region One fisheries staff continue to manage the many not-so-unique warmwater lakes in Region One outside the Black Hills Fish Management Area, as is done for warmwater lakes and streams in all other GFP Regions in South Dakota.

**The Black Hills streams are in desperate need of action in building and restoring damaged stream habitat, not endless study.**

While research is certainly necessary as the predicate for science-based management decisions, the Draft Plan gives the impression that GFP stream biologists are a newly created group just beginning a study of Black Hills streams -- but present and previous GFP staff have collected extensive stream data for many years and have completed numerous studies which are presently available to current GFP staff. It's high time to analyze the data and studies, put plans in place, and get to work on habitat in the streams.

p. 3 / 7

**GFP BH fisheries research should be need-based and application-directed.**

GFP funded research should address practical problems and questions in the Black Hills fishery and should attempt to provide a basis for determining cause of a problem and a proposed solution -- such as solving the puzzle of consistently missing year classes of brown trout in Rapid Creek, recommending remedial action, and implementing the remedial plan. Esoteric studies which do not have practical application for significant improvement of the fishery in Black Hills streams should be discontinued during the Plan period.

**Accelerate the action elements in the Draft Plan**

There is no apparent reason to wait until 2019 to address many of the known and documented problems and issues in Black Hills streams – **it's time to get to work through on-the-ground, in-the-stream remedial action.**

Although 1993 BH Stream Management Plan was good plan by GFP's Erickson, Koth and Vanderbush, the stream habitat commitment was not met – the last stream habitat project was a minor project in 1997 – 18 years ago. As practical matter, little habitat work has been done in Black Hills streams since Erickson left GFP for Alaska. Since 1997, the GFP fishery priority in the Black Hills shifted exclusively to expensive construction of small dams and ponds – e.g., Sunday Gulch Dam and Pond (0.15 acre), Savoy Dam and Pond (0.10 acre).

**Based on the current (1993) Plan, we're 18 years behind in stream habitat maintenance and construction.**

GFP's commitment in the Draft BH Streams Plan to enhance one-half mile of stream per year, the same as the 1993 Stream Plan, is not sufficient to bring streams up to good fishery habitat for dispersed angler use within Plan period 2015 – 2019. For example, in the 4000 feet of stream below Pactola Stilling Basin, there are probably only six prime fishing areas for fishermen. After years of neglect, Black Hills streams should now benefit from a "jump-start" from "catch-up" funding and effort to restore critical stream habitat. We can assure GFP that NGOs are eager to provide cooperator funding.

**Specific recommendation for Draft Plan: Amend Objective 1 on p. 14 to read "Objective 1: Protect or enhance at least one mile of coldwater stream habitat annually."**

**GFP should make a commitment to stream habitat improvement in the BH Stream Management Plan.**

**Specific recommendation for Draft Plan: Add as Strategy 1.9 on p. 14 of the Draft Streams Plan: "Strategy 1.9: Construct at least one mile of coldwater stream habitat annually during the Plan period."**

p. 4 / 7

**GFP should make a further commitment to stream habitat improvement.**

**Specific Recommendation for Draft Plan: Add as Objective 3 on p. 14 of the Draft Streams Plan: "Objective 3. By 2020, construct at least five major in-stream habitat projects in the major streams of the Black Hills."**

**GFP focus, effort and funding should be on major streams with greater potential for development as a Class 1 fishery.**

During the Plan period, GFP should maximize its resources to focus on the three major streams/watersheds in the Black Hills (Rapid Creek (including Castle Creek), Spearfish Creek, and Spring Creek, which have the greatest potential as fisheries and for frequent angler use. With limited resources, GFP should not focus during the Plan period on smaller streams with limited potential as a fishery or on stream reaches within private property where public access is problematic. For some unexplained reason, GFP staff is apparently reluctant and/or opposed to making such a commitment to the major streams.

**Specific recommendation for Draft Plan: Add as Strategy 1.2 on p. 14 of the Draft Streams Plan: "Strategy 1.2: Concentrate efforts and funding on major streams in the Black Hills (Rapid Creek, Castle Creek, and Spearfish Creek) during the Plan period."**

**Develop and maintain a prioritized list of stream habitat projects in the major streams of the Black Hills, with objectives for stream and fishery improvement defined – by June 2015!**

In the Draft Streams Plan, GFP proposes to develop a prioritized list of potential stream projects “**by June, 2017**” (at p. 14, Objective 1, Strategy 1.4 and “Objective 2 : By June 2017 . . Strategy 2.3: Prioritize potential projects . . .”) -- it just shouldn’t take two more years -- until June 2017 -- to put together the list of high priority stream habitat projects in the Black Hills. We believe that the highest ranking priority projects are obvious based on stream fishery potential, stream habitat condition, and high angler use. They are: **(1) Rapid Creek in Pactola Basin** -- the present Pactola Basin project identified as Objective 5 of the Rapid Creek Watershed Plan at p.70. This project has been in the planning stage since 2003; the contract for construction has been awarded, but the project was delayed due to high flows in winters 2013-14 and 2014-15. We understand that GFP has this project rescheduled for construction during winter 2015-16, with fishery evaluation to follow. **(2) Rapid Creek in Pactola Basin** to extend the habitat project from Tamarack Gulch approximately one mile to the Placerville Footbridge and to improve habitat in the 800’ reach from the Stilling Basin to the weir at the USGS gauging station. **(3) Spearfish Creek** -- probably the rebuild of habitat destroyed by flooding in the reach between Maurice Intake and Homestake Hydro No. 2 and in the reach through the City of Spearfish. **(4) Castle Creek** from immediately below below Deerfield Dam downstream to the Slate Prairie Road near McKinney Walk-in Area parking lot (US Forest Road 188), where previous habitat improvements have deteriorated badly. **(5) Rapid Creek through Rapid City** to restore damaged habitat structures and restore deeper sections of creek bed which have filled with silt and cobble due to high flows. Rapid Creek through Rapid City is

p. 5 / 7

a self-sustaining brown trout fishery – no stocking is done in this stream reach which sustains high angler use and has no special regulations regarding daily limit except for the one-half mile stretch through Meadowbrook Gold Course, for which special regulations were established largely at the request of golfer s who wanted to keep fishermen out of the fairways on the golf course.

#### **Develop GFP fisheries staff capability to self-construct small stream habitat projects.**

Stream maintenance and small habitat projects don’t have to be expensive contractor-build projects – GFP should have a GFP backhoe and crew able to perform in-stream construction and maintenance for smaller stream habitat projects which will not entail extensive permitting, contract bidding, and expense. In many instances, simple in-stream boulder or timber placement can create significant in-stream habitat changes – work that could be easily done by a GFP crew with a backhoe. GFP design and build of smaller self-help projects could avoid the significant delays caused by the USFS permitting requirements and the SDGFP contracting process.

#### **Resume and restore the brown trout fishery in Black Hills streams.**

Despite 1993 Plan, which was based on the maintenance of a brown trout fishery in Black Hills streams, GFP has established a put-and-take fishery by stocking Rainbow Trout almost exclusively in Black Hills streams where stocking is done. We’re told by GFP staff that rainbow trout do not “recruit” to build a self-sustaining stream fishery as brown trout will do in the Black Hills. GFP cites additional cost of brown trout as the principal deterrent to stocking brown trout, but brown trout can be developed to provide a self-sustaining fishery over a relatively short time under appropriate stream management regulations.

But, while cost of hatchery produced brown trout may be said to be a consideration by GFP which leads to the stocking of rainbow trout, recent GFP sponsored research (Scheibel) shows that that the cost of growing just one illegally-stocked northern pike to large adult size in Pactola Reservoir is \$200 - \$300 worth of hatchery rainbow trout, and GFP has not made any effort to reduce the population of northern pike in Pactola Reservoir – not even a regulation change.

**Discontinue stocking of trout, especially rainbow trout, in streams which are presently or will develop self-sustaining brown trout fisheries.**

For example: "Stream Reach Management – Wild Fish 4. Improvement (I)" at p. 17 – revise to eliminate "Option b. May use stocking of hatchery trout in wild fish management reaches to provide increased catch rates of adult trout." Follow the lead of Montana Game and Fish, which has not stocked fish in Montana streams since 1974, but has stressed enhancement of stream habitat -- and fish populations in Montana streams have increased significantly.

**Consistent with 2014 Angler Use Survey, increase the number of special regulation stretches of streams in the Black Hills, as the present 4 miles of special regulation stream reaches do not provide for adequate angler dispersal on prime fishing areas in those stream reaches.**

p. 6 / 7

The 2014 Angler Use Survey (Longmire) demonstrates and confirms that 51% of Black Hills stream fishermen "like/strongly like the Black Hills catch and release only areas" and that "39% [of stream fishermen] thought the number of areas should increase a little or increase a lot . . ." We believe that the 2014 Angler Use Survey supports an increase to the present 4 miles of Black Hills streams with special regulations. Four miles of stream throughout the Black Hills with special regulations to manage desired outcomes is just too few – and, if the oft-heard GFP assertion that "nobody keeps fish anymore" is true, then what's the harm in establishing several more catch-and-release reaches of stream.

**To avoid misinterpretation in the section entitled "Habitat Enhancement and Angler Access" and to be factually accurate GFP should include a report on the current state of repair of the referenced "24 miles" of stream habitat projects constructed during the period 1976 – 1991.**

To avoid misinterpretation that the "24 miles" of stream habitat is working today as designed and constructed, and to be factually accurate, it should be noted in the Plan that at the present time most of the 24 miles of stream habitat work referenced, which was constructed 24 to 39 years ago, has deteriorated significantly due to lack of maintenance.

**GFP Fisheries staff should report to the GFP Commission annually on progress on implementation of GFP Black Hills Streams and Lakes Management Plans Objectives, Strategies, and proposed actions.**

The GFP commitment to implement the Management Plans should be reinforced by the requirement of an annual progress report to the GFP Commission. GFP's failure to implement critical elements of the

1993 Stream Management Plan is confirmation that status reports on implementation of the 2015 Plan are important to assure the success of the Management Plans.

## **COMMENTS ON GFP DRAFT BLACK HILLS LAKES MANAGEMENT PLAN**

### **Manage major Black Hills reservoirs as coldwater fisheries.**

Outside of Missouri River reservoirs, which are managed primarily for walleye, only three large coldwater reservoirs exist in SD (Pactola, Sheridan and Deerfield Reservoirs), and they should be managed as coldwater fisheries. GFP manages hundreds of South Dakota lakes as warmwater lakes, including nearby Orman/Belle Fourche Reservoir and Angostura Reservoir.

### **The 2014 Black Hills Angler Use Survey shows that trout are the fish most preferred and sought by fishermen in both large and small Black Hills reservoirs. (2014 GFP Black Hills Fisheries Management: Angler Opinion Survey Results (Longmire) at pp. 16 – 23)**

While some vocal fishermen in Black Hills coldwater reservoirs like to catch perch and northern pike, they are in the minority. On average, perch in Black Hills reservoirs are generally small, and recent GFP-sponsored studies have determined that the northern pike in Pactola Reservoir are voracious trout-

p. 7 / 7

eaters, particularly in late season. Go with the majority of fishermen who prefer trout in Black Hills reservoirs, and manage the reservoirs as coldwater fisheries!

### **In developing management plans for Black Hills reservoirs, management plans for the two large warmwater reservoirs immediately adjacent to the arbitrary Black Hills Fishery Management Area boundary (Orman/Belle Fourche and Angostura Reservoirs) should be considered when developing management plans for Pactola, Sheridan and Deerfield Lakes within the BHFMA.**

Advocates for management of Black Hills lakes for warmwater species, and GFP for that matter, fail to acknowledge that two large lakes managed by GFP as warmwater lakes are located within a few miles of the arbitrary boundary established as the Black Hills Fish Management Area. Fishermen need to trailer their boats only a few more miles to access two large nearby lakes which are managed for warmwater fish species, primarily walleye. These two large reservoirs could also be managed by GFP for other warmwater species to satisfy those Black Hills anglers who like to fish for perch, crappie and northern pike.

### **Manage Deerfield Lake as a “blue ribbon” trout fishery by eliminating perch, suckers and rock bass as competing species for trout.**

The deterioration of Deerfield Lake as a once-premier trout fishery is tragic – small perch, suckers and rock bass are taking over! GFP needs to put a remedial plan for Deerfield Lake into action as soon as possible to save the trout fishery in Deerfield Lake.

**Control illegally-stocked northern pike in Sheridan and Pactola Reservoirs** through GFP removal and through fisherman removal by liberalized take regulations and by catch-and-kill regulations.

**Resume stocking of brown trout in Pactola Reservoir**

In years past, GFP stocked brown trout in Pactola Reservoir, where fishermen caught these fish by boat and from shore. As a bonus, there was a significant fall spawning run of brown trout from Pactola Reservoir upstream in Rapid Creek above Silver City. While stocking of brown trout in Pactola Reservoir continued, there was a self-sustaining population of brown trout in Rapid Creek above Silver City, although GFP also did supplemental stocking of brown trout. We believe that GFP should resume stocking of brown trout as a sport fish in Pactola Reservoir and in order to support the fall spawning run of brown trout into Rapid Creek above Pactola Reservoir.

Respectfully submitted on April 22, 2015.

S/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Everett E. Hoyt,  
4422 Carriage Hills Drive  
Rapid City, SD 57702

**From:** Freddy Maseman [<mailto:Freddy.Maseman@chssd.org>]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 24, 2015 3:27 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** Deerfield Lake

I recently saw an article in the paper about controlling the rock bass population in Deerfield lake by stocking it with a predator fish. I think one of the ideas was putting Walleye in there and is an idea I would support. Thanks for all you do.

**From:** Mark Vickers [<mailto:wbg@rushmore.com>]  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 26, 2015 2:16 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Subject:** GFP Draft Management Plans for Black Hills streams and lakes

A couple of quick comments:

- 1) Streams in the Black Hills have been neglected. The stream habitat improvements suggested in the 1993 Management Plan have largely failed to take place.
- 2) The draft plan suggests further study. Study is fine, as long as it doesn't become an excuse for lack of real progress. At this point, I am far more interested in progress in the stream than additional study.
- 3) Develop a list of stream habitat projects in order of priority, and schedule to complete them in an accelerated manner. Not all projects are large, expensive ventures. Pactola Basin will be (to my knowledge) the first meaningful stream habitat work since the mid-80's. Since that time (mid-80's) there has likely been years of study and a great deal of money spent, yet nothing has been achieved. The lack of progress does not reflect well on your agency. Set a goal of achieving something every single year.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,  
Mark Vickers  
PO Box 8124 / Rapid City, S.D. 57709  
(605) 342-7676  
[wbg@rushmore.com](mailto:wbg@rushmore.com)

**From:** Hans Stephenson [<mailto:hansrc@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 26, 2015 4:59 PM  
**To:** GFP Wild Info  
**Cc:** Ev Hoyt; Gary D. Jensen; Scott  
**Subject:** Comments on Draft Black Hills Streams Management Plan

### **Comments on SDGFP Draft Black Hills Fish Management Area Stream Management Plans**

Submitted by

Hans Stephenson

1114 South St

Rapid City, SD 57701

Below are my specific comments on the Draft Plan for Black Hills Streams. First I would like to make a few general comments. The use of the 1993 Stream Management plan as a partial framework for this plan is a step in the right direction. Overall I think plan moves us forward a great deal. However, I would like to see the timelines set in the plan for habitat improvements to be accelerated. Environmental changes have made fishing for wild self sustaining trout more and more concentrated in the Rapid Creek, Castle Creek, and Spearfish Creek drainages. These same environmental changes have made streams such as Spring Creek, French Creek, and Box Elder Creek marginal fisheries at best since 2001. We need intensive focus to protect, preserve, and improve the fisheries that have shown the most resilience to drought. I first started fly fishing Black Hills Streams in the early 1990s. From 1995-2000 the Black Hills experienced a period with abundant moisture resulting in very productive stream fishing. During that time anglers didn't have to worry about what part of the Black Hills they were in, good stream fishing could be found throughout. Since 2001, drier conditions and more erratic moisture patterns have resulted in a concentration of wild trout fishing. While wild trout populations on Rapid Creek, Castle Creek, and Spearfish Creek have fared better than those in other parts of the Black Hills, these streams have seen significant habitat degradation in the past 15-20 years. This habitat degradation has severely limited the quality of the remaining wild trout fisheries. Since we can't predict when another stable period of moisture will allow for sustained wild trout fisheries outside of Rapid, Castle, and Spearfish Creeks, it is critical that we hasten efforts to improve the habitat on streams with the most potential. The Draft plan can accomplish this important task if the timelines for habitat work are moved forward and if we set larger goals for habitat work. The adopted plan must be fully implemented and followed for this to happen. Thanks for the opportunity to be involved in the process.

### **Comments on Stream Draft Plan**

#### **Objective 1-**

Create two tiered system for habitat projects -- Tier 1 - Large Scale Projects and Tier 2 Small Scale Projects.

Build a framework for small scale projects that can be completed with minimal funding and permitting requirements. These projects could be used for annual maintenance and improvement of wild trout fisheries. Complete 6 small scale projects on Wild Trout Management Areas annually.

Large scale projects (Tier 1) projects should be in continual development. Focus large scale habitat projects on streams that will provide most return. Develop, fund, and complete a large scale habitat project on Castle Creek and Spearfish Creek by 2017. Develop, fund, and complete an additional large scale habitat project on Rapid Creek by 2018.

Increase total improvements from one half mile annually to one mile annually.

**Objective 2-** Accelerate the timeline for habitat project proposals. Submit proposals for Castle and Spearfish Creek by September 2015.

**Stream Reach Management Wild Trout-** If a stream supports wild trout and is managed as such it should not be supplemented with hatchery fish as specified in Improvement management option #4 b. on pg. 17.

--

Hans Stephenson  
Dakota Angler & Outfitter  
513 7th St.  
Rapid City, SD 57701

Phone: 605-341-2450  
[email: flyfish@rapidnet.com](mailto:flyfish@rapidnet.com)  
[www.flyfishsd.com](http://www.flyfishsd.com)

Ascher, Debra  
From: GFP Admin Rules  
sent Friday, March 27, 2015 11:03 PM  
To: GFP Admin Rules

Subject Comment on: GFP 2015 March Proposals - 2015 April Finals

Name: norm burleson  
Address: 22343 burleson lane  
City: lead  
State: sd  
Zip: 57754  
Email: burleson@wildblue.net  
Phone: 6055843123

Comment: read the article in rapid city journal about the owner of the rooster getting a petition out to put walleye in Deerfield lake. Please consider leaving that lake alone. My family and my parents and many friends

love that lake for the relaxing quiet time and can catch the trout we want for a meal. People have messed with

pactola and Sheridan so put the walleye in there. The lake will fill up with boats and then you will here complaints constantly about improving the ramps. I can go on forever so I will quit now and just ask the