

## Comes, Rachel

---

**From:** mtnmach <mtnmach@itctel.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 20, 2016 5:38 PM  
**To:** Coughlin, Paul  
**Subject:** Input on Public Hunting Area Purchases

Dear Paul,

My suggestion for a future purchase of land for a GPA would be to purchase an entire operating farm that has say at least 30% land that would be suitable for game production/hunting.

The object for this would be threefold;

- 1) Of course to acquire land suitable for public hunting/game management.
- 2) Create a classroom/laboratory for not only wildlife management, but also agriculture science in order to develop and demonstrate methods of mitigating agricultural chemical runoff. We are to the point that proactive measures are urgent if we are to avoid the situation that Des Moines vs Iowa Drainage districts presently find themselves in court over!
- 3) Provide continuing funding for future public land purchases.

How do we go about all this? Buy the farm, Request a university such as SDSU Brookings to develop and monitor a farming program using the latest known methods of minimizing run-off while building soil nutrients with minimum tillage. Chemical monitoring stations would be required at all upstream and downstream waterways including shallow temporary waterways. Before and after soil health sampling would have to be done.

Lease the farm to an enterprising young farmer that has some knowledge of conservation. Strictly adhering to the SDSU guidelines, the farmer would reap the profits of his harvest at minimal land rental rate. In order to avoid the inherent high costs of bureaucracies, the farmer would be in charge, GFP and/or SDSU would strictly act as a monitor to ensure compliance and good operating practices. After several years there should be enough data collected to demonstrate to the media and the public (and hopefully to doubting farmers) that conservation, clean waters, and profitability can go hand in hand. After the study is completed, the ag land could continue to be leased out to the highest (complying) bidder, with the land rental going into a fund for future land purchases.

George Bogenschutz  
46135 222<sup>nd</sup> St  
Nunda, SD 57050  
605-586-4187



## Comes, Rachel

---

**From:** The Kameruds <belly@abe.midco.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 18, 2016 8:50 AM  
**To:** Coughlin, Paul  
**Subject:** land aquisition priorities

Dear Mr. Coughlin:

In light of the several years of land-owner obstruction of access to the Jesse Slough-Lily Lake complex in Day County, I propose that the GFP open a Lake Access Area on this body of water. This could be easily done along the east-west county highway known as the Lily Road, west of the town of Lily. Local land owners have convinced the county and the various involved townships to close and/or abandon roadways leading into the water simply to prevent sportsmen from accessing this resource.

If the state opened a LAA and boat ramp anywhere on this body of water, the public access to this fishery would be preserved, and the efforts to close the roadways would be rendered moot. I understand from the local game wardens that the State is unable to even access its own lands due to the interference of the surrounding land owners with their clout over the local governing boards of the townships and county. I suggest this must be done, through condemnation if necessary.

Thank you for your kind consideration. I remain,

Sincerely yours,  
Brian J. Kamerud

## Comes, Rachel

---

**From:** curt koepp <ckoepp@abe.midco.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 11, 2016 9:53 AM  
**To:** Coughlin, Paul  
**Subject:** land purchases by gfp

as a land owner in day co I have been hearing a lot of rumbling's of having to compete with the gf&p for land sales. Explain please as it seems there is plenty of land already purchased and all your programs (food plots ect. are tied to land access) that is why I will not participate in this as I am tired of trespassing on my land because the neighbor has walk in, seems the rules mean the fence line + 50 feet on the other side of the fence (mostly out of staters.

## Comes, Rachel

---

**From:** Dean Fitzler <dkf@sio.midco.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 16, 2016 8:56 PM  
**To:** Coughlin, Paul  
**Subject:** Land Purchases

Paul

Buy, Buy,Buy. We (the hunters from SD) are being pushed out from lands.

Dean Fitzler

4001 S, Crescent Dr.

Sioux Falls, SD 57106

## **Comes, Rachel**

---

**From:** Bill Mitchell <billinmalibu@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 17, 2016 1:45 PM  
**To:** Coughlin, Paul  
**Subject:** buying property

**the state already has more property than it can take care of ..it needs the farmers and public to help then  
..If the state hasn't already pissed everybody of..i am not much for emails but would love to talk to you  
before there is more damage .. Bill Mitchell 8183712336**

## Comes, Rachel

---

**From:** Gregg Yonkovich <gjyonkovich1@mmm.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 27, 2016 8:53 PM  
**To:** Coughlin, Paul  
**Subject:** Comments on GF&P Land Acquisition Guidelines

I fully support the purchase of additional land for the purpose of expanding hunting and fishing opportunities in our State. It appears the primary goal is to expand acreage of existing State lands. I agree with this when these opportunities present themselves and hope this includes purchasing State land adjacent to existing Federal land.

I realize larger tracts improve effectiveness of land management activities, but ask the State to strongly consider other tracts of land, including smaller land purchases such as 40, 80 and 160 acre parcels not connected with existing State or Federal lands. In my opinion, four 160 acre provide more hunting opportunities than one 640 acre tract. I rarely enter a Game Production Area if there are others already hunting for safety reasons and out of respect for their hunting opportunities as they were there first. I also believe numerous smaller tracts of land provide better hunting opportunities due to reduced risk of wildlife loss from storms and other environmental issues. Farmers often purchase land in different areas to reduce risk of production losses from hail, drought, flooding, etc. I believe the same principle applies to wildlife management.

Sincerely,

Gregg Yonkovich  
2421 SE 14<sup>th</sup> Ave  
Aberdeen, SD 57401  
605-216-4529  
[gjyonkovich1@mmm.com](mailto:gjyonkovich1@mmm.com)

## Comes, Rachel

---

**From:** Larry Roberts <4lrbobac@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 12, 2016 7:07 PM  
**To:** Coughlin, Paul  
**Subject:** Document Input

Hello Paul,

The South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks News sent me an opportunity for input on public hunting area purchases. I'm providing input on the Wildlife Division's land acquisitions priorities and guidelines document.

With the exception of the last section, I liked the document. I found the section, Regarding land ownership and stewardship the Wildlife Division will, to be too down beat with too much focus on surplus and disposal. I suggest the following two sentences be considered for addition to this section.

Will strive to maximize habitat quantity and quality for fauna found on WPA and WAA lands.  
Will strive to maximize recreation opportunity and access, with habitat as priority, on WPA and WAA lands.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,  
Larry Roberts

--

Larry Roberts  
630 West 50th Street  
Casper, WY 82601  
307.472.6696  
[4lrbobac@gmail.com](mailto:4lrbobac@gmail.com)



## Comes, Rachel

---

**From:** lonny kracht  
**Sent:** Monday, March 14, 2016 12:21 PM  
**To:** Coughlin, Paul  
**Subject:** GFP Land Acquisitions

Mr. Coughlin,

I am a life long resident of South Dakota and am a very avid outdoorsman. I have shared how great it is to be a part of the outdoors with my 3 children and grandchildren. Thru the years we have seen what kind of land acquisitions work for us and what does not work for us so those are the opinions that I can share.

1. A land acquisition that is managed mainly for sportsman is most likely to benefit sportsman and the GFP for the long run. The best way I can explain that statement is in the following scenario. There is a piece of ground 10 miles north of Mud Butte, SD that sits on the Moreau River. It is a fantastic piece of wildlife property with great wildlife habitat. Perfect for deer, turkeys, grouse, and antelope. I'm not 100% sure but I believe the GFP purchased this property from the McKenna family about 10 or 15 years ago. I am not sure how but now the property is "School Land". With this being the case the person that leases the land can use the land as they see fit which allows them to allow cattle to graze this land. What happened to us was we found this awesome piece of public property and so we sent in for prairie deer tags and made plans to archery and rifle deer hunt it. The first time I drove up there to archery deer hunt the property there were 150 cows on the property which had pushed all the deer out. Later in the year we drove up again to rifle deer hunt and were met with the same thing. Cattle everywhere. Now I know the School Lands administration can't do anything to adjust the leases to aid sportsmen as that would possibly cause a loss of revenue for Schools but by putting the administration of this land in the School Land system it essentially puts sportsmen second in line for land use. If land is purchased by the GFP the GFP needs to administrate the use of the property to always insure that the property will always be first and foremost used to benefit wildlife and sportsmen. Having places available that sportsmen can count on year after year that are managed for them will go a long way in keeping young people interested.
2. The next thing I would like to suggest is purchasing properties that are already popular Walk In Areas. I am a huge fan of the Walk in Area program that the GFP administers. The only setback to this is often properties are listed for a year or two and then withdrawn. Purchasing some of these properties will ensure they are available every year. Also, if the GFP purchases a property they can control the lease of these properties to possibly only allowing grazing for the summer months to help recoup some of the cost to administer the property and insuring that sportsmen will be able to enjoy a property in the fall that is free of livestock.

Thank you

Lonny Kracht

Sturgis, SD

## Comes, Rachel

---

**From:** Levi <levi-garrett@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 18, 2016 1:08 PM  
**To:** Coughlin, Paul  
**Subject:** Input on land purchases.

As a hunter I'm against Land Purchases. The money would be spent better in my mind by spending it on leasing more walk in areas instead.

Thank you  
Levi Garrett

## Comes, Rachel

---

**From:** Bill Chalcraft <chalcraft@pie.midco.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 11, 2016 10:33 AM  
**To:** Coughlin, Paul  
**Subject:** Public Access Purchase Comments

Paul,

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on your document. I don't see it reflected in your document but I feel it is important to increase the amount of shoreline access via vehicle for fishing. Many fisherman don't have boats and many are limited mobility. GFP could do a great deal to increase shoreline access on existing public lands but you could also make this a priority for future acquisitions. Vehicle shoreline access is important for the elderly as well as families with young children. The way it is now, it seems like GFP is trying to limit access. I live in Pierre and see this first hand with Missouri River access but also consider it a statewide issue.

Thanks for your consideration.

Bill Chalcraft  
Pierre, SD

## Comes, Rachel

---

**From:** Kutella Ron <rjkutella@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 17, 2016 2:15 PM  
**To:** Coughlin, Paul  
**Subject:** Public area hunting purchase

Paul, here is my several cents.

The available CRP land as you know is shrinking. Therefore we need to back fill and provide more constant and a permanent solution to a continuous and growing concern.

Suggest you explore an option on the license purchase to make a contribution to your fund to purchase land.

Or

Just add a dollar (\$5) amount but have it line item to show the dedication fund.

I am an out of state land owner and owner of a resident in your state. Also have a small business in your state.

Hunt usually a week or so a year. It has been my growing experience that we are not able to find the land owner to ask permission to hunt. When we do ask my estimate is that 90%+ give us permission or are for fee hunting. Really easy when we can find the owner.

Hunters should not be trespassing and respect the owners rights. At the same time it would be advantage if a mechanism/process/source was set up to allow the hunter to make contact with the owner or a data bank that indicates the property is available to hunt. Some states are set up to allow hunting unless posted. The land owners that allow the hunting could get a tax relief or some monies from the fund.

Thanks

## Comes, Rachel

---

**From:** Dave Templeton <dtempleton@pie.midco.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 15, 2016 7:08 PM  
**To:** Coughlin, Paul  
**Subject:** Public hunting area purchases draft document.

I don't have any major comments on your draft, it looks good to me. However, I would encourage GF&P to solely limit their purchases to those properties that fit one or more of the priority acquisition criteria listed in the document.

I don't know for a fact, but I suspect more GF&P effort could be done to evaluate their current properties to figure out if they are being managed to their maximum potential and if not, what needs to be done to get the property to that level and then put your available funds into those efforts first.

Wildlife isn't stationary and movements occur with the seasons. Has GF&P ever done a complete analysis of existing GF&P properties, the adjacent properties, and then figured out how each GF&P property could then best be utilized to provide maximum hunting opportunities?

For instance, maybe a current GF&P property has good dense nesting cover but lacks winter cover and the existing adjacent private lands also lack adequate winter cover. In that case, perhaps winter cover should be added to your property. Each property is probably unique.

GIS would be a good tool to help in this endeavor.

thanks for the opportunity to comment.

## Comes, Rachel

---

**From:** Jerry Larsen <jlarsen@venturecomm.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 11, 2016 9:06 AM  
**To:** Coughlin, Paul  
**Subject:** Public Hunting Area Purchases

I would encourage the Game, Fish and Parks Department to acquire as much land as legally possible to add to the land that the public has available to access hunting and fishing opportunities. With the current attitude about exploiting our PUBLIC resources for private gain, it is going to be harder and harder for non land owning sportsmen to find and afford hunting and fishing opportunities in the state. I have hunted and fished in the state for about 65 of my 72 years and while my age is a contributing factor, it continues to be more and more of a challenge finding good hunting and fishing areas not already in heavy use, typically by OOS hunters and fishermen!! The more access the state can provide, the better.

Jerry A. Larsen  
419 East Chestnut Street  
Sisseton, Sd 57262

**Comes, Rachel**

---

**From:** Janet O'Keefe <jebokeefe@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 11, 2016 8:34 PM  
**To:** Coughlin, Paul  
**Subject:** Public Huntinh Grounds

The acquisition of wet lands is of the highest priority because it is being drained and destroyed beyond our ability to even slow it down. The state and the feds have allowed the draining of wet lands as never before, excluding the early and mid 20th Century. The proof is measured by the foot of plastic drain pip at or on hand in the farm supply companies and farmers property. Hundreds of miles of pipe have been used to drain water from the land that has held water for thousands of years. Yes, they say they replace drained land with other water acreage, but it is a lie.

Public land is being readied for private sale without notice to the general public, and with no thoughts of the impact on fresh water availability to the nation and wildlife. Wetlands provide water, cover, and food for all wildlife and human existence. They filter or try to purify the chemical poisons spread on the land to satisfy the needs of foreign countries. The farmers/ corporate farms fill their pockets through greed and with no thought to the needs of future Americans.

Save the wetlands!

Dennis O'Keefe

## Comes, Rachel

---

**From:** Acs <acs@venturecomm.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 14, 2016 1:37 PM  
**To:** Coughlin, Paul  
**Subject:** public land purchases

Hi, I'm replying to the public input on the purchase of public lands email. I feel a lot of land that was available to purchase in the past

3 years has been missed out on in northeast south Dakota just because it wasn't right next to other public land. I feel that practice needs to go away. Yes if land is available next to public its good to purchase it, but if 2 quarters are available that is ideal property for wildlife but its all by its self, why not purchases it and put it back to grass and trees. Case and point 2 quarters of land southeast of Amherst SD that was 2/3 wetlands and 1/3 trees and farm ground(very poor farm ground that was put into CREP/crp) was up for sale last year. A TON of waterfowl and pheasants nest there and its right next to a water run off( grass is important for water quality). But the GFP's wouldn't even look at it and a group of farmers(no names needed) purchased it and tore out every tree and drained the wetlands(they have been doing this practice for years). Its time to end the practice of purchasing land right next to other public state owned land and base the purchase off of quality of nesting and protection of clean water. I understand the GFP's can only buy land if the landowner comes to them, but its time to end that as well. If its up for sale, its time for the public to part of the bidding process too. Its time to partner up with DU and PF and have them put up some money for public lands, it was my understanding they USE to do that, time for it again. And its time to purchase small parcels of land for boat landings as well on public waters. I use public land a lot for waterfowl and grouse and bowhunting in NE SD. And we have seen a lot of land change hands in the past 12 years right next to public lands that the state couldn't purchase because of the Gov's freeze on the purchases(which was wrong on many levels, and I can't see how it was legal). Its time to purchase lands that are not next to public land already and keep the practice to purchase next to land too.

Thank you,  
Ryan



## Comes, Rachel

---

**From:** Ryan <ryan\_ryszyk@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 11, 2016 12:39 PM  
**To:** Coughlin, Paul  
**Subject:** wildlife land acquisition

First let me say thank you for recognizing the importance of public land in your state! I'm happy to see that your state takes land acquisition seriously. The importance of public land and access to public land for outdoor recreation can not be understated. I don't have specific comments to add to the guidelines recently sent out but I simply wanted to take the time to say this is a very important subject. I greatly enjoy the public lands in the state of South Dakota when I come to hunt.

Please continue to purchase lands for public use.

Thanks

Ryan from Oklahoma.

## Comes, Rachel

---

**From:** eric grenz <egrenz@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 12, 2016 8:12 PM  
**To:** Coughlin, Paul  
**Subject:** Opportunity for Input on Public Hunting Area Purchases

I would like to see lands purchased to gain access to private land locked parcels of public. There is a lot of acres of private land locked forest service land north east of Edgemont and South west of Hot springs. There are lots of other locked up public lands north of Wall.

Other great lands to acquire would be any lands in the cheyenne, white and other major river drainages. Get some lands with good cedar draws. Good lands to acquire east river would be lands with permanent lakes or good woodlots. Land with water or timber will get more sportsperson useage days.

Thank you  
Eric Grenz



Scanned for viruses. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)