

Resident /Nonresident Work Group
Jan 11, 2019
Matthews training center

In attendance Scott Simpson
Tom Kirschenmann
Rocky Niewenhuis
Matt Morlock
Jim Faulstich
Chris Hesla
George Vandel
Commissioner John Locken
Tasha Bothun
Nathan Sanderson
Kevin Robling
Dana Rodgers
Mike Vehle
Commissioner Gary Jensen
Cindy Longmire
Kevin Robling
Scott Simpson

Audience
Nick Lowery
Paul Lepisto
Jaime Huizenga
Troy Spitzer
Emmett Keyser
Mitch Babcock
Alex Russo
Mike Shaw
Ryan Thompson
Matt Eldridge
Commissioner Scott Phillips

On the phone
Sean Fulton

Simpson – Would like to pick up where we left off. We have notes from last meeting and a worksheet outline document. My goal for the day is to take each one of these themes from last meeting and add bullet points under each one. It doesn't matter how many. Some will have more than others and need more fleshing out. We went back through our conversations and tried to fill in some of the blanks. Feel free to discuss /edit. This document is a guideline and is not set in stone. At the end of the day, we need support for these main themes and will be provided to the commission. The commission will then take it into consideration put their thoughts into this and then take it to the public process.

Jensen – if anyone has thoughts on the priority of these themes we'd like to hear them.

Simpson - Last meeting we finished with the species abundance idea. –This is what we came up with.

1. Species of limited abundance (elk, bighorn sheep, mountain goats, etc.) - **The Commission should manage these species with discussions of the species constituencies and the department management plans.** Opportunities for Species of limited abundance should remain with residents and allow for little or no nonresident participation.
2. Species with greater abundance (deer, antelope, turkeys, waterfowl) - **Fewer restrictions should be placed on nonresidents when populations are abundant or above population objectives found in specific species management plans.** Opportunities for abundant species will allow for liberal and in some cases unlimited nonresident participation as species populations allow.
3. Abundant species (walleyes, pheasants) - **Any statement related to resident /nonresident shouldn't apply to these.**

Simpson - Anyone have any comments on this? Does anyone object?

Rogers- one caveat – even though we have an abundance of something, nonresidents can still have an impact on the quality of a hunt and access for the resident.

Simpson –That goes back to the crowding issue we talked about. Is that issue just limited to nonresidents?

Nathan – I think this will fit in other categories as well. As will more ideas that come up. I think we need to capture them in multiple

Morlock – how to you quantify that though...what bothers some people, might be ok for others.

Dana – it is objective. But this is to provide some basic guidelines. It's the commission's job to figure that out.

Vandel – Sometimes there might be abundant species, but the demand for buck licenses etc. is what is there. Somehow we have to take into account. Even abundant species, there is a higher demand for bucks than what the allocation would be allowed.

Simpson – I get where you are coming from, but I don't think we can take a scalpel to these things. We need to stay general

Vandel – in order to maintain quality, you have to control buck harvest, antlerless controls population. To maintain the quality of herd, you have to control buck harvest. That has to be taken into account. I'm still not comfortable with that first general statement.

Vehle – Future populations need to be inserted – If CRP becomes decimated, or a population is decimated, this might change our thinking. We need to be looking to future. I want to make sure that future is included

Jensen – It's not like you have to win every bullet point. We are going to have many points. It isn't necessary. We are going look at everything.

Simpson – So George as we talk about spec. abundance, when we go back to demand for licenses, we have that first bullet statement, do you feel like that is what we are talking about?

Vandel – Part of my concern is – I hate broad blanket statements. They tend to come back and bite you. Broad statement applies well to some, but not all.

Simpson – Go back to mikes statement

Vehle – we have to consider future populations....species...

Sanderson -Current and future pop of species should be taken into consideration

R3

Sanderson – We should encourage opportunities for youth and new hunters

Vandel – I don't know if we should worry about other states youth hunters. That is that states job.

Vehle – This is extremely important. We are coming up on a generation that doesn't like guns. They aren't comfortable and we need to make sure we get them involved.

Simpson – Regulations should promote, and not deter, youth participation.

Morlock – That applies more to retention and reactivation for nonresident hunters

Vandel – add youth to the first bullet.

Simpson – What about second bullet? Simplify and streamline regulations? What else?

Vandel - Strong wildlife pops are the best for R3

Falstich – I'm almost wondering if these should show up in more than one heading.

Simpson – I will do what the group wants.

Falstich – if I was commission, I would want a ranking of importance.

Simpson – I think that is what commission wants

Falstich – I think even within each category should be rankings

Jensen – if we want to list them more, imp ok with that.

Vehle – Guys have given up. Some are saying they don't have a place to go. For retention, access goes hand in hand.

Sanderson – We revised the first bullet point, it addresses youth...imp good with expanding opportunities for more than resident youth. I'm all for expanding opportunities for everyone.

Simpson – I just gave a presentation to commission on this today. Any one first time deer hunter or 10 years old can apply for an apprentice license. We had 531 apprentice licenses sold. It's not only youth. You are right.

Vandel I don't think it is our job to retain or reactivate nonresidents. That is my concern.

Bothun – I would disagree with that. At Tourism, we try to retain nonresident hunters. We work to encourage hunters we haven't seen for a few years to come back. Mainly pheasant hunting and fishing.

Simpson – Ok. I think we have captured most of this.

Jensen –should we consider economics?

Rogers –I don't think we should consider that at all? When it starts affecting resident hunters, then it is a problem.

Sanderson – So why allow anyone? We allow nonresident hunting licenses?

Rogers – They just want to take a vacation. What other reasons should be consider?

Sanderson- Main Street

Rogers- well that's money

Sanderson – the non-meandered issue is a great example; we have to think about hotels in Willow Lake etc.

Rogers – I think that is debatable – it is a positive for tax base. These places that advertise “come hunt” don't have land, they advertise to come and hunt and it has negative impacts on the resident hunter.

Sanderson – Property taxes are lower because of nonresident hunter and angler money. It actually reduces your cost of living. It has to be part of the mix

Falstich – As a landowner, I disagree with negative impact to landowners. Some own hunting operations, some don't. For me as a landowner, it is a positive. It helps main street, small towns are struggling. If it means keeping a grocery store open it's a positive. And it is about economics.

Fulton – Most of what I hear about nonresident is about complaints on overcrowding on public lands, not private lands...

Vandel - the issue of pheasant hunting and nonresidents and commercialization, well that train has left the station. Limiting pheasant hunting will never happen. My concern is expanding more nonresident hunting....outside of pheasant hunting. I spend more than any nonresident. We don't want to see commission expand nonresident licenses in those areas. That somehow needs to be worked into that.

Simpson – one thing I'm picking up on...needs to be some recognition of living here, paying taxes, etc. so if there is recognition of resident contribution, doesn't there have to be recognition of the nonresident? Can't have one without the other.

Sanderson – key is balance. We will all have different ideas on that balance. George's idea of balance is different than mine.

Morlock – we have to make sure we aren't swinging it too far against nonresidents. Their money helps us do the things we want to do as well.

Hesla – Nonresidents pay the biggest part of the bill. Boils down to the reason why we live in SD. It is for outdoor opportunities. Important to protect it for residents first and keep door open to nonresidents.

Vandel – I would like some mention of nonresident crowding. I think it needs to be stated.

Simpson - I think the commission needs to acknowledge hunt and fish realized economic impacts to state.

Sanderson – I know they are looking at hierarchy of categories. I don't know if you need to have a hierarchy. It depends on each individual species. It is part of the conversations. I am good with that as long as it is on the same level of the conversation.

Bothun- I agree. That is primarily what we promote. We are all residents who enjoy the outdoors, and we don't want to see it overpopulated. We want to make sure economic impact is considered. The nonmeandered issue does show importance to our communities. It is a way of life and a livelihood.

Simpson – I know this has come up in the past. Communities putting resources into the issue, does this have a place at the table? Where does the funding come from these activities? There hasn't been as much participation in the past, but it is starting to happen and the more it happens, the easier it is to talk about economics.

Hesla –GFP is solely funded by sportsmen's dollars. Everything costs more. The visitors come in and spend money, but what do they do to help the critter? Maybe it's time to talk about expanding the money base; a penny tax in the fall. What would that do for habitat? Sooner or later the GFP budget is going catch up to you. All your work adds up. Expansion of one thing takes money away from others. Expand the base for funding

Sanderson – That is more than tactics but maybe we need to look at license fees.

Hesla – I don't think license fees can keep up with it and don't think it will happen.

Sanderson –I think that is beyond scope of this group.

Jensen – I'm just playing devil's advocate here but what if there was a petition for nonresident mountain lion hunting? Would there be a possibility for allowing?

Rogers- Allowing or promoting?

Jensen – Allowing

Fulton – If we have lack of hunter participation, why wouldn't we open it up to that especially if it was for population control?

Vehle – That goes back to species.

Vandel - Overabundant Canada geese and snow geese in the spring is a similar issue. We are already getting concern from residents with guides and outfitters limiting opportunities by leasing ground. If we have exhausted our ability to get the harvest on a species with our resident hunters, then people don't have a problem, but when we do that, does it reduce and negatively affect our resident hunting population?

Fulton - This has to be a species specific type of thing

DEMAND FOR LICENSES

Simpson – We had two bullet points from our last meeting.

Second bullet added “on both residents and nonresidents”. Archery is a great example.

Vehle- When in times of limiting licenses, we default to favoring resident over nonresident

Sanderson –Isn't that is basically status quo?

Simpson – Would that first statement help?

Vandel - Even in population abundance, demand for buck tags are above limits to maintaining a quality herd. Struggling with this statement a little. There are some, like buck tags, you will always have a higher demand.

Sanderson – I think that is covered in species abundance.

Simpson – still up to public input and commission input

Nathan – from a policy building standpoint – more bullet points provide more chance for contradiction.

Simpson – So we have covered this pretty well. Maybe let's move on.

DEMAND FOR ACCESS

Simpson- For that first bullet. I'll use the Slim Buttes area as an example. If we limit one group, consideration needs to be made for all groups.

Vandel – To me, this applies to big game.

Simpson- But the Lower Oahe access area is a prime example too.

Sanderson – Ensuring the consideration of the geographic area. If you want to restrict archery hunters in Slim Buttes, that makes sense. Maybe saying something like a localized decision. Continue to use local decisions instead of statewide decisions.

Simpson – So we don't necessarily have to pigeon hole decision making.

Fulton – This is one of my biggest points. On some of these units of high pressure, why don't we suggest limited draw units for some of these areas? Start with nonresidents and if it cures problem then it could stop there.

Falstich – My concern is many of these areas are public lands. I would worry about private lands in any of these decisions. What if landowners don't want this?

Kirschenmann- It is not necessarily a problem. In the Sioux Falls area harvest has switched from gun to archery. One of the results has been a reduced number of firearms tags.

Simpson Some specific geographic locations may be required to have limited access due to hunting pressure or due to hunting pressure or management objectives.

Commissioner Locken – The Commission is always challenged that problems are local but solutions are statewide.

Fulton – If we limit different areas, a fallback could be a standard 8% access for nonresident.

Simpson – Eventually that would be up to commission

Kirschenmann – Using the example of limiting on public lands, maybe it should also be consideration to the people who were using certain lands; where do they go and will it lead to creating more hotspots. Pressure shifts as a result of these decisions.

Vandel- when the legislature 500 added waterfowl licenses to the northeast, it added increase in pressure on public lands. At one point do nonresident hunters impact resident hunters? This doesn't address that. Public land access is coveted by our resident and nonresident hunters.

Sanderson – As we restrict certain areas, we will need to analyze how those displaced hunters are affecting other areas.

Jensen- Can I suggest timing be listed?

Kirschenmann – That is known as temporal distribution of hunters.

Jensen – Does it matter who the nonresident is? Family who moved away

Rogers – That depends upon who you talk to.

Vandel – Nonresident is clearly defined in statute.

Sanderson – I am suggesting cutting social carrying capacity.

Simpson – We have been talking about this. All the other things take this into account. Anyone have any heartburn with removing this category?

Vandel-The commission needs to consider social carrying capacity and find balance between the needs of the resident hunters and the numbers of nonresidents. Top reason people quit hunting is finding an

uncrowded place to go. There is a turning point, and maybe it is up to each individual. WW2 example when nonresident duck hunters were outlawed for 20 years because of residents getting access taken away. Since then there has been increasing pressure. I think this needs to be articulated somewhere. There is a point where the conflicts and resident and nonresident hunters and hunting opportunity cause a decline in resident hunting population.

Sanderson – To what end?

Vandel- I don't know?

Sanderson – I think all the other statements on board cover that.

Vandel – I disagree. It needs to be articulated.

Simpson – My problem is that it is also resident vs resident, youth vs old, etc. I don't know if focusing on just nonresident helps the commission at all.

Vandel – How do you resolve, acknowledge this issue?

Sanderson – You are articulating the groups charter George.

Vandel – I'm looking at everyone. Do you think other points cover this issue?

Rogers – Other statements do cover it, but I'm ok with adding verbiage.

Longmire – Let me see if I can help. Surveys, find threshold of where the tipping point is, is subjective by time, space, critter etc... If I was charged to find tipping points, I'd be looking at what hunters are looking for in a quality experience. Quality experience is very subjective. From a social carrying capacity standpoint, all these other factors lead into carrying capacity and the tipping point.

Hesla – We were asked to come up with criteria for nonresident vs resident. I don't think it's our job to tell commission, we just want them to consider.

Simpson – I will put this up on the board and let commission decide. This is more than just a resident vs nonresident issue...it's a crowding issue.

Vehle- Residency has its advantages. If I'm crowded out by people in my neck of the woods and there are local plates, I might say...ah they beat me to point, but if it is nonresident plates, then I may be mad.

Social Impact

There is a point when the conflict between Res and non res causes a decline in resident participation.

Economics

Sanderson –I think these could roll all into one statement.

Rogers – We think the commission should take all of these into consideration? I don't think they should take all of these.

Vehle – All of these are dependent on the resource and the size of the resource. If resource is shrinking, economic impact will shrink.

Sanderson – I don't think anyone is saying we should abuse resource because of economics.

Simpson- Economics doesn't trump management.

Rogers - If everything is good, economics will be good.

Bothun – As long as there is opportunity is there to sell licenses, we just want to make sure these people are considered. We should share these resources if we have the ability and it is appropriate.

Vandel– the GFP budget and the economic impact needs to be separate.

Sanderson – All those others should be listed. If you consider impact of hunting and fishing to state economy. That impact is much greater than GFP budget.

Vandel– I don't think they all need to be listed.

Falstich – I think they need to be listed.

Simpson - we can wordsmith this. Economics should not trump management objectives.

HABITAT AND STATUS OF HABITAT

Simpson – I think most of us agree that this is the most important piece of puzzle that we have. I'm not sure how to provide a criteria bullet

Sanderson – You could roll habitat into species abundance category. If people feel that it diminishes importance of habitat, I'm ok with that. Current and future habitat is an important criteria to be considered. Not just what we have now, what we have down future

Jensen – I don't necessarily disagree, but with governor and her priorities...

Rogers – I don't know if it comes into play with this discussion

Vehle- Would you ever consider a nonresident habitat?

Rogers - There are lots of ideas but it has to make financial sense to private landowners.

Fulton – What about selling a separate license for private vs public lands?

Sanderson – There is some value in a limited number of these categories fewer is often better.

Simpson – Maybe this is one of those things that we take to the commission and mention this process and how we saw this play out. The commission can take the ideas and incorporate in some subcategories or keep it separate.

Simpson – From here on out, the process is we will clean this up and make it presentable. Once that is complete we will send this out to the group, you make your comments. Then we present this to the commission on Feb. 28 – March 1. Commission doesn't have to make this a proposal, but we will handle it as such. We want it out there for public comment. At the same time, the commissioners will have their own ideas and edits. In April, they will get together and work out public comments and their own ideas, and hopefully adopt a version of this.

Jensen – We also shared this with 50 different groups,

Simpson – Also sent it to 150,000 people letting them know what this group has done so far.

Jensen – We will take public comment

Simpson – To the group here...any ideas?

Flatland Flyways – I would say from my perspective, I noticed in a situation like this where you have passionate people on different sides. I'm from Hecla. There isn't much and business owners are all great people. I think resident should always have first crack. But there has to be compromise. I respect the positions. But we also have to really think about is youth, military, etc. I heard a lot about competition. I don't think competition should be involved in this. We are only as strong as we are together. Lots of anti-hunter, sentiment. We need to stay together. We have to figure out the facts of it. Is it acceptable to have nonresidents and at what level?