**BEFORE THE SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**DOCKET NO. EL24-023**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION BY DEUEL HARVEST WIND ENERGY SOUTH, LLC FOR ENERGY FACILITY PERMITS OF A WIND ENERGY FACILITY AND A 345 KV TRANSMISSION FACILITY IN DEUEL COUNTY, SOUTH DAKOTA, FOR THE SOUTH DEUEL WIND PROJECT**


Direct Testimony of Chad Switzer
On Behalf of the Staff of the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
November 13, 2024

**Q: State your name.**

A: Chad Switzer.

**Q: State your employer.**

A: State of South Dakota, Department of Game, Fish, and Parks (GF&P).

**Q: State the program for which you work.**

A: Division of Wildlife.

**Q: State the program roles and your specific job with the department.**

A: The role of the Division of Wildlife, in particular, the Terrestrial Resources Section is to study, evaluate, and assist in the management of all wildlife and their associated habitats. Management includes game and non-game wildlife populations, habitat management on public lands and technical assistance and habitat development on private lands, population and habitat inventory, and environmental review of local and landscape projects. As the Deputy Director of the Wildlife Division, I directly oversee regional field operations, licensing office, GIS and database intelligence program, federal aid, and am involved with wildlife management and research, as well as habitat management consisting of the department's public lands and private lands programs.

**Q: Explain the range of duties you perform.**

A: Duties include providing a major role in budgeting, planning, development, implementation of strategic plans, and policy/rule development. Serve as a liaison between the division and the public, working with various boards, commissions, and user groups. Directly supervise and oversee regional field operations (four regional supervisors), licensing (one program administrator), federal grants (two grant coordinators), GIS and database intelligence program (one coordinator), and one division staff specialist. Operational management includes staff and programs managing wildlife populations, harvest/season structure activities, wildlife damage, public land management, outreach and outdoor education at two Outdoor Campus facilities, and private land habitat and access programs. Assists with the creation of department reports, briefs, and documentation for the executive and legislative branches, GFP Commission, public, and other interested user groups.

**Q: On whose behalf was this testimony prepared?**

A: This testimony was prepared on behalf of the Staff of the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission.

**Q: What role does the Department of Game, Fish and Parks have in the permitting process of a wind energy development project?**

A: Game, Fish and Parks has no regulatory authority when it comes to permitting wind energy development projects. The agencies' role is to

consult with developers and provide recommendations and suggestions on how to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts of wind energy development to wildlife and associated habitats and provide available information to make informed decisions as related to natural resources.

**Q: Have you reviewed the Application, attachments, and Deuel Harvest's responses to PUC Staff data requests?**

A: Yes, relevant sections of the application and attachments and also received briefings provided by GFP biologists.

**Q: Did the GF&P provide comments and recommendations to Deuel Harvest about the project area? Please identify who provided those comments and provide a brief summary of them.**

A: Yes, Hilary Morey, former Senior Wildlife Biologist responded to an inquiry from Invenergy, (on behalf of the developers of Deuel Harvest) to provide information on listed, proposed, and candidate threatened or endangered species, or sensitive environmental areas in or near the project area. Mrs. Morey conducted a search of the South Dakota Natural Heritage database within the proposed project boundary. Mrs. Morey's response to developers in October of 2022 included records of the Hornyhead chub and Blackside Darter, both fish species of greatest conservation need. The response also included information about the project area and concerns over sensitive species and sensitive environmental areas. Mrs.

Morey also provided comments at meetings and during conference calls with Invenergy.

A summary of those comments included suggestions on the types, timing and number of surveys for grassland birds (songbirds and grouse), survey recommendations for raptors, placement of turbines and associated infrastructure considering the avoidance of untilled native prairie and large contiguous blocks of grasslands and to focus on disturbed lands such as fields currently cultivated. Game, Fish & Parks also suggested avoidance of activities that will fragment contiguous blocks of grasslands, avoidance of wetland basins or areas of high concentrations of wetlands, pre-construction surveys for bat use and habitats plus post-construction mortality surveys, and recommendations on transmission line placement.

**Q: Do you agree with the comments and recommendations provided to Deuel Harvest by Mrs. Morey? If not, please explain.**

A: Yes. These are standard recommendations and comments our Department would provide to wind power companies to identify, minimize, or reduce impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitats, especially those projects that are proposed in grassland and wetland habitats.

**Q: Based on the information provided in the Application, in your opinion did Deuel Harvest utilize the proper studies and wildlife surveys**

**necessary to identify potential impacts to the terrestrial environment?**

A: Yes.

**Q: Are there different types of grasslands?**

A: Yes.

**Q: Please define the following: native prairie, hayland, pasture, CRP, grassland, cropland and agriculture.**

A: Grasslands are areas that contain plant species such as graminoids and commonly used for grazing or set aside for conservation purposes. They can also be areas which are planted to a mixture of grasses and legumes for livestock grazing or feed. Native prairie is grassland upon which the soil has not undergone a mechanical disturbance associated with agriculture or any other type of development. Hayland is grassland that is managed by frequent mowing and often contains non-native plant species either intentionally or by encroachment. Pasture is grassland that may contain non-native plant species either intentionally or by encroachment and is managed by through grazing. Rangeland is similar to pasture; however, these areas are often larger and less invaded by exotic plant species. In some instances, hayland, pasture, and rangeland could be native prairie; in other situations, hayland and pasture in particular could be land once cultivated and restored to grassland habitat. CRP is

grassland that occurs on land that was once tilled and used for crop production. These lands are often not as productive as other cropland and grassland restoration is intentional.

**Q: What are remnant prairie tracts?**

A: Remnant prairie tracts are pieces of native prairie remaining in a landscape that is dominated by tillage agriculture that have never been tilled or have never undergone other mechanical disturbances for agriculture or other purposes. Prairie is a naturally occurring ecosystem in central North America characterized by certain precipitation levels, grazing pressure and fire. Dominant plant forms characteristic of and adapted to these environmental conditions include native grass, forb, and sedge species.

**Q: Do remnant prairie tracts have high conservation value?**

A: Yes.

**Q: Why do remnant prairie tracts have high conservation value?**

A: North American prairies (tallgrass, mixed-grass, and shortgrass), especially those with higher precipitation levels have had a long history of being converted to cropland. Once tilled, this system cannot be fully restored. In the Prairie Coteau ecoregion, 1 million acres of potentially undisturbed lands (e.g. prairie) remain (Bauman et al. 2014) and represent

some of the last remaining areas of native prairie habitat. There are several endemic grassland bird species that require native prairie. Many of these populations are rare or declining and one of the main reasons for their decline is habitat loss.

**Q: To your knowledge, are there grazed grasslands in the project area?**

A: Yes.

**Q: Do grazed grasslands have any conservation value?**

A: All grasslands have a conservation value when considering both wildlife and livestock. Grasslands (native prairie, restored/replanted grasslands, pastures, hayland, etc.) provide habitat that can and will be used by grassland birds and waterfowl. Management activities, in particular managed grazing, can help maintain healthy grassland habitats or enhance its current state. Various grazing strategies can also determine which bird species and other wildlife will use individual tracts.

**Q: Briefly explain the role of grazing on grasslands.**

A: Grazing provides different plant heights that result in different types of wildlife cover, allows for nutrient recycling, and helps to maintain grassland especially in areas with higher levels of precipitations. Grazing can be used as a management activity to either manage for a specific diversity or to manage unwanted plant species.

**Q: One of the GF&P's recommendations was that efforts should be made to avoid placement of turbines and new roads in grasslands, especially untilled native prairie. Based on the information in the Application and the proposed turbine layout, did Deuel Harvest demonstrate efforts to address this recommendation?**

A: From reviewing the maps, resources, and other information available there were efforts to avoid placement of turbines on untilled native prairie. It appears that in some instances the placement of the turbine is on the edge of native prairie and other land use types which is also a positive approach. Some turbines were placed on other types of grassland habitats that are classified as herbaceous cover (hay and pasture) within the project area; these too are important grassland habitats to many wildlife species. Avoidance of all grassland habitat will be challenging in this part of the state and in the project area as a high proportion of the total area is some type of grassland/herbaceous habitat (~50%). Placement of turbines in cultivated land (disturbed) is a positive siting approach.

**Q. Does the state or GF&P have specific mitigation recommendations that will minimize or compensate potential impacts from wind energy development if they cannot be avoided?**

A. At this current time South Dakota does not have a state mitigation policy that can be provided to wind energy developers. However, there are resources available which can provide guidance and suggestions that can be considered as well as self-imposed actions or activities that can minimize impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat.

**Q: Beyond avoidance, initial consultation with GF&P recommended that impacts to native prairie and wetlands should be mitigated. What does mitigation mean?**

A: In its broader context, mitigation can be an enhancement, restoration, creation and/or a preservation project or activity that serves to offset unavoidable impacts to a resource. It can also be measures taken in the design, materials, timing, layout/siting locations and all associated infrastructure during construction and operation.

**Q: What are potential mitigation considerations?**

A: Mitigation can take multiple forms and can be accomplished in a number of ways. It could be an approach which implements an applied management activity/strategy on impacted lands which elevates these lands to a more productive state or higher ecological state (example – grazing management) to an approach which is more sophisticated and detailed using scientific information to calculate acres of habitat to be restored or created based on impacted acres and other relevant research

data (example – decision support tool). Two examples that are available specifically for wind energy projects is a research study conducted by Loesch et al. (2013) that considers breeding waterfowl and another which focuses on breeding grassland songbirds resulting from research findings of Shaffer and Buhl (2016). As stated earlier, South Dakota does not have a state mitigation policy nor does the state endorse either study and resulting products, however it is worthy of mentioning these studies that demonstrate available options to developers and land managers.

**Q: Can you explain the difference between temporary and permanent habitat impacts and suggested methods to address these changes?**

A: There will be temporary and permanent losses of grassland and potentially wetland habitats resulting from the construction of turbine pads, roads, and other associated infrastructure. Construction of a wind farm often requires wider roads, crane paths, laydown yards, etc., to erect turbines. These construction activities will have temporary impacts that likely can be reclaimed by restoring impacted areas by grading and reseeding. Disturbed areas should be restored using native seed sources to reduce the introduction of new or discourage encroachment of already present exotic and/or invasive species.

For those areas that are permanently changed, it is a typical recommendation for lost grassland or wetland acres to be replaced. Disturbed areas again should be restored using native seed sources to reduce the introduction of new or discourage encroachment of already present exotic and/or invasive species. It would also be recommended to replace lost acreage within the Prairie Coteau ecoregion.

**Q: Are there any other impacts besides temporary and permanent habitat impacts that are likely to occur as a result of the project?**

A: Indirect habitat impacts are also a consideration. Indirect impacts caused by wind turbines and associated infrastructure raise concerns with habitat fragmentation and potential displacement, especially with regards to breeding grassland and wetland species. Research into the effects of wind energy on habitat avoidance has shown that some species will use grassland or wetland habitats to a lesser extent within a certain distance of a wind turbine (Loesch et al. 2013, Shaffer and Buhl 2016).

**Q: One of GF&P's concerns involved the fragmentation of contiguous blocks of grasslands. Why is fragmentation a concern?**

A: Fragmentation results in the direct loss of habitat and diminishes the value of remaining habitat. Habitat fragmentation is the division of large contiguous blocks of habitat into smaller, and in some instances isolated patches.

**Q: The GF&P recommended avoiding the placement of turbines and roads in contiguous blocks of grassland. Based on the information provided in the Application, did Deuel Harvest address this recommendation?**

A: Based on reviewing available information, fragmentation of grassland habitats were avoided/minimized in some of the project area through the proposed layout of the infrastructure of the wind farm. This is a result of using existing roads, placing new roads along edges or through cultivated lands, and following existing corridors (roads) for power lines. Based on the location of the project area and the existing land-use, it will be challenging not to create some additional fragmentation of grassland habitat.

**Q: If fragmentation of contiguous blocks of grasslands couldn't be avoided, the GF&P recommended the impacts should then be mitigated. Does the GF&P have any recommendations on adequate types of mitigation measures Deuel Harvest should undertake to offset any adverse impacts due to fragmentation? Please explain.**

A: As stated earlier, the state does not have a mitigation policy, however other resources and approaches exist that could be considered to help minimize the impacts of additional fragmentation.

**Q: The GF&P recommended that turbines should not be placed in or near wetland basins and special care should be made to avoid areas with high concentrations of wetlands. Do you believe that Deuel Harvest's proposed turbine layout incorporates this recommendation?**

A: The application mentions under mitigation measures for wildlife that wetlands will be avoided or minimize disturbance of individual wetlands during project construction as well as identifying wetland boundaries by delineating them prior to construction. These are appropriate measures. No turbines are planned in wetland basins. It will be challenging to avoid areas of high wetland concentrations because of the number of wetland acres and basins found in this part of state and project area.

**Q: Are you aware of any other wind farms near this proposed project?**

A: Yes. I am aware of projects in the area by reviewing the map of wind projects found on the PUC website indicating projects either in the status of existence, proposed, pending, or under construction.

**Q: Does the GF&P have any thoughts regarding the potential for cumulative impacts the Project may have in relation to other projects?**

A: Native prairie grasslands continue to decline in eastern South Dakota. Knowing the importance of these native prairie tracts to several grassland

dependent species, continued development on these types of lands could result in reduced or limited habitat value, and possibly reduced densities of these species. Placement of turbines in lands currently under cultivation and avoiding, where possible, the different varieties of grassland and wetland habitats will help minimize potential cumulative impacts. Species sensitive to habitat fragmentation may show different responses based on the landscape context (e.g. areas surrounded by grasslands or areas surrounded by cropland or other development).

Our agency will continue to work with wind developers and provide recommendations that we believe will help minimize cumulative impacts. No different than offered to this project, the focus could include, but not be limited to, recommendations on avoiding grassland habitats, in particular native prairie remnants, avoidance of high-density wetland complexes, maximize the use of existing corridors for infrastructure, and pre and post construction surveys to assess the proposed project area.

**Q: Do any State threatened or endangered species have the potential to be impacted by the wind farm?**

A: No.

**Q: Are there any GF&P lands or other public lands that may be impacted by the wind farm?**

A: There is one Game Production Areas within the project area boundary. There is one walk-in-area parcel within the project area. These properties are privately owned and an agreement with GFP opens them to free public access for hunting.

**Q: Does the GF&P have any recommendations to protect those GF&P lands or other public lands?**

A: The state does not have an established set-back policy or recommendation for wind turbine placement in proximity to state properties such as Game Production Areas. Set-back policies have been established at local levels by local government entities and in some instances have been suggested as the potential set-back distance from state properties. At this time, it is the GF&P's belief that these types of policies be established at the local level and at the discretion of the PUC to impose such set-backs when considering wind energy permits.

**Q: If the final turbine locations changed from those provided in the proposed turbine layout, could the potential terrestrial environment impacts change?**

A: Yes.

**Q: You mentioned the applicant requesting data from the Natural Heritage Database. What is the South Dakota Natural Heritage database? What type of information does it contain?**

A: The South Dakota Natural Heritage database tracks species at risk. Species at risk are those that are listed as threatened or endangered at the state or federal level or those that are rare. Rare species are those found at the periphery of their range, those that have isolated populations or those for which we simply do not have extensive information on.

This database houses and maintains data from a variety of sources including site-specific surveys, research projects and incidental reports of species that cover a time period from 1979 to the present. It is important to note that the absence of data from this database does not preclude a species presence in the proposed project area.

**Q: In summary, does GF&P offer any specific permit recommendations/conditions should the permit be granted?**

A: The GF&P recommends two years of post-construction avian and bat mortality monitoring. A similar condition has been ordered by the Commission in past wind farm dockets and if applied for this project would be consistent and addresses our recommendation stated earlier in the testimony. If such a condition is included, we would recommend a copy of

the report to be shared with the US Fish and Wildlife Service, SD Game, Fish and Parks, and the Commission.

**Q: Does this conclude your testimony?**

A: Yes.

Bauman, P., J. Blastick, C. Grewing, and A. J. Smart. 2014. Quantifying undisturbed land on South Dakota's prairie coteau. SDSU Extension.

Collins, J., and G. Jones. 2009. Differences in Bat Activity in Relation to Bat Detector Height: Implications for Bat Surveys at Proposed Windfarm Sites. Acta Chiropterologica 11:343-350.

Environmental Laboratory. 1987. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. Technical Report Y-87-1, U.S. Army Engineer Water-ways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.

Loesch, C. R., J. A. Walker, R. E. Reynolds, J. S. Gleason, N. D. Niemuth, S. E. Stephens, and M. A. Erickson. 2013. Effect of wind energy development on breeding duck densities in the Prairie Pothole Region. The Journal of Wildlife Management 77:587-598.

National Research Council. 2007. Methods and metrics for wildlife studies. Pages 279-348 in Environmental impacts of wind-energy projects. The National Academies Press,Washington D.C.

Shaffer, J. A., and D. A. Buhl. 2016. Effects of wind-energy facilities on breeding grassland bird distributions. Conservation Biology 30:59-71.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 2010. Regional supplement to the Corps of Engineers wetland delineation manual: Midwest region (Version 2.0). Wakely, J.S. R.W. Lichvar, and C.V. Noble, eds. ERDC/EL TR-10-16. Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2012. Land-Based Wind Energy Guidelines (WEG). Available online at: https://www.fws.gov/ecological-services/es-library/pdfs/WEG_final.pdf.

Weller, T. J., and J. A. Baldwin. 2012. Using echolocation monitoring to model bat occupancy and inform mitigations at wind energy facilities. The Journal of Wildlife Management 76:619-631.

# CHAD T. SWITZER

20515 Shamrock Avenue, Pierre, SD 57501 | Cell: 605.280.9035 | chad.switzer@gmail.com

**PROFESSIONAL SUMMARY**

Dedicated and reliable wildlife professional with 25 plus years of experience in wildlife and habitat management, social issues related to natural resources, and in providing effective wildlife management leadership. Diversified skills include project management, administrative support, interrelations, team building, and effective communication.

**EDUCATION**

B.S. Natural Resources, May 1996
Major: Fisheries & Wildlife Management
University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Department of Forestry, Fisheries & Wildlife

**EXPERIENCE**

**Wildlife Division Deputy Director** (August 2022 - Present, Pierre, SD)
South Dakota Department of Game, Fish & Parks, Division of Wildlife

- Provide supervision and oversight in the areas of field operations, licensing, federal grants, and geographic information system and data intelligence services
- Operational management including staff and programs related to managing wildlife populations, harvest and season structure activities, wildlife damage management and animal damage control, outreach and outdoor education at campus facilities, and private land habitat and access programs
- Serve as a liaison between the division and the public, working with various boards, commissions, and user groups
- Assist in the creation of department reports, briefings, and documentation for the executive and legislative branches, commission, public, and other interested user groups

**Wildlife Program Administrator** (July 2009 - August 2022, Pierre, SD)
South Dakota Department of Game, Fish & Parks, Division of Wildlife

- administered statewide wildlife programs (big game, upland game, waterfowl, wildlife diversity, hunter harvest surveys, and Custer State Park) and supervise program staff
- with the input obtained from department staff, developed hunting season recommendations, discussed with department leadership, and presented department recommendations to commission for consideration
- coordinated statewide wildlife research, wildlife surveys, management plans, and disease monitoring efforts
- developed, justify, and allocate program budgets and authorize expenditures

**Senior Upland Game Biologist** (March 2008 - July 2009, Huron, SD)
South Dakota Department of Game, Fish & Parks, Division of Wildlife

- was responsible for the management and research of ring-necked pheasants, prairie grouse, greater sage-grouse, ruffed grouse, Northern bobwhite, and wild turkey
- provided technical support to state and federal agencies regarding the management of upland game species
- directed the daily operation of a district office

**Wildlife Habitat Biologist** (August 2002 - March 2008, Huron, SD)
South Dakota Department of Game, Fish & Parks, Division of Wildlife

- completed wetland and grassland habitat restoration, development, and enhancement projects with federal, state, and local partners on public and private lands
- assisted with the development and management of wetland and grassland projects on department-owned lands
- assisted with upland and wetland land reconnaissance and acquisition projects
- conducted wildlife surveys and assisted with wildlife damage complaints

**Wildlife Biologist II** (February 1999 - July 2002, North Platte, NE)
Nebraska Game & Parks Commission, Wildlife Division-Management Section

- administered, coordinated, and implemented the management activities on 10,000 acres of Wildlife Management Areas
- assisted in the implementation of all wildlife surveys and inventories, disease control, animal damage control and wildlife propagation projects
- was responsible for related contractual services, agricultural leases, federal farm program requirements, project requisitions and management documentation
- prepared budget requests and monitored expenditures for assigned areas
- supervised permanent and temporary employees

**Soil Conservation Technician (**November 1997 - January 1999, Ipswich and Watertown, SD)
USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service

- advised landowners on the selection, installation, and maintenance for a variety of conservation practices and cost-share programs
- surveyed, designed, and staked engineering conservation practices
- prepared records and reports on conservation planning

**Conservation Technician I** (June 1997 - October 1997, Alliance, NE)
Nebraska Game & Parks Commission, Wildlife Division-Programs Section

- implemented wildlife habitat programs on private lands
- provided technical assistance to landowners on conservation issues
- inspected and planned improvements on selected habitat sites
- maintained program records and databases
- assisted with wildlife damage management

**Wildlife Technician (**January 1997 - June 1997, Fairfield, NC)
North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission, Wildlife Division

- assisted with a farm ecosystem research project involving Northern bobwhite and mammalian predators on private farmlands on the coastal plains of North Carolina
- established and monitored artificial nests to determine rates of predation
- trapped and removed mammalian predators utilizing foothold, Conibear, and box traps
- assisted with a fox squirrel relocation project
- collected, compiled, and entered field data into spreadsheets

**Seasonal Biologist** (May 1996 - August 1996, Ogallala, NE)
Central Nebraska Public Power & Irrigation District

- managed nesting areas of least terns and piping plovers in western Nebraska
- performed population surveys, documented nesting and fledgling success and recorded associated habitats
- developed and delivered educational activities to the public
- prepared weekly reports and a final completion report
- presented results of completion report at the 58$^{th}$ Midwest Fish & Wildlife Conference

**SKILLS**

Proficient in Microsoft Works, Excel, Access, and PowerPoint. Intermediate skills with ArcMap and ArcGIS applications. Several years of experience with motor and air boats, four-wheel drive vehicles, all-terrain vehicles, farm equipment, welders, surveying equipment, GPS units, radio telemetry, numerous hand and power tools, meeting facilitation, and public presentations.

**POPULAR PUBLICATIONS**

Switzer, C. 2020. Chronic wasting disease—looking forward. South Dakota Conservation Digest 87(1):26-29.

G. Adams and **C. Switzer**. 2018. On-going scientific advancements. South Dakota Conservation Digest 85(2):16-17.

Switzer, C. 2017. Deer management in South Dakota. South Dakota Conservation Digest 84(5):12-13.

Flake, L.D., A.E. Gabbert, T.R. Kirschenmann, A.P. Leif, and **C.T. Switzer**. 2012. Ring-necked pheasants: thriving in South Dakota. South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks, Pierre.

**Switzer, C.** and G. Adams. 2011. Plugging technology into fish and wildlife management. South Dakota Conservation Digest 78(4):8-11.

Switzer, C. 2009. Ring-necked pheasant management plan for South Dakota 2009-2014. Version 09-01. South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks, Pierre, South Dakota, USA.

Switzer, C. 2009. Empire of the ringneck: a century of pheasants in South Dakota. South Dakota Conservation Digest 76(1):10-13.

**Switzer, C.T.** and S.A. Tucker. 2009. Survival, reproduction, home range, and habitat use of translocated eastern wild turkeys in the Wessington Hills, South Dakota. Completion Report. South Dakota Department of Game, Fish & Parks, PR Project W-75-R-51. Study No. 7585.

Smith, B., **C. Switzer**, R. Murano, T. Olson, and D. McCrea. 2009. SD GFP private lands habitat programs: designed to enhance CRP. South Dakota Conservation Digest 76(2):12-15.

Switzer, C. 2008. Private lands and wildlife habitat—the foundation of South Dakota's wildlife legacy. South Dakota Conservation Digest 74(4):6-9.

Murano, R.J.D. and **C.T. Switzer**. 2008. Private lands habitat and access programs, strategic plan. South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks, Pierre, South Dakota, USA.

**PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS**

Switzer, C.T. Survival, reproduction, home range and habitat use of translocated eastern wild turkeys in the Wessington Hills, South Dakota. Presented at the South Dakota Chapter of The Wildlife Annual Meeting, March 1-3, 2010.

Switzer, C.T. Managing nesting areas of the endangered least tern and threatened piping plover at Lake McConaughy, Nebraska. Presented at the 58th Midwest Fish & Wildlife Conference, December 7-11, 1996.

**PROFFESSIONAL TRAINING**

2023 Civil Treatment Workplace for Leaders
2022 Leading the Five Types of People; Managing Remote Workers; DISC Session & Team Building
2020 Crucial Conversations; How to Become a Power Point Superhero
2019 South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks Leadership Development Program-Cohort 1
2018 Feeding the Four Tendencies
2017 Wildlife Governance Principles Public Trust in Practice Training
2016 Don't Stress the Stress; Skype for Business
2015 Journey to the Extraordinary: Peak Performance; Works Well with Others: Your Part in Cultivating a Respectful Workplace
2014 Supervisor ACES; The Legal Side of Discrimination; Legal Side of ADA, FMLA and Workers Compensation; Legal Side of Hiring and Discipline
2013 Communication Breakdown
2012 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Introduction to Structured Decision Making; First Aid and CPR; Strategies for Customer Service; Manager's Conference
2011 It's Okay to be the Boss; The Right Words at the Right Time; Americans with Disabilities Act; Family and Medical Leave Act; Workers' Compensation Laws; Discrimination and Harassment; Hiring and Discipline; Documenting Discipline
2010 Relationship Strategies; Supervisor Recognition Kit; The New Employee: Interview and Selection
2009 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Project Leaders Course; Crazy Busy: Gaining Control of Your Day; PPAR: Supervisor's Role
2008 Adobe Contribute; South Dakota Department of Game, Fish & Parks Career Development Level III; Visionary Leadership
2007 Housecleaning for Government Websites; Knowing About Internet Users; Writing for the Web; Eight Factors of Communication Excellence
2006 Think on Your Feet; Emotional Intelligence; National Wildfire Coordinating Group S-130:

Fire Fighting Training; National Wildfire Coordinating Group S-190: Wildland Fire Behavior; South Dakota Department of Game, Fish & Parks Career Development Level II

2004 Bleiker Training Course; Creating Optimism in the Workplace; MAFWA Trapping Matters

2003 Leadership Development Workshop; Access Level 1; Excel Level 1

**AWARDS**

2018 South Dakota Bowhunters, Inc.—Wildlife Biologist of the Year

2015 South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks—Outstanding Performance Award

2006 South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks—Public Relations Award

**LEADERSHIP AND VOLUNTEER ROLES**

Past-Board Member of South Dakota Chapter of The Wildlife Society
Past-President of South Dakota Chapter of The Wildlife Society
Past-School Board Member at St. Joseph's School, Pierre, SD
Past-School Board Member at Holy Trinity Catholic School, Huron, SD
Past assistant and head coach for youth boys' baseball, basketball, and football teams
Past assistant and head coach for girls' t-ball and softball teams
Past hunter education instructor
Special Olympics of South Dakota