

## Sauk Prairie Recreation Area

*The following comments regarding the “No Action” conceptual alternative were received by the Department through the online survey during the public comment period (July 15 through August 31, 2013). The contents of the responses submitted are copied here as received. Personal names of non-public figures and addresses have been redacted.*

### **Conceptual Alternative 1: No Action**

As a new property not yet opened for public use, the Sauk Prairie Recreation Area is undeveloped for visitor use and minimally maintained with management activities focused on keeping some of the roadways cleared of invasive species. The property has roads of varying condition throughout and areas to pull-off on the side for parking. There are currently no improvements to facilitate visitor experiences. Possible property access points are identified with a star.

The property will have limited public access for Nature Based Outdoor Activities (NBOAs) of hunting, trapping, fishing, hiking, and cross country skiing. Public access to the cemeteries will be maintained. No additional funding will be spent on restoration or property development. Any structures or debris left on the property at the time of the land transfer will remain. The Department will restrict areas due to any public safety concerns.

### **What do you like about this alternative, what concerns you, and what other comments should the planning team take into consideration regarding this alternative?**

1	I don't like much about it. If you can't afford to spend additional funds why take over this area? The DNR can't maintain the properties it has. Frankly I think taking on this property is a huge liability for the state. Should have had the feds clean it up better. You really think people are going to stay out of restricted areas?
2	I disagree with the No Action Alternative. If we develop this property, now today, we will be able to maintain the property appropriately with state federal and local money. The property will be preserved and used in a manner that will improve lives, locally and globally.
3	Horseback riding.
4	Horseback riding was not listed as a NBOA, as it certainly is. This is a billion dollar industry that is as deserving as the other listed NBOAs. Many taxpayers enjoy camping and exploring nature with horses. Access should be granted to this discipline as well.
5	This is not a good option as it benefits very few.
6	maybe apply for grants to be able to develop the land so it is useable for people to use, or ask for donations to help with upkeep
7	I support Alternative 4 submitted by the Badger Oversight Management Commission with an emphasis on Conservation and Low-Impact Recreation as specified in the Badger Reuse Plan. There is no regional need for a shooting range or an ATV trail at Badger.
8	I like that it would be open to hunting and fishing. I would like to see it open to horse riders. I do not like that perhaps unsafe structures or debris would be left.
9	I think to leave it undeveloped as a recreational area would be a detriment to the state.

10	What a waste of this beautiful land if nothing is done , no one gets to see the beauty and landscape in this area.
11	1. limited investment 2. open to outdoors sports and users 3. little oversight needed
12	Seems like a waste, let the off-roaders in at least.
13	There is nothing that I like about this alternative. All of the elements concern me.
14	You could build an underground tunnel for the animals that want to cross the road.
15	Not a preferred alternative
16	I don't like this plan as no public unlimited access to areas are allowed. We have a need for a large multi use park in that area.
17	It is good for the wildlife, but if nothing is done to control invasive species in the non-road areas, it will eventually hurt the wildlife. There does need to be some work/intervention to encourage certain species to stay/thrive. Also, if there are dangerous areas, they should be addressed... restricting will just challenge some people to explore illegally .
18	This sounds to much like minimal upkeep -let it rot.
19	We don't need any more areas in the state that allow hunting and trapping! It's hard enough right now to get out somewhere and go for a hike where you don't hear gunshots or have to worry about your dog stepping into a trap. There are a lot of people in this state who enjoy hiking, photography, birdwatching, cross country skiing, and folks with limited physical ability who would also enjoy an auto tour.
20	I do not like this alternative. It wastes a public resource that could otherwise be developed to provide recreation opportunities for a large number of residents that are proximate to this site. The property needs to be developed to maximize recreational opportunities.
21	A small fee for off road use could help fund making the area safe for all use's
22	do not favor this alternative - very limiting to public access
23	Too limiting-we need more areas for horseback trail riding and driving, especially driving.I support hunting if areas are clearly marked.
24	Absolutely not, this would be a lost opportunity for motorized recreational trails.
25	I really think there needs to be a place where old hunting traditions are preserved. Use of horse back riding is low-impact, and there should be no fancy facilities for any human use.
26	You mention public access for hunting and trapping and fishing. There is so much land available to hunters now. We currently have to share the State forests with hunters during the ideal riding seasons. The deer hunt are being extended which limits horseback riding dramatically. We need more land for horseback riding which does not include hunting. Horseback riders contribute huge amounts of money toward the economy including trail passes, vehicle passes and campground reservations.

27	This option would waste a great natural resource that many people can enjoy. It is rare for such opportunities to come up, and I feel that it would be detrimental to the area to not utilize the property for the general public use in a recreational manner.
28	The property needs to be slightly developed to maximize recreational opportunities. We can't let this large parcel of land go unused.
29	I love the idea of keeping the property free of invasive species for all 3 plans, whichever you decide on!
30	I like that the buildings remain--Old buildings intrigue me. On a recent trip out west visiting ghost towns and abandoned mine works was a highlight.The no-action alternative concerns me such that this land could be put to much more uses than the listed NBOAs
31	This is not compatible with the Badger Reuse Plan owing to lack of commitment to the partnership goals, including ecological restoration and cultural history preservation. The preferred Alternative is the BOMC Proposed Land Use Alternative 4 (see <a href="http://saukprairievision.org/">http://saukprairievision.org/</a> ).
32	This would waste a tremendous opportunity to share history and provide a venue to where our citizens can safely exercise their 2nd Amendment rights.
33	Very POOR alternative. Lets use it!
34	The 'No Action Alternative' is not acceptable given our lack of balanced recreational land. This is a huge opportunity to do something vital for a large population of mixed users.
35	Don't like this alternative
36	If people can not come, why develop this area, its great to habitat birds,flowers and animals, but if no one can enjoy it WHY
37	nothing
38	Nothing
39	This option concerns me because of the invasive species which will come to dominate the area (buckthorn, garlic mustard,etc.) which will have lasting negative consequences on the property & future usage.
40	Not an option. Property must be fully restored and all debris and remnants of the old use must be cleaned. It's our generations responsibility to clean up our mess and not leave it to our children. No action is simply freeloading.
41	Not like.
42	It would be a shame to restrict public access to this newly acquired land.
43	Would prefer to see the property opened up for different recreational users to enjoy.
44	this is a vast area that could and should be used for educational purposes and recreation not limited to those mentioned above.
45	I don't think this is a good idea. The property has more potential than this.

46	NO! It would be a shame for this piece of land not to be used by the public
47	The vehicular access should be allowed to diminish to a no roads situation and only trails should be allowed throughout the property
48	The land should be made safe for the public. Make trails for people to walk on and to bring there animals on(Horses as well).
49	Kill the no action alternative and consider my previous thoughts.
50	These three 'alternatives' are very poor and appear meant to steer the conculsions rather than to truly evaluate options. This is the throw away option.
51	The no funding is not an option
52	Please provide horse trails onto this property. There are limited horse trails in Wisconsin, and we would like to ensure that future acquisitions of land provide for equestrian opportunities.
53	this space, while it would be great to keep it this way, needs to be shared with the public and given trails for horseback riding, hiking and skiing.
54	This property needs to address the recreational use needed by so many user groups, to include equestrians. There are not enough horse trails in Wisconsin, and I would like to see this property provide equestrian trails.
55	Taking no action would be a wast of a public resource that could serve a very large number of residents.
56	This alternative sucks! The DNR has been promising an Off-Highway Recreation Area in Southern Wisconsin for many years now. It's time to act.
57	Don't like this alternative at all. We take an area with limitless potential, including natural Southern WI prairie, and allow it to gradually go to hell. The areas restricted due to any public safety concerns will become larger and larger until they encompass the entire property. This is not an alternative, this is not management, this is the wasting of an irreplaceable resource, a one-time opportunity. When it is gone, there is no other BAAP area or similar on the horizon with which to replace this one.
58	You're leaving out a lot of horsemen
59	hazardous conditions,aesthetic value,less opportunities for the state to provide safe and fun activities to the public,
60	This sounds like a pour decision. Wisconsin has always been recreation driven and needs to continue to enhance it's amenities if order to continue to draw recreational dollars from visitors and enhance their experience when visiting Wisconsin..
61	The roads already exist and horseback riding could be allowed ont he roads. If no funds are to spent on devopment perhaps horse clubs could do some clearing (where you approve) and do the work to make some ridable trails and put in a parking lot for horse trailers. We don't need much.
62	Hazards should be removed.

63	I want to speak up for the inclusion of a motorcycle single track to be added to the area. Even if the park is not developed fully, it should include access for motorized recreation.
64	sorry, this whole questionnaire generates a furnace of emotion -- literally, the time limits of the questionnaire -- exceeds the slow-paced thinking of the aged
65	I do not like this alternative. It wastes a public resource that could otherwise be developed to provide recreation opportunities for a large number of residents that are proximate to this site. The property needs to be developed to maximize recreational opportunities.
66	Public hunting land is extremely lacking, leaving land for sportsman is a rare and wonderful thing.
67	Wisconsinites don't just sit around, this is a bad alternative.
68	I don't this should be utilized for public.
69	This seems like a good alternative, but what about the hunting, like in the state parks, that has caused problems? Will that be funds to monitor the activity in the area?
70	I DO NOT LIKE THIS ALTERNATIVE. THERE IS A NEED FOR A RECREATION AREA CLOSE TO WI RESIDENTS HOME. IT IS A COMPLETE WASTE OF A PUBLIC RESOURCE
71	I support Alternative 4!
72	It would be better to allow some visitor use; people care more about places if they can visit them (responsibly, of course). Why not visitor facilities or kiosks?
73	Allowing nature to flourish is nice. But this area could benefit from management directed towards ecological restoration and maintaining it for maximum ecological condition, as well as ecologically benign uses. I have problems with unrestricted hunting, fishing, and trapping (and plant collecting) if these would impact underpopulated or threatened species.
74	I do not like this alternative Invasive species will probably take over, and human activities would likely be destructive of the environment rather than aimed at sustainability and preservation
75	This is the plan I prefer, but not the best for a compromise. Environmental restoration is what I really want to have happen. Restoring 5000 acres of tall grass prairie would bring lots of knowledgeable eco-tourists to the area. If access is open, designating areas as restricted will not prevent those so inclined from entering them. I have seen areas on the property that would be quite hazardous to the general public.
76	The quality of the area may degrade without active management. For example, people may dump garbage, vandalize the area, etc.
77	The emphasis on NBOAs is good. The absence of restoration activities to repair ecological damage and the leaving of structures/debris is not. The latter are attractive nuisances, and will invite vandalism.
78	There are numerous areas around the state and in the area which already offer these alternatives. ORV users do not have this option in this area.
79	Horse trails. See previous statement.
80	Do not care for this option. Concern that structures and debris left on the property could become dangerous => and restricting public access to public property unacceptable.

81	It concerns me tha there will be limited public access to NBOA's.
82	Not a good alternative. The only good that would come from this is we would not be wasting tax payer money developing the site
83	I think hunting and trapping are not compatible with natural use.....fishing is noninvasive as are hiking, skiing, etc. Perhaps the hunting could be limited to areas or times that will not be dangerous if it must be allowed.
84	We can and should do better than this alternative.
85	this would be my lowest pick of the alternatives. It seems to be a wasted use of the land.
86	This alternative is unacceptable,- unless one chooses alternative:3.The area would resemble an abandoned junk yard,- however nature would regain the upper hand in time.But do maintain access to the cemeteries regardles which alternative it may be.
87	Nothing. Over population of deer.
88	No action is always an alternative, but this property offers much for use and is so vast that some access is needed other than only from the perimeter.
89	I do not like this alternative as remnant structures that may contain toxic materials and are unsightly will not be removed. Vandalism would be a continuing problem.
90	No.
91	under-developed areas have a higher incident of crime. I hate hunting and trapping, so I'm not pro that.
92	Put the land to some valuable use!!
93	shared trails for hiking and trail horses has worked in many areas. Please consider equestrian use.
94	Please include equestrian trail.
95	not totally convinced of the need for any additional hunting acreage.
96	I mostly like it, but have NO TRAPPING, limited deer hunting, and provide money for habitat restoration and invasives removal.
97	No action means going backward. Invasive species will continue to spread and prairie and savanna ecosystems will continue to be lost.
98	Get out of this game. Your attempt to scuttle past efforts is disgusting.
99	Oh for heaven's sake, why hunting/trapping/fishing come first before hiking/ skiing, even snowshoeing. Come on.
100	I think its great that some structures be left for viewing. With pictures and video like I said in the beginning of this survey.
101	Horse trails

102	open to cemeteries. there is no mention of horse trails!
103	I think it is under use of this property. There is enough room for more recreational opportunities.
104	Don't like it... If this is the way it ends up, then along with limited access for what is listed above, you need to add horseback trail riding. But as I've said, horse people have a record to helping keep trails open and helping with improvements as long as they have access to the area.
105	no need to make a lot of improvements
106	The property use for NBOA's is very limited and does not further historical and ecological preservation and education.
107	We need to keep as many places open as possible so kids can grow up outdoors. Also, creating educational opportunities for those kids to learn and be outside is important. Too many kids are growing up indoors on their phones and game systems.
108	Yes, in this scenario you left out horseback riding. If it will have minimal public access then include horses. Not many people can complain if they aren't there. Hunting and trapping land areas are abundant and have no horses allowed. Why not a horse area with hunting and trapping not allowed?
109	Not that I know of at this time
110	i like the idea of keeping the site remote, but feel that restoration of it's native habitat is very important.
111	This seems like a waste of interesting, and beautiful country for people that don't have access to it currently.
112	Keep it free of sports that inhibit use by urban dwellers who just want to watch nature. Keep hunting and trapping out of the mix.
113	This option is not good because the land should be able to be accessed and used for conservation, educational and low impact recreational uses.
114	Nature Based Activities are the minority and when such a large area is put aside for public use off the tax rolls it better have economic drivers like shared use trails and year round recreational uses to encourage yr round use by all and equal for all users to enjoy...as we are paying for it not just the birders! Snowmobile and horse industries bring in the most money statewide so cater to those groups when you develop this parcel not eliminate the most likely groups to bring money to this area!
115	Not cleaning up old junk, debris etc. seems odd. It may take a few years and some money or volunteers, but get the trash out of there.
116	No action does not allow us to take advantage of the opportunity to restore a natural treasure.
117	Don't like it. If people cant get in to experience the property they wont value it.
118	It is not an aesthetically pleasing alternative.

119	What do I like about this? Well, if I were to live to be 200 hundred years old, it might be mildly interesting to watch how the land changes and eventually comes to some semi-steady state. Otherwise, it's a waste of land, waste of opportunity.
120	Why are horses not part of the activities listed above? Limited access is fine in the event there are not funds to maintain the entire area, but all non-motorized recreational opportunities should be considered.
121	Nothing good about this alternative.
122	this alternative maintains the status quo, but provides no new opportunities for economic growth
123	Not a good idea. Everything needs some management.
124	Concerned that limited public access
125	Inclusion of a shooting range. Maintaining this property for hunting would be wonderful.
126	Some provision for removal of dangerous structures and chemicals should be included. I have bow hunted this area when Badger Ordinance was still the owner. Many solid old cement structures will do no harm to remain. Most wooden structures eventually will need to be removed.
127	I do not like the no action alternative. It wastes a perfectly good recreational opportunity and provides an unnecessary delay. The property can and should be developed for recreation as soon as possible.
128	Not a good use of such an opportunity of such a piece of property and hails of being closed to all but a few.
129	I think the property really needs to be cleaned up and since this option would not address that, i am not supportive.
130	I would like to see Horse trails added to the list of NBOAs.
131	sounds like the cheapest alternative, but not very forward thinking
132	This alternative concerns me because it does not include horseback riding as a Nature Based Outdoor Activity.
133	IT WOULD NOT GENERATE ANY INCOME AND WOULD LEAVE MY HOBBY OUT .
134	Way too narrow of focus. Disturbing to say the least.
135	If money is tight, this is a good option to start with. I am concerned about the abandoned buildings.
136	Horse riding trails would be a nice addition.
137	I think there are many areas in the state, both private and public that address the need for hunting, and would like this area to be a non hunting area. Also, state land has much potential in educating about the environment, the history and the ecological future of our state and for the land to not be accessed to recreation greatly limits it's potential.

138	I do not like this alternative. It wastes a public resource that could otherwise be developed to provide recreation opportunities for a large number of residents that are proximate to this site. The property needs to be developed to maximize recreational opportunities.
139	'limited public access' Why?
140	I don't like it, roadways are in terrible shape
141	We also agree with conceptual alternative.
142	No
143	vague as to public safety concerns and too limiting as to use, the land belongs to the people. Private organizations should at least be allowed to lease and improve the land for various recreational uses that will ultimately encompass all outdoor enthusiasts
144	Because the nature of the area has been greatly disrupted it needs to be actively managed to repair the ecology.
145	Yes, No horseback riding trails proposed.
146	I like the NBOA access, but don't agree that access should be limited. Who's idea is that, and what are the limitations?
147	NO GUNS, NO NRA \$\$\$\$. Let nature fix what man has, once again, messed up.
148	As I mentioned before, it would be wonderful if this huge piece of property could be used similar to that of the Tuscobia trail. It would bring people to the area and boost the local economy.
149	Likes: Limited public access for NBOA. Access to cemeteries will be maintained. Concerns: No additional funding for restoration or development. Structures or debris will remain.
150	No! Why not do something with the area that would attract visitors.
151	This alternative wastes a public resource that could otherwise be developed to provide recreation opportunities for a large number of residents that are proximate to this site. The property needs to be developed to maximize recreational opportunities.
152	Not acceptable - the prior disturbances to the site require active management to allow for restoration of the the natural plant and animal communities.
153	I would prefer the area be managed for grassland which means burning periodically in addition to controlling invasive species.
154	Nothing but it would be better than opening the property up to heavy recreational use.
155	A flat area simply mowed or gravel off of the road with access which would allow safe parking for people to park to enjoy the recreation area. Pull off parking if not completely allowing vehicles to pull off of the road, say less than 12 feet, could potentially cause accidents and congestion.
156	This plan seems to be missing an opportunity. Wisconsin has this wonderful property and it should do something useful with it rather than leave it in a neglected state. But at the same time if it's a choice between overcommercializing the property or neglecting it then neglect would be better. Keeping it in a natural state but allowing access for low-key use would be ideal.

157	Nature can heal many wounds, but stewardship is surely necessary. My concerns are many, but one obvious one was noted invasive species.
158	This alternative is better than the idea of adding ATV trails and rifle ranges.
159	Historically, horses had a prominent role. Why are they not included in this public access?
160	horse back riding and horse cart driving are NBOAs that should be included if this alternative is implemented.
161	I feel that as it is now with all the run down buildings and overgrown brush that it is an eye sore. When visiting a natural area who wants to look at that. If nothing is done with it it will just also become an expense to maintain as it will not draw diversified public interest.
162	This alternative concerns me with its limited access and no further improvements or clean up of debris.
163	I kind of like this alternative. It's cheap (and where is the money going to come from to maintain all sorts of rec activities?) I live in Mazomanie and we have a lot of public lands like this. They are not heavily used (this is a good thing) and maintain a wild, quiet aspect that is very difficult to come by. I'm all for lo-impact maintenance. I don't mind a little hunting (during the season) and some trail maintenance for use by hikers, off-road bicyclists, skiers etc. I do think that for the most part, people who want to enjoy nature should do so under their own power. There are plenty of places to go if you want to deal with crowds of noisy, gas guzzling machines. On my block alone, three of my most immediate neighbors spend every summer night endlessly driving their dirt bikes and 4-wheelers thru personally maintained mud pits, up and down the public roadways and round and round dirt trail gouged into their private property. It is the most annoying, dirty and destructive sport that can be imagined. No birds, butterflies, or quiet endeavor can exist along side this kind of blatant intrusion. Give me a quiet place.
164	It seems like a waste of the area. It has already sat for so long without being used, if nothing was going to be done with it, why tear everything down? When all of the Ammo Plant buildings were there it was a piece of history for our children to look at and wonder about.
165	No maintenance is provided for roadways or parking lots. Abandoned structures should be removed for public safety.
166	Trapping
167	Under this alternative I have concerns about degradation due to suppression of natural ecological process, and due to encroachment by exotic plant species.
168	Diagree with this option -- NO hunting or trapping allowed. Please keep it as a haven for wildlife, but do allow walkers/hikers in.
169	I like the fact that it supports only non motorized non firearm activities; however, I believe the army has the responsibility to remove all old buildings.
170	Nothing. The property will have more value if it is maintained and restored.
171	This option should be scrapped.
172	We don't support no action.

173	I would NOT support this alternative. More importantly, I would not support hunting or, more importantly, I would not support trapping on this property. If hunting were permitted, it should only be done at specific times for specific purposes, such as harvesting over-populated species that might hurt natural balance of wildlife.
174	As more property is added to the coffers of the state and therefore not subject to taxes, we the residents of Merrimac Township carry the greater tax burden. Property sitting idle is of use to no one.
175	This is not a good plan.
176	This is not practical nor is it responsible.
177	I like the limited access, don't provide automobile access inside the park, gate all access points, provide parking for foot travel only. Keep access similiar to what is available on other state owned properties.
178	This alternative does not provide direction and would not fulfill the intent of the above vision statements.
179	I like this approach but I think it dose not go far enough to maintain the area.
180	I support BOMC Alternative 4.
181	I do not prefer this option. Doing nothing will be good for wildlife, but it is such a large piece of land that with careful implementation, it could really be a nice place for people to enjoy the natural beauty and history of the area. Without some improvement, it is not going to be very attractive or of interest to many.
182	Please include a network of single track trails to accommodate mountain bikers, runners, and hikers as well as snow shoe enthusiasts and fat bikes in the winter.
183	While the interventions do not need to be aggressive, this would not take full advantage of the opportunities for this property.
184	Existing structures are a blight.
185	i don't like this alternative.i think it wastes resources ... when they could be used to serve an under-served group (off road recreation).the site needs to be developed to serve under-served interests.
186	It sound inexpensive, but would not allow much use of the area by people.
187	Of concern is that no further restoration will take place. In order turn this tract of land into a true recreational area (regardless of the amount of access), cleanup & removal needs to continue.
188	This alternative should be followed to the extent that it complies with the original Badger Reuse Plan. No additional work or planning should be permitted as the groups involved here agreed on the uses of the land that would be acceptable to all taking into consideration the history of the area.
189	Need to allow horseback riding.

190	I think it's good not to spend a bunch of money on the property when it's going to be used for natural outdoor activities. There should not be hunting or trapping on this land. People are going to be out walking and moving around and those activities are very likely to get someone hurt. Plus, who wants to run into dead animals while enjoying this area or worry about being shot during hunting season? Super close to devil's lake and if any bullets go the wrong direction someone could be killed.
191	My concern is undirected land use will result in a tragedy of commons where each person will use the land as they see fit. This can introduce a distractive force to natural habitat.
192	Needs camels.
193	This would not be acceptable for the amount of land and the history.
194	This is a valuable asset that should be utilized and not left to decay.
195	while this alternative includes plans for several outdoor activities, horseback riding is not one of them. Cross country ski trails and hiking trails could also accommodate horse riders.
196	Equine use
197	oops - somehow I've missed seeing what's been suggested
198	I like areas with little formal development. Without maintenance, the area will likely be overcome by invasive species. I don't like limiting access.
199	Too little public use of a publicly owned facility. Too little monitoring to maintain quality at whatever level now exists. No addressing co-existence of hunting/trapping and hiking/skiing.
200	Mountain biking should be included as a NBOA.
201	I believe this would not be in the best interest of the land.
202	No I don't. You need to clean up the area. You need to open it up to horses. You need to have bathrooms.
203	This seems like a waste. This is an untapped resource that we have. I think this could help generate some tourism to the area.
204	I think not restoring the native ecosystem would be a mistake. We have enough areas that are overrun with invasive species. It will be difficult to ferret out all the little niches with weeds.
205	Is horseback riding considered a nature based outdoor activity? As a non-motorized way to enjoy the outdoors with minimal impact, I would hope so. Please include us!
206	Any unsafe structures or debris needs to be cleaned up by the Army. Money needs to be spent to maintain roads for emergency vehicle access
207	This would be a waste: a large dump site covered with invasive species.
208	as an avid hiker, backpacker and snow shoeer i like the undeveloped and or minimal development approach that leads to a rustic experience for those who want to venture in for a remote experience. My one concern is the implication that the site would not be cleaned up. sign of human use related to the industrial use of the project should be removed.

209	I'm not in favor of this alternative, because invasive species would cause serious damage, and the activities I propose would improve the site for native animals and plants, and for enjoyment by hikers, bird-watcher and other nature lovers. Taking no action might have been a good option before alien invasive species arrived, but they are a plague and must be removed as much as possible.
210	Dislike, it needs to be opened up for public use.
211	It is very concerning that the structures and debris would remain. There is potential danger to this land if it is not maintained properly.
212	It seems to be a waste of property. It is a beautiful area owned by the public and should be opened to the public. I would like to see money allocated to help maintain and improve the area. Fees can be charged for trails, hunting, snowmobiling, etc to help with the upkeep.
213	There is no provision for horse trails. There is a great amount of horse owners that would appreciate trails there & would love the scenery. It is also another source of revenue that would help maintain the area. Many horse owners are involved in helping maintain trails
214	Alternative is to further work by working with established trail groups such as the WI horse council and the Glacial Drumlins horse trail ass.
215	I think that would be a sad waste of good land and I would worry about the safety of the area if the buildings were just left to rot, no matter how well you try to fence off an area it will attract Kids and that would be dangerous for them to sneak into. Also i would worry about the potential for further pollution if the facilities were left to degrade into the soil.
216	No Action seems like a waste of very nice land. The ammunitions plant is an eyesore. Devil's Lake is a wonderful park, but seems small compared to the amount of use that it receives. Let's have this area serve as an extension of Devil's Lake State Park!
217	AS A TAX PAYER AND NATURE LOVER, I DO NOT SUPPORT HUNTING OR TRAPPING. DEFEATS THE PURPOSE OF SEEING WILDLIFE, THAT IS PEACEFULL. LET THE HUNTER BUY HIS OWN LAND. WHY SHOULD ALL OF US PAY FOR HIS FREE KILLS. I WILL NOT VOLUNTEER TO DO ANYTHING IF YOU ARE GOING TO ALLOW HUNTING AND TRAPPING. I AM HERE TO HELP THE ANIMALS, AND THE EARTH. NOT GREEDY GLUTTONY EGOTISTICAL KILLERS WHO DO NOT LIVE OFF THE LAND. THEY SHOP AT THE GROCERY STORES, BUY THEIR CLOTHES, GLOVES, AMMO AT STORES. ALL AT OUR EXPENSE WITH RESULTING LOSS OF USE OF THE AREA FOR WEEKS ON AND OFF ALL YEAR LONG. COULD HAVE TAKEN A PICTURE TO HANG ON WALL, & ALL COULD SEE THE FINE PHOTO YOU GOT. NOT SHOT & KILLED WHICH IS SELFISH & FINAL. NOW NO ONE CAN SEE THE BEAUTIFUL CREATURE YOU HAD TO KILL. ISN'T THIS THE 21ST CENTURY? WE CREATE THESE PARKS FOR WILDLIFE ENJOYMENT & PEACEFUL DIVERSITY, ONLY TO BE SOLD OUT TO HUNTERS TO KILL? LIKE I SAID, THEY CAN BUY THEIR OWN LAND, AND KILL EVERYTHING ON IT. I WILL NO LONGER DONATE TO ANY PARKS WHICH ALLOW HUNTING. THE ANIMALS DESERVE ONE PLACE WHERE THEY ARE NOT HUNTED & RUN TO DEATH. WE AS THE PEOPLE DESERVE SAFE NON-HUNTED PARKS OF WHICH WE ALL PAY FOR. SINCERELY, I AM 1/4 CHEROKEE INDIAN W/MORAL HUNTERS IN MY FAMILY.
218	Regulate # of animals removed yearly; include horse riding. Encourage an equine trial group to form and assist with trail development and maintenance .
219	Conservation, restoration, education and low-impact recreational activities are important for the SPRA. This alternative does not appropriately address those.

220	Not a realistic alternative, and it would constitute a dereliction of duty and a denial of the Badger Reuse Plan. In particular, the spread of invasive species in the absence of active restoration and stewardship work would result in an ecological mess, directly affecting (among other things) Devil's Lake State Park.
221	We can't let the government hand over their problems to the State. We need to have insurance that any future health/safety issues will have some monetary assistance from our government. We need to maintain some infrastructure into this area if only for access. I think there should be minimal improvements to roads.
222	I feel that restoration should continue.
223	I do not like the no action alternative at all. This is a great resource and should be utilize and fostered as such.
224	Not a good choice. If the site can not be accessible and fully utilized the State of Wisconsin should sell the property.
225	The only good aspect of this alternative is the non-use of tax dollars. I think if the area was not used as the current vision statement outlines, the land could actually be productive and generate tax dollars by productive, efficient and responding commercially to the demands of consumers (i.e. the citizens and tax payers of the State), rather than be a government controlled, tax spending entity.
226	Yes this concerns me. This is beautiful property rich with history...every acre should be explored and its story told. Blending history, outdoor beauty with active options for hiking, ATV, snowmobiling, cross country skiing should be done.
227	the inability to enjoy the solitude, quiet, natural experience regularly
228	Trails, trails, trails
229	Move the airport there.
230	Not an option. This property needs to be shared with public. Not only to share the importance of the habitat but the passive recreation possibilities have enormous economic potential for the area and the entire state.
231	I do not think this is a good use of property that is adjacent to a state park and offers a range of recreational uses to the public.
232	do not likeneed to draw visitors to spend time and money
233	This makes no efforts at ecological restoration and misses the enormous potential the area has for prairie/savanna species recovery and as a huge natural area draw for ecotourism. It also ignores the balanced and hard worked out compromises of the Badger reuse commission.
234	I oppose this, it should me made available to public use.
235	I would love it if there were ATV trails, there are PLENTY of areas for all the ducks (aka wildlife) on the lake, fields etc, look at a air photo of southwest wis. its all a large habitat !!
236	There is no reason to waste money to make this into a tourist attraction with luxury accesses. The existing roads would be good for decades.

237	I like that this alternative leaves it alone for the most part. I worry about people abusing the public access. However, I do like the idea of permitting hunting trapping fishing hiking etc, but I believe there should be no firearms allowed in the area. I feel that it should be limited to bow and arrow hunting only. Bullets fly further than arrows.
238	No. But I do feel that badger should take responsibility in any future findings that can/ or do harm local health.
239	I like the idea of nboas but I think that to get the best use of the land including a little more development into the area to develop multi use trails hiking, constructed mountain biking, snowshoeing, cross country skiing. trail running. would be a better recreation component. It would be nice to have some sort of trail head to have bathrooms/water available for these activities.
240	Low impact
241	This is my least favorite alternative.
242	I don't think this is an option. Further improvements are needed to make this a viable destination
243	I like this alternative, but think that there also needs to be grassland/savanna management on the entire property, which includes burning, mowing, invasive species removal, etc.
244	I prefer the previous vision statement and acceptable uses versus the leave it alone approach illustrated above.
245	look back at last page answer
246	Nothing to like, this is an important piece of PUBLIC property, and big enough to provide something for almost everybody....
247	I like that this allows for traditional NBOAs. I do not like that structures and debris would be left, along with unsafe restricted areas.
248	If the property is to be undeveloped for recreational use, at the VERY LEAST, the army SHOULD BE OBLIGATED to 'clean up' the debris, buildings and foundations, etc. currently left on the property. I think 'no action' would be a waste of an opportunity to use this area for public enjoyment and education. Badger is a part of the area's history. Good and bad. Not taking even minimum action to action to 'return and restore' it should not be an option.
249	None
250	This is a bad alternative. The area needs some low-impact development - and some local management, like a visitor center.
251	YES
252	I don't like this alternative because it squanders the unique opportunity we have with this unique property. It should be shared and shown off. The areas ought to be accessible to kids and families. You can't have families hiking where people are hunting. Such a large piece of public land should be shared with the public and not just the portion of the public that hunts and traps. Also, the remaining structures are dangerous and leaving them up is both lazy and irresponsible.
253	I believe limited funding should be allocated to manage the property in accordance with the badger reuse plan.

254	An element that concerns me is that the property will be unkempt. Also, it doesn't utilize the beauty of the area to it's fullest potential.
255	It works for the hardiest native communities of plants and animals, as well as for the aggressive invasive species. But this is an inadequate response to the need for management of the property, and provides extremely limited opportunity for human use.
256	this is not realistic
257	DEBRIS AND UNNEEDED BUILDINGS SHOIULD BE CLEANED UP.
258	none - don't trust the army
259	What a waste of resources this would be, we have numerous areas that are preserved to maintain areas as they are.i
260	This is an inexpensive alternative and in conjunction with Devil's Lake could provide a very remote experience for users. Structures and debris should be left on the property in most cases because restoration is impractical for much of the area. There would likely be extensive illegal activity on the site without a DNR presence.
261	I have great concerns with this alternative. The property cannot be left with the Army Ammunition debris remaining as this is still contaminated. The US government (Army) needs to continue to remove and restore the land so that it is safe for the public access. Additional funds from all stakeholders needs to be assessed and applied to bring this beautiful area back to useable status. Fund raisers and funds from private donors along with taxes would help fund the future operation and restoration. Again, the US Army needs to continue to fix the damage done from their past operations.
262	see BOMC Alternative #4
263	The history of the Prairie is lost. No one will use the area and it will become overgrown and unmanageable. This alternative promotes no tourism and brings no tourism dollars to the Sauk County area. These funds will be lost to other areas in the state.
264	Who are the contact people for volunteer work?
265	Adopt the Oversight Management Commission's Alternative #4.
266	I do not prefer this alternative. I don't think it is the best use of the land if the public is not allowed to appreciate the area.
267	I like that the property will have limited public access for Nature Based Outdoor Activities (NBOAs) of hunting, trapping, fishing, hiking, and cross country skiing.
268	should have access like state park. good roads, paths, areas for camping perhaps hunting
269	This option is a waste of land.
270	Give the land back to the families or heirs to those that had it taken away from them back in 1942.
271	Not a good alternative.

272	I would like to see part of it put to use for horse trails, wide enough for carts which would also enable emergency vehicles to get through. The location is great for the central Wisconsin population to get to easily and affordably.
273	I would suggest that using the existing roadways as cycling paths would allow for greater use
274	I find very little to like about this plan because it does not even come close to honoring the values of the Badger Reuse Plan.
275	Not a reasonable use of the property. We need to open it up with added value
276	It is a poor use of the land.
277	Minimal disruption of the natural habitat. Don't like the trapping - dangerous for pets and people. Hunting in limited season - again dangerous for hikers/skiers
278	There isn't enough low impact recreation in this emphasis. I would like to see more constructed mountain bike trail that is shared with hikers and snowshoers.
279	Left unmanaged this area will become a weed infested garbage collection area for sure. What was given up by so many at the time the plant was built will have gone for nothing. We owe it to all generations to spend the money and make this an area that all can be proud of.
280	Too many invasive species, this property does need needs work with trails and educational opportunities.
281	Nothing about this alternative concerns me.
282	Why not invest in this like a state park? So much time and money has been spent to remove the buildings and restore it. Why stop until it's made into something useful for the residents of this area, as well as tourists? Also, why would the structure and debris be left on the property? That makes no sense. Finish the job.
283	Doesn't take advantage of multiple opportunities for conservation, education and recreation. Safety concerns about leaving structures or debris, that could have a negative impact on opening the area for hikers, etc.
284	Keep removing the debris. Let the area return to its natural state.
285	Not a good option. The people that live in the area and from Madison & Chicago will take it over and start using it to sell drugs, prostitution, etc.
286	Its not a bad idea, its better than ANYTHING involving no atv's or restricted hunting. Just leave it alone, and let people wander.....makes sense to me. I'd be concerned about the roads going to complete hell, I mean, they would need to be kept decent if this plan goes forward, but its not like you'd need to rebuild roads every year. You'd almost have to have some sort of continuous road going throughout for handicapped visitors as well.
287	I do not like the do nothing approach. We need to actively protect and maintain the natural ecology of the area as well as create opportunities for recreation and education. I think recreational uses like ATVs and shooting ranges are in direct conflict with protecting the peace and serenity of the natural environment.

288	I like that the property will be available for NBOAs. I am concerned that this alternative would not meet the needs of the community or the responsibility of this significant opportunity to restore a grassland/oak savanna of this scale.
289	I don't care for it. I think the land should be returned to area residents to be used for a recreation area. Because of the history, I think something needs to be done with it.
290	Yes NO RTV OR hunting or shooting range
291	This is terrible, this land was taken from families and the people of this area during WWII, it should be returned to the people in some manner and creating a plan with limited access is a terrible idea.
292	I think the property should be accessible to the people to use for recreation. Do something good with it so people can enjoy it, rather than think of how the land was taken away from the farmers to begin with. What a loss! Do not continue to cut off people from using it.
293	Unacceptable option. Waste of a great opportunity to showcase this land to others and improve it as well. Safety concern as well.
294	Alternative 4 is the best.
295	Alternative is the best.
296	The land needs to be restored.
297	This is okay with me although I would like to see restoration undertaken.
298	This option does not include bicycling, so I do not agree with it. If you would allow bicycles it would be fine.
299	I like it
300	The site needs restoration and ecological healing. Lack of facilities would be a concern.
301	This alternative limits users or deters users because it is disarray.
302	Minimal Maintenance suggests neglect, however, letting it go back to the land has its virtues. Horse back access with vehicle or under saddle not mentioned...good alternative to access issues ! Debris needs defining
303	I don't like this alternative. Property should be developed for a full spectrum of recreational uses.
304	this option would limit the land management too much. some improvements are necessary to improve the area for recreational use and natural habitat for native plants and animals
305	I don't agree. This property has so many historical spots that need to be available for all to see.
306	What a waste. Lets find public use that makes sense. Open it to the public, as something more than an abandoned product of the in appropriate nature of war.
307	It would be an abject waste of a valuable resource. A public shooting range would be the best way to use this property

308	horseback trails would not interfere with hunting, fishing, hiking and cross country skiing. The same trails could be used for hikers and skiers. hikers and horses could be on the trails at the same time, skiers would not be sharing the trails in most instances.
309	there is too much potential for a healthy outdoor experience to let things be idle.
310	Not a bad idea but some continued land improvements would be beneficial.
311	Do not like this alternative, the area should be restored as closely as possible to savanna-woodland type area with trails.
312	A complete and total cop out. Inaction only triumphs those who feel that we must punish ourselves to make amends to nature. Frankly, we have never been granted access to this area in the past for personal or recreational purposes. To let weeds grow, and to have people speak of the cultural and ecological relevance as they sit in their car at the side of Hwy 12 simply reaches for the lowest possible denominator. Open this area for its recreational potential and everyone will find a deeper and more palpable love for it. Embracing use for range shooting, motorized vehicle use, and a host of other possibilities will far more strongly sing the praise for this land than simply letting it sit idle while thousands of people pass by daily without noticing.
313	This plan wastes public resources that should be used to provide recreation opportunities to large groups that are within a short distance of the property.
314	I like the cross country skiing idea. Otherwise a poor use of a resource it will be just like all the other state parks in the area.
315	If you would allow several friends groups including a horse group, you could have improvements with no expense to the state except oversight.
316	This feels like a slum landlord approach.
317	I do not like this option. This is a rare opportunity to take a large tract of land and turn into recreational opportunities for the taxpayers of Wisconsin and surrounding areas.
318	Just let us come. Having water available would be great and a toilet
319	This does not encourage education of or enhanced use by the public.
320	It would be better to make it more accessible.
321	No
322	I do not like this alternative. Access to non-motorized outdoor recreational activities should be enhanced. Horseback riding on trails should be included as a compatible use of a shared trails system. Hunting and trapping should be prohibited for the sake of public safety and the quiet enjoyment of the natural recreation area.
323	We need horse riding trails included.
324	I like nothing and am concerned that access is limited.
325	this is a less costly option to #8 below and will get about the same benefit.

326	Don't like it.
327	It doesn't make adequate public use of the property.
328	I don't believe this option is in the best interest of the state or its inhabitants.
329	I like the low cost. Leaving structures that could present a hazard is a concern.
330	This is a waste of good space.
331	With no funding it will just have to be a public area. Similar to a public hunting grounds. Open to the public with no upkeep.
332	Debris is always dangerous. Restricted access to these areas will not prevent people from snooping around and then the potential for injuries occurs. New and unfamiliar crowds will not be drawn to this area of Wisconsin if there is no action. Its current status is, frankly ugly, scary and overwhelming.
333	It would be nice to remove the buildings that won't have a historical use, so that the land can be converted to habitat.
334	This would be a regrettable loss to the state and people of Wisconsin.
335	I like that this alternative doesn't cost a lot. I don't like that it is not a very positive use of the land.
336	This option is not appealing and would not draw consistent ongoing interest by the public. Poor should not be considered.
337	This is an excellent alternative.
338	I support continuing to leave the area as undeveloped as possible. I do not support allowing hunting and trapping in this area.
339	Adopt Alternative 4 which reflects the goals of the 2001 Badger Reuse Plan.
340	Only that it wouldn't permit better public understanding
341	This is not an option. This property is too valuable to leave without proper management of ecological and cultural resources.
342	I would rank this option #2/3. I like the natural succession that would take place, and the minimal human presence.
343	A public shooting range would be a big draw to the area and fit in perfectly with the properties history.
344	I do think this would be best.
345	I have concerns about lack of funding for restoration.
346	The No Action Alternative opens the door to many missed opportunities for developing a publicly accessible, multi-use recreational area. We have a 'blank canvas' here to do great things with.

347	I don't favor this option. I think this land should be full access to the people of WI.
348	I like that it would reduce the human impact on the landscape. The area that concerns me is the stopping of restoration efforts.
349	This will not provide benefits for anyone.
350	The most important point is preservation and the recognition of the true value of this property. Large tracts of land like this are rare particularly in this part of the state. Once this unique area is lost it will be irretrievable. We are as a people short-sighted on how the use and misuse of land affects plant, animal communities, and our lives. Water and air quality are greatly affected by the destruction. We talk about the economic good without realizing that maintaining living landscapes is part of the equation. My concern lies in the definition of minimal management.
351	I like the preservationist aspect of this proposal. It has the advantage of first do no harm. It would also, I should think, be the least costly at a time of budget cut-backs.
352	Get rid of the debris and the roads.
353	Sounds like a place teens would go to drink etc
354	The no action alternative is unacceptable. The land has been scared and we need to restore the land. Our people need to understand what has happened here and to show that we can work together to restore the area. Even if we do an excellent job of restoration, this will never repay those who lost everything for our country and our state.
355	This will provide the cheapest alternative and outside groups can fund activity areas they would like to see.
356	How about having some land not open to killing animals?
357	If there were no resources available for restoration activities, this might be an acceptable alternative. But of course, this is not the case. The kinds of work that needs to be done to create limited access, interpretive installations, historical displays, environmental restoration, and scientific research, is not intensive nor expensive if carried out in a planful, long-term manner. This alternative wastes a resource.
358	While I can appreciate the back to nature focus of this plan, this plan is too limiting from a revenue generating, self-sustainable POV. This is a huge area and parts could be developed for other recreational activities and parts left for hunting and trapping and hiking and cross country skiing. This has been accomplished at Devil's Lake.
359	Yes, it is a complete waste of a resource
360	This is an irresponsible option. Doing nothing to manage this property will invite irresponsible and damaging recreational uses and provide a huge opportunity for an invasive species nursery that will further threaten the forests of the Baraboo Hills.
361	When left without any clear plan and use, people will begin to use it as they want--dirt bikes, ATVs, etc without any thought to where they go and what they do--It will be a dump for trash and unwanted items. Like an empty house it will deteriorate.
362	Keep it as natural as possible, restrict the use of motorized vehicles and other destructive recreation.

363	There should be some public access provided for low impact outdoor activities.
364	This has the advantage of using the least amount of tax-payer dollars.
365	This is the ideal solution
366	We should open the land to at least some kind of public use. But the positives of this are that less invasive plants will be spread with fewer people visiting.
367	I do not favor this alternative.
368	I do not like this alternative because I like my tax dollars to include at least minimal amenities (e.g., trail maintenance, restrooms) for people who are hiking, cross-country skiing, etc.
369	low cost, and no gun ranges or ATVs
370	This would be better than shooting ranges or ATV destruction. However, I believe this property is worth investing in educational facilities and visitor/interpretive centers and such facilities.
371	I like that this alternative limits public access for only NBOAs. My concern is that this alternative does not take full advantage of the ecological potential of the property.
372	My preferred option is BOMC Alternative 4.
373	I don't like this alternative. The area should be restored and made accessible to LOW IMPACT visitor use.
374	I like that this alternative caters to nature based outdoor activities, however I think any benefit would be wasted if no restoration was implemented.
375	This was not the original agreement with the military nor the community
376	I feel that this alternative would be a bad choice. The size and quality of the property deserve to be enjoyed, studied and used for education.
377	I think that in some regards this is an attractive option. The only aspect that seems to detract from it would be the lost opportunity for restoration of habitat to pre-European status as it is understood through scientific and historical study. Additionally, in line with this vision of an unmolested environment, hunting and fishing should only be allowed in so much as it would help maintain an ecologically balanced and functional ecosystem.
378	This is not a great option. But at least it keeps out the rifle range and the ATVs!!! am from 30 miles away from the SPRA. If you want people like me to visit, and to spend my dollars in the local economy, then open up low impact recreational use. I have no reason to travel 30 miles to hear gun shots and roaring ATVs!
379	I believe this is an unacceptable alternative. This property should be developed for the use of the people of Wisconsin and should include public access for the nature based outdoor activities of fishing, hiking, cross country skiing, snowshoeing and most importantly mountain biking of the single track variety.
380	I like most of the idea but I think it would be under used.! Plus there's no single track mountain bike trails!!

381	Not an attractive proposition. Simply letting a huge chunk of land go unused is lame.
382	I could see some public going in and abusing it such as garbage and stuff like that.
383	I do not prefer this. There are already many public lands for NBOA and access to other user groups is denied.
384	This sounds like a good idea at first, but without guidance, the place could turn into a sea of honeysuckle and buckthorn.
385	This undervalues the potential of Badger, which presents for the people of Wisconsin a unique opportunity in terms of its geographical context, natural resources, and sheer scale (a rarity in southern Wisconsin).
386	No. Let's get moving on doing the right thing now. The Ecological Restoration Emphasis is a great plan.
387	Yes. Public safety concerns are the purview of a public government. Also, I would avoid trapping in a public area.
388	This alternative is not viable or socially acceptable.
389	We can do better
390	I like the proposed NBOA's, but believe some money is needed to control invasive plants throughout the property. There needs to be trails and parking areas for these low impact uses.
391	Buildings to remain? How many, and how much land is that, if they were demolished? Could the slabs be used for parking, or for reuse if walls gone? Not sure if I like the hunting idea. Perhaps only, if the wildlife (deer, coyote, etc, got to be too big). If I was cross country skiing, I would want to see the wildlife and not have them spooked by man. Do like the cemetery access, and need to check on ancestor grave conditions.
392	Low cost.
393	Do not support this plan of action. Return to original natural habitat is a responsible approach.
394	Access and low cost are appealing. Hunting areas should be limited to avoid excluding other users, but I have no objection to having part of the area as a seasonal hunting ground as long as that doesn't become the primary focus of management.
395	I prefer the other 2 alternatives.
396	More work still needs to be done, so I do not support no action
397	Doing nothing seems like the least favorable option.
398	One side of me thinks that it would be great that any budget would not be wasted on a defunct piece of land. But it seems like a wasted resource not to develop it given the locale and the opportunity at hand to create a new park for a modern marketable recreation facility. With a proper trails system, this park could be an excellent revenue generator for the state park system.
399	This is a terrible option and shouldn't be considered. Leaving structures and debris intact makes no sense. Nobody will want to use this land with this option.

400	I am concerned that invasive species management will be confined to some roadways and that no attempt will be made to clear structures or debris from the property.
401	My concerns are that abandoned structures and contaminants may remain on the site, and ecological restoration will not be actively pursued beyond roadway corridors.
402	This emphasis will create a playground for the privileged few.
403	This would be my second choice. The option isn't costing much, yet isn't doing anything to support itself or contribute to the local/state economy. It seems like the land could be enjoyed more and used for environmental research and letting it sit idle (for how long?) is more of an interim plan rather than a long term plan. We'd be right back at this point in another 10 years.
404	I like that this alternative would limit motorized activity in the area. However, I do not think this will be an attractive option to the public if it is not managed and promoted.
405	You can not leave safety issues unresolved. The Federal Government and corporate operators knowingly caused the damage and need to pay to clean it up. If you let them walk away you need to clean it up out of the one that let the others walk away's pocket not our tax dollars.
406	If the debris is dangerous I think it should be a special rule to remove it and also keeping the building that are still standing maintained would help out the history of the area
407	User groups can fund and maintain management activities- look at Dane county and what the Mt bikers are doing for the County. Have skiers groom the trails and a friends group lead restoration work parties.
408	There should be some management and improvements of the property that will remove unused and unneeded building, and that will enhance quiet and low impact recreational uses.
409	Unsuitable alternative as it does not include any provision for motorcycle use.
410	Doesn't cost much. All of the elements are irresponsible. Debris should be cleaned up and at least minimum maintenance should take place.
411	Like: The property will have limited public access for Nature Based Outdoor Activities (NBOAs) of hunting, trapping, fishing, hiking, and cross country skiing. Public access to the cemeteries will be maintained Dislike: Any structures or debris left on the property at the time of the land transfer will remain. I would like to see roadways, buildings etc. removed and the land restored to a natural state.
412	It wouldnt be useful to the public. This sounds like a bad idea. It should be restored to former prairie and oak savannah.
413	This does uphold the 2001 Badger Reuse Plan and honor the years of arduous and dedicated collaborative work by local governments, other Badger landowners, immediate neighbors, the Sauk Prairie Conservation Alliance and other non-profit organizations and stakeholders. It is unacceptable to reject the tenets of the 2001 plan, developed through compromise and good will and subsequently endorsed by Sauk County, the Ho-Chunk Nation and other stakeholders.
414	To return this site to a more 'natural' habitat that most closely resembles our best estimate of what the historical floral and faunal composition was before the construction of the plant, I believe that structures and debris should be removed as time and money allows.

415	This plan will cause the ongoing ecological degradation of the grasslands to woodlands and will afford little public benefit.
416	Certainly the low cost of this alternative is appealing. However, limited NBOAs and ecological management is a detriment.
417	I'd like to see more of an effort made in removing and prohibiting invasive species here. Otherwise I'd be fine with this.
418	If environmental amelioration/ cleanup is needed, do it.
419	Seems like this would offer limited economic value to Wisconsin and invasive species may allowed to overtake it in the long run.
420	This is not a realistic alternative and looks like just a boilerplate option that there is no intention of implementing.
421	This alternative is a complete waste of a remarkable opportunity that doesn't appear once in a hundred years. There are already many areas in Wisconsin devoted to this use pattern. We don't need to add another - particularly in southern WI.
422	Implement the BOMC Alternative 4 that honors the Badger Reuse plan
423	Taking no action raises the thought...should we let nature take its course, this is not possible anymore by leaving contamination, debris, and structures of various materials for eons.It also allows for break-ins and chaos on this huge tract of land with no mangement or control.
424	Please include horse trails.
425	i like it, keep the land unused
426	I like that the natural area will be preserved, but some restoration might be nice, as would be some allowance of other non-invasive recreational activities, such as horseback riding.
427	Don't like the idea of leaving existing structures or roads. Could end up looking more like a wasteland than a natural recreation area. I do not support this statement.
428	This property deserves a better future than to leave to go back... There are so many who could benefit from access for minim impatient recreation that honors the property's past history (and not as a place of war).
429	Converting some roads into paved cycling trails to create a direct bike route to Sauk City.
430	My consideration is limited use recreational and educational use not turning it into big soccer fields.
431	There should at least be some mitigation of contaminated sites, including phytoremediation, capping, and identification of problem areas.
432	A waste of a valuable public resource.
433	I do not support holding property that does not have a function or purpose. Our government owns a responsibility to decide what to do with it. If no decision can be reached, return it to the people.

434	This would be a waste of an opportunity to attract people to the area, and to serve the residents in the area, for recreational uses that are not available nearby.
435	Why have it and not use it.
436	This alternative wastes a public resource that could provide recreational opportunities to many citizens that live in central Wisconsin that are underserved.
437	This option is a waste of public land. Wisconsin offers numerous sites across the state for NOBAs. This site should be used for recreational purposes to make the destination unique and exciting
438	I am concerned that this option does not allow for any meaningful use of the property.
439	It describes a good baseline. I think further development is necessary to enhance the area's attributes.
440	I am not in favor of this alternative. Minimally maintained access with expanded NBOAs to include Mountain Biking-specific opportunities are more favorable than the proposal as stated.
441	I would rather that development not be done - the term development is usually an irony, with the end result of nature being destroyed.. There is no reason why the property should be developed for public recreation - there are people that would prefer to recreate on unadulterated nature.
442	I do not like this alternative. It seems like a missed opportunity to provide recreation opportunities for a large number of residents near to this site.
443	I don't like it!
444	SPRA is too substantial of a resource to go without management
445	I like to tour historical sites, but it sounds like that would not be possible with No Action Alternative . This would be a terrible waste of the land. If it was already pristine, untouched land, it would be an option. I'm sure there may be some land that would be a candidate for this, but not the whole site.
446	I am concerned about lack of clean up and restoration.
447	I think you are limiting the amount of people who would use the site with these restrictions. Why not open to other groups different times of the year. Native Americans should be able to do as they want on their portion.
448	If the Department is setting up this area, then why are they not maintaining it and making it available for public use? Would think that they State would provide funding to make all this happen and then once that is done, they couldn't an annual fee be charged, just like is done with the State Parks?
449	What a waste of a beautiful natural area. I don't approve of restricting access to this area. This alternative is the least desirable of the choices. I don't like anything about it since this is public land and should have access for enjoyment by everyone.
450	I do not like.
451	Very few will benefit from this option.

452	A waste of the resource.
453	I like the possibility of leaving any buildings, depending on their condition and value. The Nitro area still had bunkers remaining that seemed very solid. I could serve as a historical marker/point.
454	Leaving this property unimproved for public use carries the risk of its loss as public land, as it will benefit few in its current state. It may be sold off to private owners and will have few advocates if it cannot positively affect the local economy as public land.
455	dont like alternative.
456	I do not like nothing about this alternative. Grassland restoration and compatible public use should be part of the plan.
457	Limited access is a good thing if we are trying to preserve the environment but there should be roads and parking areas, it is a very large site.
458	I do not favor this alternative.
459	Why not just sell much of the land then, since the majority of it will not be able to be used by the public. Why not sell it in partials to the community? Highway 12 is a good location. Possibly a business or industry would build to generate jobs for the area. Partial could be sold to individuals to build homes. Crops could be planted on good farm land. Money could be generated into the area from some of this vast amount of land.
460	This idea troubles me greatly. I'm afraid illegal activities would take place, trash would accumulate, greater ecological damage would occur, and a great opportunity to serve the greater community would be missed.
461	This is an partial acceptable option - disagree with the trapping. Historical/cultural activities would be good and resotroation and removal of structures and debris important.
462	As usual government is all or nothing. There is plenty of land for a prairie and some tourist use. Hunting, Fishing , ATV park, Rifle range, and cemetery upkeep. It is not an all or nothing issue.
463	I like the concept of public access. People need to be close to the land and to understand the land ethic.
464	I really like the idea of having hunting, trapping, and fishing. At some time I would hope that ATV could open up. We have plenty of room to accommodate all forms of recreation.
465	It does concern me when limited access is mentioned and we all pay taxes.
466	Not a good option
467	The idea of doing NOTHING is very disturbing and truly limits the use of this land for public use and enjoyment. Clean-up the remainder of debris and maintain the facilities roadways and maintain funding for future years.
468	This is an acceptable alternative. Keep parts of the area untouched.
469	Alternative doesn't really seem like a useful option considering what the lands potential could be as a Recreation shooting range facility could be.

470	I like the idea of minimal road access, rather only trailsI would like the idea of removal of and debris if at all possible
471	It always makes me uncomfortable when publicly owned things are limited to certain segment of the public...creating a privileged minority. Rational for such privilege is rarely justifiable. It forces payment on individuals who do not directly benefit from their investment...seems to be a bit tyrannical. Of course, those with access rarely see it this way.
472	I think it is a good idea to use this land for these public activities,
473	I like the naturalism associated with this plan. The one thing that concerns me is the building remains and rubble that would remain.
474	It does not take into account the full use this land could have. it will be basically just sitting there. I am sure original settlers used this land in varying ways, and we too should use these lands appropriately and enjoy them. What use is 7,000 acres just sitting there if the public, who are the owners, can't enjoy them. Look at the benefits Devils Lake provides to many people. Would not have happened without being changed to public use and adding improvements. Now everyone from many states enjoy this area and add much needed economic impact to our area.
475	I don't feel this would be a safe alternative because even though areas would be restricted, people would still try to explore these areas, thus creating the possibility of injuries and liability.
476	No action will result in abuse of the property and unsafe conditions for others wishing to use the property.
477	The lower tax implications of course are attractive since no tax payer enjoys seeing their taxes go up year after year.
478	I like that there would be significant opportunities for low impact, quiet recreational use. And that public use of the Area would be very compatible with conservation management and ecological research. However, I do think state Recreation Areas provide better value to the citizens of the state if there are some improvements such as enhanced parking, signage, trail clearance, restroom facilities, and perhaps ultimately interpretative facilities.
479	What a waste of a beautiful area and an opportunity to help the surrounding communities
480	The only advantage of this proposal is that it's cheap! It represents what would be an important missed opportunity -- to re-create a natural habitat which would be unique in the mid-west, and a haven for native species which are important to human and planetary health.
481	I don't hate this idea, although I think that restoration would be a better use of the property.
482	I think it should be developed as minimally as possible for more public use.
483	The more primitive the better.
484	Snowshoeing should be included. This seems to fall short of a rare opportunity to restore this grassland ecosystem. While it would be better than allowing motorized recreation and a shooting range, it is the second of these three options, in our opinion.
485	it will be fine with people in it . Look at devils lake, millions visit and it looks nice

486	This area lost thousands and thousands of jobs over decades after the demise of Badger Ammunition. This is not a responsible alternative after the sacrifices of the local population.
487	Least cost?
488	Make sure the structures or debris will not cause a hazard or injure anyone or is hazardous to animals. Make sure that the debris will not pollute and make unsafe any water that may be used for drinking.
489	This falls short of its ability to be viewed as an asset to Wisconsin's conservation future. It will be viewed as vacant land with no purpose other than for the few people who navigate it and learn on their own.
490	I have several concerns about the acquisition of such a large and contiguous, but degraded, habitat with little investment in restoration activity. There would be considerable loss in educational and research opportunities as well. Hazards from debris and structures also concerns me.
491	land will not be used resourcefully
492	Without management to mimic the periodic disturbance of pre-settlement conditions and to check the spread of invasive species, the grassland assets of the Badger plant will be lost, making this an unacceptable option.
493	Without the action, I'd be worried what mechanical recreation (motorbikes, four wheelers) would do to the area.
494	Add biking and horseback riding to the list of activities.
495	Hunting on this land will cause some problems of access and safety to the land. Vehicle access to the land should be limited to patrolling and the land should be kept for NAOA only.
496	I don't believe that hunting and trapping should be done in any areas where there will be open access to the public. I hunt myself-but would never trust anyone to smart enough to always fully check the background before shooting. Trapping areas would have to be extremely restricted to the public. I think there are enough members of the surrounding communities that would be willing to help with clean up, should there be any debris left. Certainly, sportsman groups (this includes silent sports, as well) can contribute muscle and time.
497	I like nothing about this. I think it is our responsibility to return this area to its original habitat, providing a much needed space for wild life to live without having to compete with urbanization for resources.
498	I would think some improvements would need to be made such as bathroom facilities, trails for safety vehicles, etc. I am concerned about what will be left and the impacts they may continue to have.
499	If you can have cross country skiing you can certainly have bike trails.
500	Love it! But would like natural restoration and parking areas for cars to access the landscape and hiking/x-c trails. Here are no maintained x-c trails in park and this would be great!!
501	Low impact, cheap, fills need for public wild spaces.

502	No this doesn't concern me.
503	Not so much. We do want oversight and education.
504	possibly a necessary reality given limited financial resources but would seem to miss a completely unique opportunity.
505	This could be an option, but would not promote economic growth for our area. My only concern is that Nature Based Outdoor Activities definition should include cycling, at least on the current roadways.
506	This would be a waste of an opportunity.
507	too limited in its use
508	We have plenty of land in the Baraboo Bluffs that is in the Nature Conservancy. We need mountain bike trails in Sauk County
509	Yes, Everyone needs to enjoy.
510	For safety reasons some management is important.
511	I am concerned that the land would not allow NBOAs. That is a waste of good property.
512	I do not like this alternative.
513	I do not want hunting and trapping and I do not like the limited access. However, I don't want us to start paving roads - we should have gravel/dirt roads and paths so there is less runoff.
514	I hope that we can restore the land to its natural state. I worry about existing impact, and if there are any engineered controls that require maintenance to mitigate harm to human health and the environment.
515	I like that there are not ATV/snowmobile trails in this alternative. Concerns - Sounds like a abandoned mess that will not attracted visitors and a waste of a precious opportunity to preserve an interesting habitiat.
516	I like the limited public access to low impact use.
517	I would like to see biking added as one of the activities allowed. I like this alternative.
518	I would like to see places for picnics or maybe even a family friendly park to enjoy the area as a family
519	I'd be nervous about hiking or cycling with hunting going on.
520	Lacks opportunities for hike in camping and biking. Remains should be cleared from the property and it should include keeping it a praire.
521	Minimal maintenance would be fine as long as hiking and biking trails are part of th;e plan
522	No additional funding will be spent on restoration or property development. Any structures or debris left on the property at the time of the land transfer will remain.

523	No. We need hiking trails.
524	not a good alternative...I cannot understand why this would happen. however, I feel that putting the cross country skiing and hunting together are two different - totally - different statements. Quiet sports - i.e. hiking, biking, walking, XC skiing, are far different and more inclusive of a peaceful coexistence.
525	Obviously, this alternative is just a needed baseline and is not a reasonable approach for the DNR to take in managing this land. The state is responsible for active stewardship of this land. This includes restoration and protection, not just ignoring it. I support the Alternative Number 4, Conservation and Low-Impact Recreation Alternative and the associated Vision and Goals.
526	Please clean up debris; then leave it the way God made it.
527	While I enjoy watching nature rejuvenate on a landscape, management is very important. This place could easily become a buckthorn, autumn olive, honeysuckle nightmare in a few short years. no one would enjoy that.
528	Doing nothing is seemingly not a good option. This area must be cleaned environmentally, and improved for public use.
529	I think this would work with proper planning. Restricting access to certain parts and or buildings would only help in the development of the property.
530	I'd rather it be a location that enables recreational shooting. Barring that, doing nothing sounds good.
531	Too much of a waste of the property.
532	This is a good idea.
533	Another waste of space and money.....make is something that is useful
534	I Can See Doing This To Some of The More Remote Areas Only
535	Both Wisconsin Audubon Council and Madison Audubon Society voted recently to support BOMC Alternative 4. It is strongly supported by Citizens for Safe Water Around Badger, Sauk Prairie Conservation Alliance, Wisconsin Wildlife Federation (individual stakeholder members of the Badger Oversight Management Commission), and many others. Compared with the three alternatives offered by Wisconsin DNR ( <a href="http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/lands/masterplanning/SaukPrairie/">http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/lands/masterplanning/SaukPrairie/</a> ), BOMC Alternative 4 emphasizes conservation and low-impact recreational activities that complement each other and those of the surrounding land owners, enhancing the health, culture, and economy of the Badgerlands and the surrounding community. It much better reflects the 2001 Badger Reuse Plan, an agreement still in effect which was entered into by 21 representatives of local, state, federal and tribal units of government as well as neighboring landowners, businesses, school districts and nonprofits.
536	This would be the BEST thing to do, nothing at all. Leave it to NATURE.
537	This seems like a limited use of a land with large potential for positive recreational use
538	established horse trails, sharing with others, adequate parking

539	At its regular meeting on August 27, 2013, the board of directors of the Badger History Group voted unanimously to support Alternative 4 as proposed by the Badger Oversight Management Commission for adoption by the Wisconsin DNR.
540	like this
541	We support no hunting.
542	Hunting and trapping can not coexist on a year round basis with hiking and cross-country skiing.
543	Well, the turn our back and back to nature approach misses the opportunity to create a place of education and enjoyment of nature.
544	This sounds like a vacant lot going to ruin, although spending no money is a good point.
545	Again, I think you could turn a small piece of the land next to Bluffview into a county park and positively affect so many people who have such great needs.
546	Restriction of areas is a waste of a great land aquisition. I would like the area opened up for all types of recreation
547	This is a waste. You have a large chunk that could be used by hunters and nature lovers. Why not try to create a resource that we can enjoy and utilize?
548	he need more horse trails
549	I somewhat like it.
550	Structures, debris, pollution resulting from past industrial use should be removed and cleared by the army or parties responsible for the damage/misuse.
551	I think if you leave it alone people will start to find ways to sneak in and cause trouble. We have plenty of conservation land in this area, we could use some more recreational land.
552	Bad idea
553	Why deny the generations to come this vast area!! No Action is not the answer.
554	The land is too valuable to not open it up for the full use of the public
555	Nothing good about it. Ridiculous.
556	I don't like this alternative! I think the property should be managed for the enjoyment of people, and the well being of wildlife and plant life.
557	This property should be used for recreational hunting, trapping, fishing, hiking, and cross country skiing. Any specific hazards remaining on site should be addressed for public safety.
558	Too minimal. There should be an ongoing, long term, restoration plan that will return the area to it's original habitat to the extent possible.
559	I do not like this idea. Government lands should be accessible for the people!

560	Need to specific identify areas that do not allow or restrict hunting and trapping activities that would interfere with activities such as hiking & bird watching
561	I think its a great idea! I know me and my friend would hit those trails, I know my 4-H group would too! We are always looking for fun new trails to take the horses too.
562	Keeping the natural state of the land, controlling access to the land are good. Bad, not allowing others to enjoy this property, nature and wildlife.
563	I do not like this alternative. Elements that concern me: leaving debris on the property; no restoration; no property development. These will not contribute to a visionary use of the property.
564	Keep it wild life only. This land is much more valuable to me, my children and grand children if it is restored to the way nature intended it. You're the Department of NATURAL Resources. ATV's and shooting ranges have nothing whatsoever to do with preserving natural resources. Keep your promise and do your job by protecting the natural resources for the people of WI.
565	I do not like this alternative. I believe that we should follow the comprehensive land usage plan that was drawn up over 10 years ago. Low impact recreation (hiking, fishing), prairie restoration, and education.
566	Not enough public participation. The place needs trails, bathrooms, picnic areas and an information center that explains its history.
567	The part that concerns me about this alternative is the no taking action bit. So I guess the whole thing concerns me.
568	Return the area to it's original state.
569	I think biking could be added to this alternative. There are miles of roads that could easily be used for biking, hiking, and skiing. I fear that minimally maintained would lead to neglect.
570	Make use of those roads, and let people use them for horseback riding! Why should only hikers, skiers, and hunters experience the property? I like the idea of letting the structures and debris left on the property remain--it is part of the property's history.
571	This would be acceptable
572	Seems like a waste of a great resource.
573	Too broad and too many outs to stop cleanup.... not good.
574	It would be a more cost effective alternative. I am concerned about the public use excluding horse back riding. Horse back riders; for the most part; are accustomed to primitive accommodations and typically bring/have everything they need with them in their vehicles, trailers or person. This is due to the complexity in hauling and caring for equines. That being said; horse back riders don't want much more than a place to park and access to places to trail ride in wilderness areas.
575	The part that concerns me is the limited public access. This is taxpayer funded land and should be open to all.
576	Okay
577	Doesn't do much for the previously mentioned goals.

578	This alternative might be very good for the absolute naturalist, but the majority of people don't fit that category.
579	This would be as tragic as the removal of Native Americans and later the settlers.
580	A complete waste of the resource and of the opportunity to conserve wisely . I do not like this alternative at all.
581	I believe limited recreational development would augment the enjoyment of these lands
582	I think we need to have more development for the general public use.
583	Horse Trails
584	I think that there are some invasive species that need to addressed, as well as the removal of human activity.
585	Misses important opportunity for education and recreation. Restoration of landscapes needs additional support and work. This is not the best way forward. I support BOMC Alternative 4.
586	Good alternative due to budget issues. However cleanup should be completed.
587	Opportunities for hunting
588	Use existing parking lots for points of entry by sticker.
589	I do not like this alternative. It wastes a public resource that could otherwise be developed to provide recreation opportunities for a large number of residents that are proximate to this site. The property needs to be developed to maximize recreational opportunities.
590	If it is open to horse camping/riding, people will use it. Horse riders don't need fancy and extensive trails systems.
591	is horseback riding considered a NBOA ? If this is publicly owned property, some provisions for public access should be in place.
592	Horse back riding can bring many options as well. Trapping is not a good thing
593	Organize groups to help maintain the trails. Have signs indicating which 'group' is maintaining a certain stretch of land or trail. (Like you see on the highway. Groups take care of certain sections) To deny access to all of the public is not educational.
594	Horse trails.
595	I don't care for it. I do not care for the limited public access as it is a public place.
596	we need more horse trails in our parks
597	I would worry about the structures and debris that would remain on the property. I can't imagine that the DNR would have the resources to police the area and keep people out, which could lead to accidents and injuries.
598	Horseback riding is a sport that can be enjoyed without extra development or restoration.

599	We need to make the area more attractive to the public with the intent of bringing to them a better appreciation and understanding of the world around them. This option does the opposite and should not be adopted.
600	the plus is no tax dollars used for maintaince or upkeep; the down side few people will actually be using the public land only an elite few
601	I do not like it waste of a valuable resource.
602	This resource should be developed with a shooting/archery range for the public.
603	I worry about the restricting any part of the area
604	There is no mention of other popular nature based activities like horseback trail riding. This is especially important to many Wisconsin citizens.
605	already to much time and money spent on planning and researching to use this option
606	I like limited access. I think additional money could be spent in hiking trails and rest rooms.
607	Very little! Such a waste of a valuable resource!
608	It would be a shame to not utilize and keep the historic factors for future generations.Facilities such as this is what won WW2 and kept us free.
609	There needs to be allowances made also for horse back riding as well as for those motorized vehicles that the elderly and handicapped may use, the four wheeled riding style of vehicles so that in all fairness everyone within the public has access to share and view the beauty that is to be seen.
610	Not my choice.
611	I think this is short sighted and doesn't take into consideration the opportunity to educate and recreate.
612	Horse trails and parking for large Horse trailers
613	This was an active ammunition and explosives manufacturing facility. This is not virgin land. Land designated for shooting range use may be the most economical and practical use.
614	I would still like to see horse trails added.
615	We have a great public resource here that should not be put on a shelf as would happen in this first proposal. We should develop recreational activities where possible.
616	There is little I like about this alternative. It is the taxpayer who ultimately paid to purchase the land, it is the taxpayer who owns the land, and in this alternative it is the taxpayer who is being given minimal opportunity to use the land he/she paid for and owns.
617	Anything is better than 500 acres of ATVs which is the nightmare option.
618	If you are renting farm land that money could be used to make hoarse trails in the area. Horse people spend a lot of money, you wouls be wise to capture some of it.

619	There is no equestrian access.
620	There are several points of concern...no mention is made of horse/trail riding and the trapping/hunting option is dangerous and deplorable for a state natural area. Without taking advantage of the significant number of volunteers in the horse community to include a safe (ecologically and physically) horse access to this recreational facility, you would be missing a big piece of the areas heritage and purpose. In regards to hunting - and I am not opposed to hunting - inclusion of hunters and trappers would once again limit recreational use during certain times of the year and increase dangers to animals, birds, pets, and humans.
621	Seriously? You want to promote bird species and I believe your words were to attract native and even rare species in a prior statement and here you suggest opening the land to hunting. Which is it~ protect them or hunt them? Will the property be safe? If your not willing to maintain and invest in this property it's wasting it. Hand it over to some that will do some good with it.
622	Sounds ok for nboa's, but would like to see horseback riding included as a nboa.
623	I thought there were 4 alternatives - I opt for number 4 as the most balanced.
624	I like this as long as steps are taken to revive the natural flora and fauna
625	This alternative has merits. Perhaps minimizing State control should be considered. I still like the idea of a place for people to safely shoot, which of course would require supervision and mainainence.
626	The area should be used, not restricted
627	as long as the road is maintained to get a horse trailer in/out, the rest doesn't matter so much for trail riding
628	I feel that we are moving so fast in todays world that losing nature would be a very bad thing. I feel we all need to give back to the earth and be aware of our surroundings.
629	This would be a shame to have such a large area unused when building and maintaining trails would be a significant benefit for all users and for the local economy. Hikers and cross country skiers would benefit along with equestrians.
630	I would like to see horse trails. Riders are a good source of observing problems that arise and misuse of the area. The public will use the area more if it is maintained to some extent. This would be the 3rd choice of the alternatives. Unless the horse trails are added and an area for parking trailers were added it would then become my number 1 choice.
631	This is too nice of an area to let just sit and not be used by the public.
632	Nobody benefits when the State takes control of large tracts of land and then excludes the public from that land. The taxpayers are paying for this property so they should be able to enjoy it in a responsible way like using the property for firearms related activities.
633	The buildings need to be either removed or kept up, not left to be rat infested eye sores for the community. If there are any shelter type structures, they should be left to be utilized as such.
634	we would really love to see horse back riding allowed and camping like wild cat mt. but we definatly need more camp sites. and some that are open.for first come first serve sites so they are not all reserved to all the out of staters all the time.

635	The Department will restrict areas due to public safety--really?Will the DNR fine me if I don't wear a helmet too? We want some risk in our lives.
636	This is a non starter in my mind.
637	I like the idea that ATVs and bicycles won't be encouraged. But it seems like a wasted opportunity. Invasive species should be removed and natural habitat and wildlife restored.
638	let's make a giant outdoor party park - drinking and ?
639	This would be the best as we cannot afford to spend our tax dollars on things like this in our present economic situation. Just let it be like other public lands up north with access for hunting and hiking. Horse riding should also be allowed on designated areas.
640	Who would this alternative benefit? Lets expand this slightly to allow more visitors to experience this area without damaging the ecosystem with motorized vehicles.
641	I like this alternative, but would like to see some prairie management be implemented. I love to ski, but would not endorse it if I also had to allow hunting, fishing, and trapping. Skiing is non consumptive, the others greatly alter the balance of wildlife in the area.
642	This might be fine. However, you need decent parking areas and some kind of bathroom facilities or you will have undesirable problems.
643	This will become a wasteland and too open to invasives of all sorts.
644	I think horseback riding has been forgotten. It requires little in the way of maintenance or development other than perhaps larger parking areas which need not be paved, but gravel would be welcomed.
645	If you are going to allow Hunting, fishing, trapping, hiking, and cross country skiing, why couldn't you include horseback riding?Feel if it was left with no action taken that it would become vandalized. There would be no way to control invasive species long term.
646	provide horse trails for the many horse enthusiasts in Wisconsin.
647	This does NOT sound like an alternative I would support.
648	There needs to be growth, If there is no growth we decline. and we will be facing this problem in the near future. Look at the Kickapoo Valley Reserve, It's use is down every year, and Wildcat State Park is book full.
649	It portrays an attitude of limited vision. Leaving unmaintained structures and debris is irresponsible. What are the areas or substances that are or could be a safety concern? Some improvements to facilitate visitor experience and safety need to be incorporated. Horseback riding and carriage driving needs to be incorporated into the definition NBOAs.
650	I like nothing. Too much restriction on the public
651	Doing nothing would be a waste of a potential recreation area.
652	Yes, there are concerns because it does need developing to enable more public use.

653	Although this proposal will over time allow much of this area to return to its natural setting, it does not accomplish the goals listed in this survey. It will not educate Wisconsin citizens on the importance of retaining wild land.
654	Nothing. The property will incur vandalism and become a dumping ground or party area.
655	No horse trails
656	Although this is clearly the low-cost alternative, I think it would waste an opportunity for habitat restoration that would make the area much more valuable and attractive in the long-run.
657	If developed for horse trails, the hunting and trapping should be limited.
658	Nothing-Lack of areas not open for public use seems illogical to me
659	I like that it would remain open for public access as listed, but access that's described as limited concerns me. Free and ready access would be better. Clean-up of debris and deteriorated structures should also be done.
660	There is no mention of the area being made available for horseback riding. Devoted horseback trail riders, the ones that follow the rules and act as stewards for our public lands are always looking for new areas to ride. I know too many people that travel out of Wisconsin to trail ride because of the limited riding opportunity that exists. To keep people local and draw more horseback riders to the state we need to work, collectively, to continue building new trails and maintaining existing trails. Many of us trail riders ride in areas that require us to pack in and pack out, we get it and we want to see the environment saved. Most of us are there to enjoy nature, not just have a longer trail for our run or hike. Please consider us, the avid horse trail rider, when considering new land reclamation and future trail development. Many of us beg and plead for access to private land for trail development and would love to see more public areas become available so everyone has a place to ride. The majority of us agree with and support multi-use trails and enjoy striking up conversations with whomever we meet on the trail.
661	This sounds like a feasible alternative, but the option to debris lie does not make a bit of sense. the Property should be cleaned up as needed regardless of access.
662	I don't support this alternative because there is no funding available to get rid of invasive species and make the property useable by the general public.
663	I feel that this would be a worst case scenario. This would not facilitate the protection of those areas for future restoration. This would place archeological sites at risk and would not protect some natural areas from destruction by motorized off-road traffic. I have no problem with limited hunting, trapping, and fishing, but not the development of motorized trails or shooting ranges/courses.
664	something needs to be done with it. It can not just sit there with no one using a state resource
665	This would be a waste of the resource.
666	Money saving, least invasive but also lease accessible.
667	This would be a waste of opportunity to restore this area!

668	This is NOT acceptable to take no action at all. Invasive species is just that - invasive - and will override natural habitat, thus affecting all native species of plant and animal life. And, impacting humans as well. The ecosystem will be unbalanced.
669	Horseback riding. Use certified weed free hay if camping.
670	I favor limiting development and focusing on outdoor activities, particularly, hunting, trapping and fishing. I also favor establishing target shooting ranges on the property.
671	Allow off-road motorcycle groups use of the property as long as they maintain it condition to the current or improved state. Having the same groups donate their time to improving the lands and trying to remove any negative attributes from the lands. Saving tax payer dollars.
672	This is a poor choice. The land can be used and developed as an excellent recreational opportunity for many underserved groups.
673	As long as access is maintained for ORVs, this works.
674	Land is a valuable resource, doing nothing with it is such a waste. We should take pride in it and utilize it, be proud of it.
675	As the horse industry is a large part of our state, I would like to see some trails made available to the horse industry. As horseback riders are not use to having alot of fancy camp sites, it would not take a lot to make this area open to the horse community. A large parking lot would be all that would be necessary as a start for trails.
676	limited public access for Nature Based Outdoor Activities SHOULD include the sport horseback trail riding. Our native predecessors rode their horses through these acres for centuries and I don't believe there is any damage from horseback riding showing from those centuries of use. Thus, this No Action alternative is not the smartest usage of this area.
677	Open it for the public and maintain the roads. If the taxpayers know they can access it they won't have such a problem funding it.
678	I dislike this alternative because it does not utilize the property and improve the value of the property for any pupose, wheather an ecological or recreational based emphasis.
679	I like nothing about this alternative. It would be grossly underutilizing a great opportunity.
680	While this plan allow nature to fairly completely take it's own course, the type of trails for hunting, fishing, and hiking are not of a quality that lend themselves to use by more casual walkers, bikers, and those on horseback or driving horses. It would be better to also have areas developed enough to accommodate these other individuals as well. I believe that there are likely more individuals participating in the second mentioned activities than those in the first group, with some crossover.
681	It seems nature would be left to take its course but there wouldn't be much, if any opportunity for people to enjoy it. This is the least preferable option.
682	Simple is better.....Less is More.....the more natural also is better!
683	I don't think this would be beneficial to the people of WI who ultimately are footing the bill. Parts of the area could remain undeveloped for ecological and environmental reasons.
684	Not the best option.

685	In my opinion this option is a waste of a resource. There are very few things I like about this option. It does not represent the cultural and educational opportunities that are presented, nor restore the natural habitat and it does nothing to balance recreational opportunities.
686	This is a poor alternative use of this public resource. It is wasteful of the land. It denies a vast population any significant opportunity to use this public resource.
687	There should be horse trails for public use.
688	Limiting public access/use is a concern.
689	This is a wasteful alternative. This public resource could otherwise be developed to provide recreation opportunities for local residents and visitors to the area.
690	I do not like this alternative. It wastes a public resource that could otherwise be developed to provide recreation opportunities for a large number of residents that are proximate to this site. The property needs to be developed to maximize recreational opportunities.
691	The parts that concern me most are the restricted areas. People will still attempt to enter those areas. Much safer for everyone to remove them. I'd very much like to see the area (and trails) developed and maintained. Southern Ill has a park (Pyramid) that is in the black because it allows farming and hunting. If funds are an issue, look into creative ways to generate income. <a href="http://www.dnr.state.il.us/lands/Landmgmt/PARKS/R5/PYRAMID.HTM">http://www.dnr.state.il.us/lands/Landmgmt/PARKS/R5/PYRAMID.HTM</a>
692	Prefer Outdoor Recreation Emphasis
693	This is a very rare opportunity to provide a recreational area for multiple uses. The no action alternative ignores this great opportunity to provide a motorized recreation area. Motorized recreation is growing in popularity and is currently underserved in the state.
694	No Action Alternative I do not like this alternative. It wastes a public resource that could otherwise be developed to provide recreation opportunities for a large number of residents that are proximate to this site. The property needs to be developed to maximize recreational opportunities.
695	I do not like this alternative.
696	I am not familiar with the area so I cannot comment.
697	The entire property should be accessible to all who desire to venture into it. Of course safety has to be a giant factor. The historical value of everything should be considered.
698	Public safety of un-disposed debris, and lack of supervision and deterioration of the quality of the land aesthetics.
699	This plan concerns me as it does not address managing the property. Without proper oversight and management the land has great potential to decline, become overgrown with invasives or, worse yet, become a dumping ground for landscape wastes.
700	I would like to see this beautiful area open to public use as a restored natural area which would support state wildlife and plant species. I would like to see structures and remnants of the former use removed.
701	Public land should be open for the public to use.

702	This is benign neglect and will undoubtedly lead to vandalism, safety concerns and loss of history.
703	This potentially comports with idea to designate certain lands as the Sauk Prairie Wilderness Area where natural restoration can occur. It is misleading to suggest public access is limited, please clarify that public access is not precluded under the no action alternative (except where potentially hazardous) but limited to foot or equestrian travel or existing roads and ways where motorized access is feasible.
704	No invasive recreational activities. no NBOAs. protect and preserve the grassland birds and the prairie remnants