

Sauk Prairie Recreation Area

The following comments regarding the “Ecological Restoration Emphasis” 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 2: Ecological Restoration Emphasis

Under this management alternative, the primary emphasis is on restoration work of the grassland ecosystem. A variety of management tools will be used to maintain grassland and savanna. No development is proposed, and vehicle access will be limited. Visitors would enjoy a perceived remoteness and quiet. Recreation opportunities will be limited to the NBOAs (hunting, fishing, trapping, hiking and cross country skiing).

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	Concerened about no permanent staff at site.
2	Same as No Action Alternative
3	Nothing, there should be wide public access and no useless bat research.
4	Horseback riding
5	Horseback riding and biking are also NBOAs. Participants are also taxpayers.
6	By limiting the access you greatly limit access to a relatively small number of participants. Open a portion of the grounds for motorized vehicles
7	Parts of this plan can be achieved while still allowing
8	instead of removing some of the buildings(unless unsafe)maybe fix them up so they could be used as visitor centers,maybe have volunteers work at base stations
9	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.
10	I do like this alternative but would like to see horse riders included. Many horse clubs are willing to help maintain trails.
11	I like the idea of limiting vehicle access, this would allow the area to maintain a healthier ecological habitat.
12	We are in favor of providing a safe haven for all wildlife, particularly endangered species. This includes coyotes, wolves, bears, etc.
13	Nona
14	I like the ecological restoration, but am disappointed with the lack of effort to connect people with the land. Please consider Alternative 4 as proposed by the Sauk Prairie Conservation Alliance.

15	concerned by the number of limits that would be establishedconcerned that this would turn into preservation , not conservation
16	I think Wisconsin has enough of these type of areas. There are hundreds of parks, forests and public lands were motorized recreation like dirt bikes are not allowed.
17	This alternative is OK. It would be nice to have someone on-site for property management or teaching.
18	Plant wild flowers.
19	Sounds like another place to take your dog for a crap
20	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.
21	I do like the support to the wildlife, and limiting motorized vehicles. As someone who spends March-Oct camping with my horse and trail riding, I would like to see equestrians added to the NBOAs list, they are natural animals and non-motorized and don't do anywhere near as much damage to trails as things like snowmobiles do, especially if muddy areas are off limits (most good trail riders will avoid muddy/low areas when they are wet if they know they are there).
22	If the idea is to preserve it for remoteness and quiet, gun hunting does not fit the description. I am a hunter,so don't go there.
23	Again, keep out the hunting and trapping.
24	The site had limited vehicle access and perceived remoteness when it was an industrial site. This is largely because the public was denied use of the land. Now that we can change that, we need to make use of this property by addressing shortfalls in recreation opportunities for a large number of people that live within range of the property. We already have adjoining land that offers traits of what is proposed under this option. Tying up this property under this option would severely limit the number of residents that would benefit from the resource. We need to maximize the recreational opportunities at the site, not unreasonably limit how it can be used.
25	I do not think this will serve very many people, We need some exposure to other exciting physical activity to appeal to young people.
26	excellent concept, especially educational uses
27	Like the educational focus. Same concerns as above-want trails we can ride and drive on.
28	Don't like it. Too exclusive to all but a small segment of the population.
29	This sounds good -- again, I'd include horse back riding, and use it as a way to preserve traditional Native American hunting methods.
30	Yes. How can you restore birds and species when you are allowing hunters on the land. I've seen hunters shoot just to shoot. Take a walk in our state forests and look at how the hunters shoot up the trail signs. You want to allow these same people on land that you are trying to restore. Horse people do not pollute with garbage on trails. Horse people respect trail signs and warnings. We don't shoot up trail signs or leave garbage on the trails.

31	Again, the more people that are allowed access to the land, and to use it for their enjoyment, the better off everyone will be.
32	We need to maximize the recreational opportunities at the site, not unreasonably limit how it can be used. There is adjacent land that allows for the hiking fishing and restricts motorized traffic. We need this land to be utilized by a large number of close by citizens that are currently unserved in this area.
33	Much better use of the site. WI already has multiple recreation sites public and private, but our natural places and especially grasslands are declining significantly.
34	This would be a wonderful plan if you included horseback riding trails with it! I would love to see self interpretive signs on the history of the land as well. Too bad you couldn't include fitness stations along a section of hiking trails. They make some very nice outdoor fitness stations now with moving parts and everything!
35	This option limits the use of the public land to too few of the public. Besides, many of the uses and concepts listed are available JUST TO THE NORTH. This is an industrial site. Embrace it.
36	This is not compatible with the Badger Reuse Plan owing to lack of commitment to the partnership goals. There is no good reason for limiting interpretive centers or DNR funding or staffing commitments, or public access and educational opportunities. It reads as if it is intentionally made unattractive to the public by incorrectly suggesting that ecological restoration needs to restrict public access and enjoyment, which is a false premise. The preferred Alternative is the BOMC Proposed Land Use Alternative 4 (see http://saukprairievision.org/).
37	This ignores the history of the land
38	This is bullshit. Use it.
39	This option would prevent access to a large number of recreational users who do not have options to them currently!
40	Like this alternative the best
41	open it up to non motorized traffic
42	the best use of the land to benefit our future generations is the outdoor recreation option which includes the creation of a shooting range.
43	Ecological restoration is a necessity but do't agree with extent of using all NBOAs available
44	There are so few tracts of prairie & savannah remaining, this would make a great one!
45	Include horse trails and related support.
46	This is the alternative I favor. It is the best long-term plan for this sensitive area.
47	I would like to see the area restored to it's natural state and allow limited recreational usage, hiking, horse trails, biking, limited hunting.
48	There are many areas of the state that have had ecological restoration emphasis. I am not sure they are all that successful. If there are some spots that have rare habitat already existing, let's protect it . . and enjoy it. I feel the land belongs to the people and should be opened up for more people to enjoy.

49	right--- keep the snowmobiles and atv's out . What's quiet about hunting????? I'm sure there are numerous volunteers that would give graciously of their time to maintain a wildlife education area, among these would be horse people.
50	I think this limits the potential for the land to be enjoyed by more people.
51	I like the idea of keeping it quiet. We enjoy watching the wildlife. We are campers who go during the week when things are quiet and many times we enjoy the wildlife.
52	NO! Do not manage off site, DNR/Visitor Interaction is needed, Educate and Allow Public Use
53	It is a good plan for the restoration and educational use of this area.
54	seems good but as long as people can enjoy the land.
55	All is possible except staff should be on site. Interaction with the DNR to foster cooperation and knowledge is required.Why do we need bat research and to learn what?
56	Overall this is the preferred option, though there should be development of visitor facilities and trails.
57	I like much of this. Add sufficient staff to manage habitat and educate visitors. Allow some vehicle access to some areas, but not all. NO ATV's!
58	All good uses&ideas
59	Save and restore buildings of historic relevance. Provide trails for equestrians.
60	history of the land needs to be preserved and taught, not destroyed and buried. let the child of Wisconsin be able to go and learn about this area. let adults be able to take their child and learn about the geography of this landscape.
61	Yes, this property should have more public use to include equestrian trails.
62	There is already adjoining land that offers this option. it would be better to maximize the rec opportunities at the is site, not to limit how it can be used.
63	The public has been denied use of this industrial site for too long. Now that we can change that, we need to make use of this property by addressing shortfalls in recreation opportunities for a large number of tax payers that live within range of the property. There already is adjoining land that offers traits of what is proposed under this option. Tying up this property under this option would severely limit the number of residents that would benefit from the resource and limit potential revenues from Trail Passes and Vehicle Registration.
64	This is fine for SOME of the property, but hardly for all of the DNR managed acreage. Such a complete hands-off approach is little better than the No Action alternative mentioned above. With a property this large, a one-time opportunity coming into the possession of the People of the State of Wisconsin, we have an obligation to manage it for The greatest good, for the greatest number of people, over the longest period of time. (Theodore Roosevelt quote)
65	Horse, hiking and cross country trails users could all use the same trails.
66	Unless the buildings are dangerous leave them & rent them out for function
67	I like the middle road. keeping the land quiet, for the plants, animals and for silent sports recreational opportunities.

68	i like the concept of restoring the grasslands,but limiting access could be difficult for bike riders,the handicapped,elderly,people with young kids and pets forcing them to walk long distances
69	This only addresses a small portion of recreational hobbies and is a very poor use of this significant property.
70	Removing all the infrastructure seems foolish as at least some of it might have value for meeting/class locations, study of the history of the facility.
71	I want to see some portion of the park that allows motorized recreation.I do not feel that motorized recreation will harm the park or the experience for those who prefer silent activities. Offroad motorcyclists are environmentalists too.
72	I prefer this option for returning the area to its natural habitat and the protection of the native animal species.
73	The site had limited vehicle access and perceived remoteness when it was an industrial site. This is largely because the public was denied use of the land. Now that we can change that, we need to make use of this property by addressing shortfalls in recreation opportunities for a large number of people that live within range of the property. We already have adjoining land that offers traits of what is proposed under this option. Tying up this property under this option would severely limit the number of residents that would benefit from the resource. We need to maximize the recreational opportunities at the site, not unreasonably limit how it can be used.
74	Good to maintain NBOAs and have an educational goal for youths to experience nature.
75	I like absolutely everything about this alternative.
76	This sounds excellent.
77	IT IS UNECESSARY, VEHICLE ACCESS WAS NOT PERMITTED HERE BEFORE. YOU WILL LIMIT WI RESIDENTS WHO WILL BENEFIT FROM THIS LAND
78	I support Alternative 4!
79	A good option, but more emphasis on education would be beneficial. It wouldn't hurt to employ staff; Wisconsinites need jobs.
80	How wonderful to have a large parcel of grassland within reasonably close reach of large population areas in Wisconsin. It would be great to have extensive grasslands and savannas in Wisconsin.
81	I like the idea of restoring and persevering a rare natural area. There are already plenty of recreational areas in Devils Lake State Park. OK with limited NBOA's.
82	This emphasis is a very good one. It helps preserve wildlife habitat and allows education and low impact recreation.
83	This is the plan that I think should be implemented. Again, fishing, hunting, and trapping should be restricted to those species that are not rare or threatened.
84	This needs to be what we all decide on. This will provide the least impact while allowing public access.
85	I like the emphasis on restoring the natural ecosystem. Without active management, the property could fall into unauthorized uses or abuse.
86	I like this alternative (what's not to like?) From my perspective, there are no concerns here.

87	Plenty of other areas with this alternative already, ORV users already have volunteer groups ready for use and conservation for this area
88	Horseback riding is an NBOAs that should be included. This middle of the road approach to management of the property makes most sense.
89	This could be an alternative as well but could co-exist with recreational use of some of the land as well.
90	I like this alternative!
91	This sounds good - use of area for schools, groups(scouts, vets etc) in an educational and recreational way sounds perfect. I like the idea of volunteers - saves money. Hunting and trapping would need much more supervision and onsite care.
92	This is the best use of the property and conforms with the original Badger Reuse Plan. I support this alternative.
93	There are plenty of opportunities for NBOAs. please don't restrict to this alternative.
94	This is the best idea for this sensitive area and would impact us all for good.
95	In a world where animals are losing their habitats on a daily basis, it is important to provide a place that animals can rely on to survive and keep their populations from going extinct. It would be great to keep this primarily wild but also be able to include trails for people to enjoy parts of this wonderful area. I would also consider trails important because they provide a place to bring children to get them to understand nature and respect it more.
96	This is the alternative which 19 members of my family would like to see used. There are no concerns.
97	Limiting vehicle access. No horse trail.
98	This is the solution local people voted for several years ago. It supports native species and allows access for NBOAs, which offer minimal disturbance to the environment. Large tracts of native grasslands need to be supported and protected.
99	Some access is needed to enable the owners of the site (the citizens of WI) to enjoy more than just the outer areas of the site.
100	This is a good plan but other low impact activities such as biking and horse riding and driving should be considered.
101	Important but it does not have to exclude Outdoor Recreation use.
102	Love this. There aren't enough unfragmented grass and shrublands. Even if you have to restrict horse traffic, this is a good use.
103	Promote/use this land as much as possible for wildlife/classroom learning/ tours for retired.
104	Restoring trails, limiting vehicle access, making available for equestrian use.
105	Please include equestrian trail.
106	Eliminate trapping, please.

107	This is preferable to alternative 3. It will be very important to control invasive species, and to prevent the site from becoming a source for dispersing invasive species to other locations.
108	Yes, your meddling in a matter already considered extensively.
109	All of a sudden the NBOAs are including hiking and xc skiing. This didn't appear before. How about rifle ranges and ATV trails?? are they included in the NBOAs???Not
110	This concept is the primary basis from which any alternative activities could be added in a very limited way.
111	This is a great alternative which develops and manages the land in the wisest fashion allowing access to public but minimizing negative impacts.
112	horse trails
113	Removing any infrastructure, buildings or debris. no hose trails!
114	I think it is under use of this property. There is enough room for more recreational opportunities and still preserve the ecology.
115	If you add horse trails then this would be a very acceptable use.
116	It doesn't make as good of use and develop appreciation for the land like having some access to areas for hiking, biking, XC skiing and horseback riding. I believe you can both preserve and protect...yet people can enjoy it.
117	While this option is preferred over no action, it does not allow for equine access and therefore excludes a major segment of the horse industry.
118	Again no mention of horse back riding. Horse back riding doesn't always need improvements just well constructed trails to begin with.
119	I am for making any of it better
120	I feel returning the site to its nature state is the best. Although I am a horse owner and would love to ride in this type of environment I feel it is best to have land that is restored. If we could include horse back riding in the restoration I would be thankful.
121	Good, but add a shooting range. To save cost, it doesn't have to be manned. Look at the state-of-the-art shooting range in Shiocton (Outagamie County), which has many length ranges, shooting tables, etc. No range officer on hand. Pay as you go, honor system. Works great.
122	Same concerns as first option.
123	This option would be ok if more educational and low impact recreational uses were allowed.
124	You can travel all over USA and see where they manage resources and protect them but still allow shared uses equine, bike ped snowmobile....Nat'l and state parks do but WIs is slow to get w/ the program...time is now to include all uses on trails here and many of them! NBOA are out of date w/ a depressed economy and need to make money off tourism, need shared uses and lost of uses!
125	yes, keep the development low. no need for offices, shelters.... a few porta johns would be nice so people aren't going all over the place....

126	I fully support this alternative. It focuses on the opportunity to restore the area. It allows visitors to enjoy quiet, away from the typical state park type of experience that is already available. It focuses on the right things to make this a unique and valued area for the future.
127	no access by major recreational groups means little buy in from them.
128	It concerns me that horseback riding isn't listed as a recreational opportunity. Horses come without a motor! They are beautiful themselves and would blend quite nicely with the scenery and enhance any hiker, trapper, fisher or skier's outing.
129	this is a good alternative, except that it would be foolish to not have staff on-site at least during the first year or two of its opening.
130	Again, why are horses not considered a part of this plan?
131	Increase vehicle access, start a sticker program, make money, plain and simple.
132	this alternative provides some limited opportunities for creating employment and generating revenue
133	This is best. Other opportunities are available at Devils Lake, just up the road. Add the Shooting Range and Lake Wisconsin access to this plan. The otehr recreational opportunities mentions below are available at Devils Lake.
134	Like that access is limited, but could there be other non-motorized access?
135	like this option
136	This has some merit, but I do feel that on site management will end up being a better alternative.
137	When this was an industrial site it had limited vehicle access and the public was denied use of the land. We have an opportunity to change by addressing shortfalls in area recreation for a large number of people living within the range of this property. Moreover, we already have nearby lands which offer restoration opportunities, so tying up this land would unreasonable limit recreational opportunities.
138	Some of this is good, but way too limited.
139	Until funding is available for the Outdoor Recreation Emphasis this option would be acceptable as long as we would be working towards the Outdoor Recreation.
140	still want horse trails included, perhaps involving local saddle clubs to help with trail building, clearing and maintenance, this sounds like a good compromise between expensive on site staff and doing nothing with the property
141	Concern is that horseback riding is not included as a NBOA activity. Experience shows that equestrian trails and those who use them are more respectful of the ecosystem then many of the activities included as NBOAs.
142	Treat it like any other state or county park. Charge user fees
143	Please do not allow any firearms on this property. The DNR is already allowing them on so many places that many of us no longer feel safe to visit state parks and recreation areas. The idea of restoring the wildlife to the area also is negated by altering hunting.
144	I am concerned about the lack of access to this property under this plan.

145	This is the best alternative for this site
146	NO INTEREST TO ME .
147	Lack of motorized recreation is depressing.
148	I think this is much better option than the first one. I like the idea of educational use and low impact recreation. I like the removal of unused buildings. I generally have no concerns with this option. It seems to fulfill what the mission is for the area.
149	What I like the restoration of grasslands, classroom opportunities, restoring species, and potential removal of some debris. Continuing bat habitat is important. I do not agree with limiting educational or vehicle access. And would prefer this to be a staffed station with a recreational emphasis.
150	The site had limited vehicle access and perceived remoteness when it was an industrial site. This is largely because the public was denied use of the land. Now that we can change that, we need to make use of this property by addressing shortfalls in recreation opportunities for a large number of people that live within range of the property. We already have adjoining land that offers traits of what is proposed under this option. Tying up this property under this option would severely limit the number of residents that would benefit from the resource. We need to maximize the recreational opportunities at the site, not unreasonably limit how it can be used.
151	I like restoration of grasslands, but would enjoy easier access--trails etc.
152	Nothing. No
153	to limiting. More access needed for visitors
154	We also agree with this.
155	No
156	what about horseback riding and biking and to what extent will NBOAs be allowed?
157	I am leery of zones that might not adequately recognize continuity and mixture of nature across the area.
158	Yes, no horseback riding trails proposed.
159	I appreciate the emphasis on ecological restoration, and that it allows accessibility for outdoor activities and education.
160	Nice alternative.
161	Repeating: NO GUNS, NO HIGH-IMPACT, NO NRA \$\$\$.
162	I like keeping a large part of the area only open to quiet sports and very limited vehicle traffic. However, I believe some of the area could be open to other sports, biking and horseback riding particularly.
163	Likes: All bullet points. Especially like classroom opportunities for schools. Important events in history happened at the plant, they should be communicated. Concerns: No high priority concerns.
164	Limiting vehicle access? Designated sites for certain types of users (ATV, horse riding/trailers, snowmobile, etc.)

165	This area of the state seems to have an abundance on heavily managed and restricted lands. Including the Wisconsin river conservation land, Devils lake, multiple state natural areas and WI river public land and accesses. Being a former industrial site, motorized recreations and firearm range seem to be a natural fit.
166	Given the alternatives, this is a better management proposal but doesn't actually go far enough in the direction of restoration and protection.
167	Ok, this is better than the No Action alternative and it addresses my concern to maintain the grassland and savannah.
168	It's realistically attainable, does more good than harm, provides a platform for future positive development and by default, provides opportunity for an integrated, cohesive management approach. I believe this approach should be carefully preserved as the fallback by advocates for thorough restoration.
169	I think this plan is heading in the right direction but doesn't go far enough. Limiting vehicle access and buildings is a good plan but basic outhouse, drinking water availability would make it more attractive to visitors. Horseback riding doesn't have a negative impact on the hiking experience or wildlife habitat and should be added to this plan.
170	Managed trails to keep visitors from damaging the restoration areas would be in your best interest. If not provided, visitors could and would tromp over plants damaging the development of the grassland and savanna.
171	NBOA does not include horse riding and carriage driving. We have used the trails at Black Hawk Ridge for these recreational opportunities for many years. The large shelter on top of the ridge provides an excellent place to park our horse trailers and the trails are scenic and in good shape for carriage driving and riding. We do like the concept of removing invasive species.
172	As already noted, this would be my primary recommendation.
173	This would preserve the area for future generations without it being torn to pieces by ATV and rifle ranges.
174	Horse Back Riding and Horse Cart Driving should be included as NBOAs
175	I like all points but managing from an off-site location. I feel it is important to have educated staff on site providing the opportunity for interaction w the public.
176	This alternative does not involve the community it just puts everyone on the outside looking in. I can understand limited vehicle use. The restoration of the natural grassland is important. Volunteer involvement is always a good thing. Not having enough DNR staff is a concern. This area should be used for educational purposes.
177	I like this too. It's simple and clean. The Badger site has been a tumble of human exploitation for decades. Give it some time to rest and restore.
178	This alternative would be fine if there werent already miles and miles of land just like this all over the area. I think it is wonderful that we have such a large area of natural areas to enjoy all over the area, and I do believe strongly in restoring as much of that as possible, so it would be great to restore part of the land, but there is also alot of other things that could be done with it so EVERYONE can enjoy it.
179	Managing the property from an off-site location with no permanent staffing.

180	This is my preferred emphasis.
181	this alternative should be an important part of the final plan.
182	This alternative gets my vote!
183	This would be something unique to the southern part of the state and my preferred use of the property.
184	Great ideas!!!
185	I am ok with this plan. I think people want to be able to view this land, more vehicle access would be needed.
186	This proposal is adequate.
187	We like the no vehicle impact and fully support outdoor classroom opportunities.
188	I like this option better than the first. Assuming that limited financial resources may be available, this might be the one that is implemented.
189	Again, 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. There are many acres to work with. Lets set aside some for this purpose, as well.
190	We already have a lot of this in Devil's Lake and Riverland Conservancy.
191	Too narrow a usage, especially considering the amount of public land already in conservation within the immediate vicinity.
192	I like the hands off approach, but maintenance is vital, I like the use of volunteers and managing the property with off-site staff. Restoration of native communities and controlling invasives is vital. Allow full use, hiking , hunting, fishing, trapping, etc... but only provide parking outside the gates. Foot travel only, allow biking and Cross country skiing.
193	It is line line with the BOMC recommendations of 2001 that was a coordinated effort of 21 entities. It is more neighbor friendly to adjacent land owners since there would be minimal noise impact.
194	I like this alternative.
195	I believe this alternative would be the most effective at maintaining and preserving the natural beauty and ecosystem of the area without being overrun by visitors.
196	I support BOMC Alternative 4.
197	PLEASE, oh PLEASE! This is exactly what the 30 or so enviro-whackos have been promoting. Lord forbid that any other human have an opinion that makes sense.
198	the preservation aspect, but don't think it will provide enough to bring people to the area for recreation. too limited.
199	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.

200	I am very supportive of this approach, but believe that additional recreational opportunities could be provided.
201	we need to maximize recreational activities at this site.
202	It would become a little known gem, accessible to a limited number of people.
203	I would be very happy with this option.
204	This is the management concept that best fulfills my hopes for this valuable landscape. At the time the munitions plant was conceived and built, the U. S. was zealous in it's patriotism and an effort to speed up a hasty conclusion of the war. But in doing so, the plant used some of the most fertile and cultivated soil in the state, and although many farmers made money, the state lost valuable farmland. Please let it return to it's natural state.
205	this is cost effective
206	I don't think all the building need to be removed. It makes it interesting to see the history of the land. Again, I do not approve of hunting or trapping, especially when there will be no permanent staff in the area.
207	I like this.
208	I like to see mountain biking included into the land use. Mountain biking is becoming popular around the area. Tourism dollars are good for the area and help sustain the restoration efforts.
209	Needs camels.
210	We have many wild areas in the state now but few that offer opportunities for users to partake in activities on the land
211	Again, hiking and cross country ski trails could also accommodate horse riders!
212	I agree with ecological restoration, but it does not need to be exclusive of recreational opportunities.
213	This would be my first choice
214	This only makes sense if necessary to maintain or increase endangered species present on the property. Lack of public use would inevitably lead to lack of interest in public funding.
215	Mountain biking should be included as a NBOA.
216	This is the most suitable alternative for the site, with a few modifications. This alternative should allow for single-track mountain biking and equestrian use. These uses should have minimal impact on the management goals related to this management alternative. Permanent staff should be on site. At a minimum, a caretaker, possibly provided by a partner group (e.g. Audubon, TNC, Ho-Chunk). Or a caretaker and management services could be contracted out.
217	I think again you are limiting the land to very few users.
218	No horse trails.

219	The site had limited vehicle access and perceived remoteness when it was an industrial site. This is largely because the public was denied use of the land. Now that we can change that, we need to make use of this property by addressing shortfalls in recreation opportunities for a large number of people that live within range of the property. We already have adjoining land that offers traits of what is proposed under this option. Tying up this property under this option would severely limit the number of residents that would benefit from the resource. We need to maximize the recreational opportunities at the site, not unreasonably limit how it can be used.
220	I like this alternative. I'd be concerned about abuse and damage with limited staff.
221	that the recreational opps do not include horseback riding trails.
222	Use of horses would fit this alternative. They are a quiet, traditional, low impact use of the land for recreational pursuits.
223	Equine use also needs to be part of the NBOA.
224	I favor this alternative. There is a need for large, unfragmented tracts.
225	Like this approach combined with the no action above. minimal development, open to those seeking a rustic experience.
226	I consider this the best alternative. There are plenty of places in Wisconsin where people can shoot guns and drive their all-terrain vehicles.
227	A grassland ecosystem does not interest me at all. This would be a waste of a great opportunity for public use.
228	I like the idea of quiet sports being permitted While hunting isn't necessary quiet, I like the idea of including it in order to help control animal populations. You totally left out horse trails, though. What better way to see the area than on a horse. It is like being back in the time of our fore-fathers who came into the area on horse back. Please include horses in the plan.
229	Please include horseback riding along with hiking. In many parks, including Gov Dodge state park, the horses and hikers share the trails with great success. We have limited opportunities for horseback riding in the area, and this would be an excellent situation for low-impact land use, such as horseback riding.
230	It is better than doing nothing at least the old buildings would be removed, but I would like to see a trail system developed here for hiking and horses.
231	sounds good if you include equine activities
232	Would you allow horseback riding? I think you could provide slightly more recreational access to the land, similar to Devil's Lake.
233	Would like to see bicycle trails as well as hiking. Tie bicycle trails to rails to trails through Sauk Prairie and down to Mazo. Eventually connect to North or Northeast to get access to other state trail systems.
234	ABSOLUTELY #1.... IF YOU CAN'T DO WITHOUT KILLING OR DISTURBING THE WILDLIFE. YOU CAN'T HAVE PEACE & QUIET WHEN YOU HAVE A SHOOTING RANGE, HUNTING, ROCKETS PROPOSED, AND THEN ADD ANNOYING ALL TERRAIN VEHICLES. WHAT PART DON'T YOU GET?

235	On- site staff should be there. Park office, regular drive thru
236	I like this option - we need to restore the land and give it time to reclaim itself. The State needs to have a large parcel of grassland and the bird populations it supports.
237	Of the three alternatives, this is the best in that it emphasizes the most important aim of the Badger Reuse Plan: to manage Badger in a manner that honors its unique natural resources, size, location, and potential. The recreational opportunities are appropriate and in keeping with the provisions for low-impact activities, as required by the reuse plan and the agreement DNR has with the US Park Service. However it is unnecessarily restrictive, and should include elements that are presently in Alternative #3. And it fails to honor fully the reuse plan's core emphasis on the integration of restoration with not just recreation, but education, research, and sustainable agriculture.
238	This is the ideal plan. There are low-impact portions of Alternative 3 that could be incorporated, including an educational center--something similar to the Horicon Marsh visitor center. A low-impact use picnic area along the Lake Wisconsin parcel would be acceptable (no docks, canoes/kayaks only).
239	I like this
240	I do not like using tax dollars to feed a few people's ideas of a valuable 'restoration' project, which, when considering the evolution and evolutionary process of the area, is really a snippet of a time out of the many facets of the area over centuries, just to satisfy those same few people's ideas. This is really an undertaking of a 're-creation' of a specific era and dictating how valuable tax dollars should be spent.
241	I love having a piece of this project for ecological needs and outdoor learning; however, active sporting opportunities are just as important to me. I think educating those on how to maintain an area for wildlife would be important.
242	One concern could be the off site management. I like the idea of having someone there to help visitors get the most out of their experience. Also, biking as a use would be extremely important to get visitors from Madison thru to Devils Lake.
243	This is to large of parcel with special characteristics not to be utilized for more active recreation.
244	Move the airport there.
245	All of this should be done. Absolutely.
246	I vote for this alternative.
247	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. I also wonder if it is possible to achieve perceived remoteness and quiet on land located so close to 2 state highways.
248	Honestly, this is the proposal that is closest to my own vision, but.....it does not meet the needs of the parties that worked out the Badger land compromises. It needs tweaking with sustainable agriculture and low impact recreation.
249	looks good
250	I oppose this, it limits the available opportunities for recreational use such as hunting and atv use.
251	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 !!
252	This sounds right to me.

253	I like this alternative because it preserves the land. I believe that too many places in this country are being used in ways that are disruptive and destructive. By allowing vehicles and excessive traffic in the area it will limit the natural wildlife that resides there. Our children have a fantastic opportunity to learn to respect Earth and all it has to offer. I see this as a one shot deal to get it right. I am in full support of this plan to give people a chance to come and ENJOY REMOTENESS AND QUIET there are few places around where that can be done. What an honor to have the chance to preserve an ecosystem!! Don't lose this chance!
254	we have all that around us, and all around the country. That can be just as much a part of it as other things too. I do believe in preservations for our primitive recourses. But theres only so much you can do to certain areas after badger ammunition.
255	I like the idea of removing old infrastructure that is no longer in use. I think that some sort of facility with staff on the property would be a helpful element. I don't see this emphasis providing enough recreation opportunities.
256	I like the idea of this alternative. However, I'd like to see this in addition to more developed visitor centers and areas for public access.
257	Low impact
258	Again, some areas should be limited and maintained as prairie, but be careful on that extent.
259	I like this alternative the best. This alternative seems to provide the best combination of providing access to this unique area while limiting environmental impacts and protecting it's natural state.
260	I like this goal. This is how I see the property should be managed. The only thing I would change is that I think the staff that are currently stationed there should stay there. Limit vehicle access to some of the main roads.
261	I like this idea the best. look at my statement from last page.
262	This is unnecessarily restrictive to legitimate public use of an already greatly disturbed landscape.
263	I would like to see equestrian trails in addition to the activities listed in this plan.
264	No
265	This is my favorite plan for the site. Remoteness and quiet are important and will help the mission of fostering native plant/animal species. Limiting recreation activities to NBOAs is also appealing. It would be nice to have a fishing pier and picnic area too, but this plan does not provide for that.
266	I believe there is room for both Ecological Restoration and Outdoor Recreation
267	REMOVING NON TRADITIONAL STUFF
268	This is a bad alternative. The area needs some low-impact development - and some local management, like a visitor center.
269	I do not like this alternative. This land was taken from tax paying landowners who were primarily farmers and I think it should be given back to the taxpayers through land auction with only agricultural use would be permitted. Maybe this would ease the property tax trouble for some of these townships by putting more acres into the tax roll.

270	I like the emphasis on grassland restoration, but again, you can't have families hiking where people are hunting. The area would be lacking in education without a visitors center, leading some to people to visit without knowing what is so special about the property.
271	I am strongly in favor of low impact uses such as hunting and hiking.
272	I do not have any known concerns with this proposal. I like that the area is kept as a natural area and the land is preserved.
273	This alternative is better in terms of achieving restoration goals, but does little to develop the low-impact recreational potential of the site, and says nothing about blending agriculture into the mix of uses to serve conservation purposes.
274	This alternative needs to include on site management and modest development of facilities for the education and research, and hunting, trapping, hiking and skiing and bicycle facilities. A new alternative 4 should be developed and it should have the elements of alternative 4 recommended by the Sauk Prairie Conservation Alliance. This alternative is more consistent with the intent of the original re-use plan.
275	HUNTING, HIKING, BIKING AND OTHER LOW NOISE, LOW IMPACT ACTIVITIES SHOULD BE ALLOWED. ITEM ONE ON THIS MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVE IS VERY IMPORTANT.
276	all
277	I don't like anything about this plan, the public should be able to use this area for recreation
278	The restoration of this property on a large scale is unrealistic as it was severely disturbed industrial site and other restoration activities on other DNR properties have very limited success. Debris from past uses should be left on site to memorialize past uses and the presence of debris does no harm to any future use. Any restoration activities would require maintenance of some infrastructure such as roadways for prescribed burn breaks. Without a large assigned staff, restoration work would be unsuccessful. Lack of DNR staff on site would lead to illicit uses.
279	Yes. This alternative greatly concerns me. Select roadway & trails will need to be developed to experience the property. Rather than have it quarantined like it has been since Badger fenced it off. A permanent staff person(s) has to supervise this otherwise it won't be ecologically preserved. This could be managed by volunteer organizations who have the authority to patrol and enforce the rules of the SPRA.
280	Again, no one will come to see the rich history of Badger Ammunition. The history of the Prairie is lost. No one will use the area and it will become overgrown and un-manageable. 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.
281	see BOMC Alternative #4
282	This looks perfect. What about the salamanders?
283	Adopt the Oversight Management Commission's Alternative #4.
284	I do not support this option because it excludes motorized vehicles. The truth is that the site is a toxic dump that will never be restored. Open it up to a wide group of users and satisfy the recreational demands THAT ARE NOT CURRENTLY BEING MET. The environmental crowd already has over 20,000 acres in Sauk County alone to play on, while the motorized crowd has zero acres within the surrounding 10 counties. INCLUDE MOTORIZED VEHICLES.

285	I like that vehicle access will be limited. Visitors would enjoy a perceived remoteness and quiet.
286	I prefer this alternative. Restoration, conservation, and education should be the primary emphasis areas.
287	it would be very nice to reclaim land which is becoming more scarce. perhaps very little human activity there would be best for our water, air etc
288	Ecological restoration should take place, regardless of the option chosen. DNR staff should be on the property.
289	Give the land back to the families or heirs to those that had it taken away from them back in 1942.
290	A great concern would be the concept that there will be no staff on site -
291	I support this plan more than the other two, especially the parts that speak to restoration of grasslands and rare natural communities, removing buildings and debris, and limiting vehicle access. However, the plan ignores several key values of the Badger Reuse Plan, including: research and sustainable agriculture, allowing a wider range of appropriate (low-impact) recreation options, and more interpretation of features of natural and cultural interest.
292	Access needs to be improved. Sauk county has many areas for recreational activities but not many with the opportunity for good access for all, including handicapped or limited mobility. We need activities like the other DNR educational programs and facilities within the state.
293	None
294	Still too limited use of the land.
295	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.
296	I like what is being said here and this is more of the vision that I have for what should be done. While I'm a hunter, I do not see that hunting and trapping should be an open option. This should be an area for wildlife to live as if man was not present.
297	I love the restoration idea, but I think DNR employees are needed to maintain the park. Possibly some half time employees for education, enforcement, and maintenance.
298	I like this alternative and have no concerns with it.
299	Hiking trails should be limited to areas that would not negatively affect ground nesting birds, which cannot survive in farmed land. Educational uses should be given priority.
300	This is all fine and dandy, but it would not make me visit the site. We have those opportunities just down the road at devil's lake. Why duplicate that?
301	This sounds so ideal.
302	Ummm.....NO NO NO, and NO again. This is the exact plan that scares the living hell out of me, and its the exact plan I fear will end up happening because people are too inept! This plan CAN NOT happen. You're the WI DNR, you want peoples inputs, but you rarely listen, well I guarantee you i'm not the only one saying this plan is terrible.

303	I feel this is the ideal use of this property. I agree with the description.
304	I like the emphasis on protecting the natural beauty and ecology of the area, but passive recreational opportunities and education needs to be developed and promoted as well.
305	I'd like if this could be incorporated with the outdoor recreation emphasis. Focus on restoration but also let area residents use it.
306	I think more thought needs to go into this I think a blend of option 8 and 9 is where we need to go. I think you need to generate enough activity to make the generate some income while protecting the environment and animals.
307	Look at the KICKAPOO RESERVE in Vernon County - Wonderful outdoor recreational experience, NBOA's, biking, horseback riding. The only development is a beautiful educational and visitor center. All other access has been kept primitive so it doesn't cost much money to maintain (gravel parking lots, primitive campgrounds). No motorized vehicles allowed. It combines it's primary purpose of preserving the land with a goal of allowing the people to utilize the land. The Kickapoo Reserve land was forcibly taken from families just as Badger was (but for flood control). The people's access and ability to utilize this land should be considered.
308	Do not like, again you are cutting off the majority of the people.
309	Emphasis on restoration is nice, however the limited use and access prevents many users from enjoying the many benefits that the area offers.
310	Alternate #4 is the sensible choice and resolution.
311	Alternative 4 is the best.
312	I disagree with any plan that does not include bicycling.
313	I like the restoration pieces, removing unused buildings and roads, and offering some educational activities.
314	i like the low-impact limited recreation opportunities and limiting vehicle access and the restoration of tracts for birds and native species. I am concerned about managing the property from an off-site location and depending on the great amount of volunteers needed.
315	No we have areas all over the state no revenue comes in but you need to pay people to maintain.
316	This is my definite preference.
317	This alternative or the Alternative 4 put forward by the Badger Oversight Management Commission have my support. There is a tremendous and rare opportunity with this tract of land that should not be wasted.
318	It limits equestrians, but it could be start if you include equestrians in the next phase.
319	I like it !
320	Easy out for govt
321	I do not care for this. It would lead to limiting access and recreational use other than hiking and other very limited uses.
322	this is the best option. this option promotes the native environment and bird habitat while still allowing

	some recreational use and education
323	this would be nice, but I think we need to have it available for all, including equine, hiking, biking, cross country skiing and possibly ATV
324	More likely to get the space back to the way it used to be as quickly as possible. Labor intensive though.
325	Not realistic given the fiscal constraints of the federal government and the state. The US as a whole is the responsible society to help pay for the recovery of this property. In order for it to be health and useable for general public land-use. Given sequestration it is not likely that WI will get money from the federal gov to help with a safe recovery.
326	Highway 12 runs down it's entire western border. It will never be quite and remote . A public shooting range would be the best way to use this property
327	this is the best for ALL citizens --a variety of uses with safety and quiet use in mind--
328	removing buildings and bunkers could be costly.
329	Good idea. Add bicycling on any paved roads.
330	The best alternative.STRONGLY oppose adding hunting/trapping to the region.
331	Does not return the land to all people
332	The recreational opportunities listed above are not in short supply in southern Wisconsin. Merely allowing this area for such purposes falls remarkably short.
333	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.
334	Don't like this alternative to limiting.
335	While this is better, you once again limit public interest. Limiting interest limits volunteers.
336	I do not favor this option as it limits vehicle access and therefore would limit motorized recreational access.The property should be developed in a manner that promotes the underserved needs of off road motorcycles. This can be done in a manner that allows for a healthy restoration of the forest, grasslands and other ecological concerns.
337	Horseback riding could be a part of this plan without much change. I would suggest it be added as an option.
338	Ok
339	Add horse riding and driving!
340	I like this alternative EXCEPT that horseback riding is not included among the permitted activities. Horseback riding is fully compatible with this alternative. One small trailhead for trailer parking would be needed, in keeping with with the limited vehicular access requirement. Horseback riders share trails with hikers in many recreational facilities around the state. Designated equestrian trails could easily be routed around sensitive ecological areas. Horseback riding is a silent sport , and many of us ride horses specifically to enjoy the perceived remoteness and quiet noted above. As an older rider, I am especially concerned that horseback riding be included in the permitted uses, so that I and other riders in the senior citizen category have the opportunity to experience this property in the company of our equine partners. When riding in nature, my horse's legs substitute for mine. We belong in the category of hiking and cross country skiing. Thank you for your consideration.

341	Volunteers have certainly made a huge difference at Pheasant Branch. How accessible?
342	Yes
343	Access limited to pedestrian use concerns me. Horseback riding should be included. I would prefer limiting trail access to non vehicular, non motorized use (this would exclude bicycles and snowmobiles, exclusions which make sense from a restoration perspective).
344	Nothing. It discriminates against motorized users.
345	The property will get very little use with this option.
346	I would include biking and horseback riding. #8 is not enough recreation and educational development.
347	We do not like the idea of allowing hunting and trapping.
348	While better than the do-nothing alternative, I still believe that the project could better serve the people.
349	It would be good to establish a balance with low impact uses.
350	Like outdoor classroom opportunities. Concerned with cost of restoration efforts.
351	This is the alternative I prefer, minus the hunting and trapping. Horseback and bike riding would be fine.
352	To limited. Need to get more users on the site. Naturalists always complain that motorized vehicles will ruin the land. NIMBY neighbors always complain that motorized vehicles will bring too much noise. Since this site is polluted and noisy (4 decades of military helicopters) this is the perfect site for motorized vehicles.
353	There needs to be some supervision from the DNR. Need someone to watch the property on a ongoing basis. Routine patrol by some governing factor. Police or Warden.
354	This sounds like a reasonable middle-ground approach. I still don't think this will draw in new and unfamiliar crowds to this area of Wisconsin. People need more direction. More structured focus on the historical significance of this area will help draw in consumers.
355	This alternative is practically perfect, and very close to the spirit of the Badger Reuse Plan that was approved after a great deal of work and negotiation by all concerned parties back in 2001. Perhaps go beyond the NBOAs to add some additional low-impact recreational activities such as walking/hiking trails, fishing pier and canoe access, and a visitor's center with interpretive trails. These low-impact recreational activities would complement the goals embodied in the Badger Reuse Plan and provide opportunities for the public to enjoy the SPRA without compromising the ecology or sense of remoteness and quiet.
356	The focus on wildlife habitat is an excellent use of the property, and removing the buildings and debris will be important to fulfill that focus. Limiting access to promote wildlife habitat is paramount, and using it for education is the best use of the land.
357	I think this is the best use of the Sauk Prairie Recreation Area. The adjacent state park provides contact with DNR staff and interpretive exhibits and information, making their presence here redundant. The 'perceived remoteness and quiet', especially in a prairie setting, is an extraordinarily rare experience, and this should be valued as one of the very, very few chances people have to encounter it. The restoration of ecological functions and rare habitat is an important goal as well.
358	I strongly support the ecological restoration emphasis. I spend a lot of time at Devil's Lake and I think this alternative could provide another great natural area nearby. There are a lot of places with development already. This would be a good alternative.

359	I like this option a lot! Like all aspects of it!
360	I like the further clean-up of the area including removing buildings. I do not support hunting and trapping in the area.
361	Adopt Alternative 4 which reflects the goals of the 2001 Badger Reuse Plan.
362	This is better, in that old infrastructure of no educational value would be removed. I like the limited vehicle access and primary pedestrian use. Perhaps seasonal presence of DNR staff would be possible, and perhaps some visitor education opportunities. Of the three options this is my definite first choice.
363	The emphasis on ecological restoration is very appropriate given the incredible potential of this site to provide unique grassland habitat. Furthermore, the continued use of volunteers is an exciting and essential way to engage the public. However, this plan does not permit for historical interpretation, low-impact recreation and research opportunities that could be very compatible with an ecological restoration focus.
364	I would rank this option #1/3. I like the focus on habitat management and development, and value the volunteer and classroom opportunities. I don't think it's necessary to remove old buildings; they can be left to naturally decay over the years.
365	That land is so contaminated from decades of government use that it would cost billions to restore .
366	This is better than No Action.
367	I like the focus on restoration, the lack of and removal of infrastructure, the lack of permanent staff, and the lack of vehicle access. I also like restricting access to pedestrian use and opportunities for outdoor education.
368	Many aspects of this restoration are very sound, with the exception of limiting vehicle access. Vehicle access, particularly dual sport and offroad motorcycle should be allowed on a controlled single track trail network.
369	I like the restriction on vehicle access and the outdoor classroom potential. None I dislike.
370	This would provide opportunities for recreation and education that my family and I would enjoy. We are amateur botanists and birdwatchers and the Badger site is a a great example of our region's ecology. It would support educational opportunities for schools as well, something that was very important to my children in elementary school (trips to McKenzie Environmental Center are big memories for them). I have visited the site as a volunteer to help with prairie restoration and I treasure it for these values.
371	Because of the land's inherent value, this management alternative supports the environment and allows people to experience the environment on it's own terms and to further develop their appreciation for the land ethic.
372	I like that the land would be restored and maintained as natural habitat, and that it would be an educational resource.
373	I like this plan best. Plants and animals are losing habitat everyday on private land. We need to use some state lands to provide habitat that will enable species to continue to survive. There are plenty of places I can go to shoot my guns but not many places were there are thousands of acres of prairie and oak savanna. An interpretive center staffed with naturalists at the edge of the property would be a bonus.
374	Awesome!!!Classroom: just a shelter. No airtight electrified structures. No flush toilets.
375	This alternative is what the stakeholders have agreed to and is the best alternative. I am concerned that if the DNR is involved, political pressure will continue to turn this property into a mess. We need our environmental agency and state government to protect our state ecology.

376	this is possible, but should be revisited after a year to see if on site staffing is needed.
377	What concerns me is how this will be funded.
378	This is fine except for opening the land to wildlife killers. Of course that is who the DNR and NRB cater to so it is no surprise.
379	We would like the plan to include hunting and horse trails.
380	As described, this alternative sounds like the best balance of ecological management goals and NBOAs.
381	I believe that this is an excellent alternative which provides access to a unique site to enhance its conservation, education, and silent recreational potential. Nothing of this alternative concerns me.
382	Like the No Action plan, this usage plan is too limiting. I do like the idea of outdoor classrooms.
383	safety for while both hunting and hiking/xc skiing are going on. I would like to include horseback riding and biking to the mix.
384	I favor this option because it provides an opportunity to experience an expanse of prairie and savanna that can evoke the magnificence of the historic Sauk Prairie. The largest eastern hardwood forest in southern Wisconsin -- in the Baraboo Hills -- will be complemented by the largest prairie and savanna in southern Wisconsin.
385	This is how I would like to see the land used, but it may take a more active presence to assure that the integrity of the uses be maintained. Depending on volunteers may not provide the level of support and collaboration needed.
386	Let it go back to nature.
387	This should be the chosen path.
388	I favor this alternative. Presumably it will not cost a lot and still provide some cleaning up of the area. It would be nice to make sure there are paths for school access.
389	I like the concept for the major sites in the area, with some public uses in non-sensitive areas.
390	This is by far the best choice. Nothing about this choice concerns me. I think it is the primary responsibility of the DNR to protect remaining populations and native plants and animals and manage for rare species. These vast open landscapes have declined so much that we need to protect what little we have left of them.
391	I like this much better than the No Action alternative but, again, 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.
392	I think that biking and horseback riding could be added to this proposal without harm.
393	I like the emphasis on grasslands, savanna, restoration, and NBOA recreation. The steps listed are excellent.
394	sounds a little better, what's the cost
395	I like that this alternative limits public access for only NBOAs. I further appreciate the restoration initiatives in this alternative as well as outdoor education opportunities. This management alternative takes full advantage of the ecological, recreational, and educational potential this property holds without exploiting it.

396	Best
397	This option does a good job of prioritizing restoration and the environment, while also offering recreation. As an avid birder, this is the option that I would choose.
398	Essentially all elements of this plan are contained within the BOMC Alternative 4, which in addition more fully develops plans for cultural, educational, and interpretational uses.
399	I like this alternative best because it restores this critical ecosystem, and provides appropriate access to visitors. Some minimal development would be good, e.g. pit toilets? Drinking water? Trail markers and interpretive signs?
400	I like this but allow horses, too. They are not the ecological destructors that some people, who haven't been around them, seem to think they are.
401	This is the best option for a seemingly natural area and experience. I like that grassland and shrubland would be restored for the benefit of wildlife. Additionally, I think limiting access is of the utmost importance to reduce ecological stressors (fragmentation, noise pollution, high use, erosion, etc...) on the wildlife, vegetation, and landscape.
402	This is the hands-down best alternative. Motorized vehicles should not be allowed on this land, period. If hunters want to hunt, skiers want to ski, hikers want to hike on the land, then they can park their vehicles on the periphery of the property. There should absolutely be no snow-mobiles, ATVs, dirt bikes, or other obnoxious disruptive vehicles allowed. The land should be restored to how it was hundreds of years ago before we humans screwed things up and made it ugly and polluted with our trash.
403	I prefer this to the no-action alternative. Would this allow increased access to the south bluff of devil's lake?
404	I think that this alternative fits perfectly with what I believe would be best practice. Please see my earlier answers to understand why. I don't believe that hunting, fishing, and especially trapping, should be permitted beyond what would be necessary to maintain a peak functioning ecosystem.
405	this alternative is pretty good, by combining restoration with low-impact recreation. But it basically leaves out such important Badger Reuse Plan goals as research and integration of conservation and agriculture; and the responsibility for implementing public education and historical interpretation is limited to volunteers, which would likely result in very limited programming.
406	This is my choice for best use of this property. It improves on existing natural assets and provides for small human impact with plenty of opportunity for human visitation. I also think the research component is very important.
407	I believe the land should be opened up for ecologically friendly NBOAs including singletrack mountain biking. We should restore the land and maintain the natural beauty but rather than leave it as a natural land to be untouched we should be allowed to experience the beauty of the land through NBOAs including single track mountain biking.
408	no mountain biking!
409	I do not like that it would limit use to NBOAs. I do like the idea of the BAAP bunkers being retained for bat research.
410	I would support an equine and other recreational activities
411	The restoration goals ought to have top priority in any plan. Really quiet spots are hard to come by around here; limited access to much of the place is great. Leave a road or two open for Sunday drives with the grandparents. Don't worry too much about the old building. Adds interest to a hike to see something other than trees.

412	I strongly support this alternative, though I do think this may not fully utilize the educational opportunities of Badger.
413	This is the alternative that I prefer.
414	I like the restoration of grasslands. Look at the tourist draw of the huge restored/preserved areas of the Black Hills and Badlands of South Dakota. Limiting vehicle access is key, along with preservation of quiet and the prairie ecosystem.
415	Wow! This is great. A large tract dedicated to a preserved prairie/savannah wilderness. It would be so unique and saved for all generations to come.
416	Most of the management concepts listed are commendable. However, it will be necessary to strictly manage any consumptive uses of native wildlife and plants if the maintenance of a healthy native biotic community is to be attained. It would seem unlikely that such a large area requiring extensive, labor-intensive restoration and management can be managed without at least some onsite or very close by DNR infrastructure and staffing. It is also likely the area will require monitoring and protection from poaching and illegal biotic collection.
417	I believe this is the best alternative for this land. I believe Wisconsin is woefully short of areas described by the above vision. Much of our natural lands are dominated by or are adjacent to farms or human recreation areas where noise and habitat destruction accompany human use. We and future generations would really benefit from more preservation of natural habitat that allows wildlife to find refuge, live, and reproduce. We would benefit by preserving some semblance of a nature to non-destructively observe, inspire, and study. As the population has grown and become more affluent, it is more rare to be able to escape noise, pollution, technology, invasive species, high-speed vehicles, artificial light, and the effects of too-intensive fishing and hunting. For the sake of those who enjoy observing and studying nature, and who seek some escape from the modern world for the sake of inspiration, I urge you to please proceed with an ecological restoration rather than recreation use for this land. Our state has a magnificent and unique heritage in its original, post-glacial landscape. Please restore this section to its natural form rather than transforming it into human recreation land that loses its uniqueness and becomes only a modern, transformed remnant of what it could be.
418	This sounds pretty good. I appreciate the fiscal restraint of this option.
419	This sounds like a perfect use plan for the property!
420	I really like this alternative! It returns the land as much as possible to its pre-developed state and allows endangered species to flourish.
421	Like, just that limited interpretation: means no sign posts or trail maps, or signs indicating....types of grasses, or restoration history guides?With smart phones and apps, the future could be just a quick DNR sponsored website guided tour and information source(s). Just make sure they are noted on entrance and support locations. A picnic and shelter area would be a plus with restrooms.
422	All proposed actions are appropriate.
423	This is my preference, and it would still serve the NBOA interest as well as conservation.
424	I support Alternative 4 offered by the Badger Oversight Commission.
425	I like this alternative, but would prefer a somewhat stronger emphasis on education and interpretation facilities and public access for recreation.
426	I support these actions
427	At least with this option, access is avail. Will XC trails be groomed, or just left to go natural.

428	I do like the natural preservation of the rare natural species.What I don't like is that this doesn't provide much of a park that doesn't already exist in other parks nearby. The land surrounding the Wisconsin River is a great expanse of grassland and natural area that is not susceptible to development. It seems like more money spent on the same parks that are in the area already.
429	Too many of these types of look but don't touch sites already available in the local area. This was a high volume military ordnance manufacturing facility for many years, let's not make it into something it is not.
430	I like it. This would be an important investment in restoring land that has seen ecological damage and the legacy of weaponry to a place where nature can return to healthy and ecologically productive conditions and a place of peace and natural beauty that will add ecological services and beauty to the area--a true healing of an injured landscape. It captures the spirit of the agreement of multiple parties from a decade ago.
431	This is the best of the three approaches described. I like the emphasis on ecological and cultural preservation and restoration. It could use a bit more emphasis on education and interpretation.
432	This emphasis limits the recreational venues available the Wisconsin residents.
433	This would be my first choice option, or rather, some step in between this option and the outdoor recreation emphasis. I strongly support restoring the property with an emphasis on the natural environment. Recreation opportunities should be lowest impact, non-motorized. Cars and driving within the area should be limited. Educational and research opportunities within the park should be maximized.
434	I like the emphasis on resoration and limit of motorized transportation. I think this is the best option.
435	This is the best plan.
436	Keep the historical buildings!
437	This concerns me. TNC owns 1800 acres across the street that does not get much use. Add up state land and Riverland Conservancy (1600 acres) and you have a lot of land with few people using it- the problem is people are losing there connection with nature and they can not love what they do not know. They will vote against things they can't relate to. Choose activities that will get people using the area, before it is to late. Prairie ecosystems are great, but don't exclude the people or wildlife is doomed for the long haul.
438	Again does not provide recreational opportunities for access and use of motorized off-road motorcycles.
439	This could be a viable alternative, but I would like to the opportunity for hiking, birdwatching, and also bicycling on specific improved trails.
440	I like all of the points in this alternative. This is a very special resource that does not come along very often. To restore it to be similar to the original prairie would be an invaluable resource.Some people will not like this option as it limits hunting and other recreational activities.
441	I like this very much.
442	I favor a balance between conservation and low impact recreation per the 2001 Badger Reuse Plan (as in Alternative 4 offered by the Sauk Prairie Conservation Alliance.
443	I like removing all traces of human activity. I like no motorized vehicles. I like restoring the status of the environment to its former glory. I like using it as a classroom to teach children. I do want to be able to visit everywhere by foot.
444	This alternative accomplishes what I believe is the best use of the land. This allows for a combination of limited use, education and habitat restoration.

445	I really like this alternative; unfragmented tracts of grassland and shrubland are frighteningly scarce in our state, and becoming more so every year.
446	This is a great alternative. There are very few large grasslands in the area. All of the recreation opportunities included hunting, fishing, trapping, hiking, and skiing are appropriate uses of this land.
447	This would be a better proposal if it included multi-use recreational trails, such as for bicycles, that connected to regional trails. A bicycle trail through this area could eventually connect to the Hwy 12 path and allow for a bike path connection between Devil's Lake and Madison.
448	Of the plans listed, this would be my preferred. Ecological restoration and low-impact recreation represent the best uses and greatest opportunities for the property. This should also be cheaper. However, I do not understand why this alternative omits the possibility for significant educational and research opportunities. There is no reason that recreation, ecological management, research and cultural opportunities cannot coexist. A clear plan that incorporates these goals and multiple uses was developed with DNR support in 2001: the Badger Reuse Plan.
449	I like the idea of restoring the ecosystem and what would probably be a relatively low cost of maintenance. I don't like removing all of the existing infrastructure and buildings as I think they may have some historical value. I also feel this emphasis may limit the NBOAs too much.
450	I like everything about this. It keeps in mind what makes the area important and rare, and is something the area can be proud of.
451	buildings that are structurally unsound removed; others restored to museum standard
452	This is not suitable because a property of this size needs to be actively managed by permanent staff as partners with volunteers and local communities. If this option was changed to include active, permanent staff at the site, it would be acceptable.
453	This is the preferred alternative. The high value of having a restored natural area so close to a major population center cannot be overstated. It will provide a tremendous opportunity to make people aware of the value of sustainability and Leopold's land ethic. And, partnering with the UW-Madison will allow future generations to learn ecological management principles in a real-world laboratory. As I mentioned in the answer to an earlier question, hunting as a use should be delayed until self-sustaining populations of grassland fauna are established. And when hunting is finally allowed, it should be limited by access permits and possibly a low-fee system (to cover administrative costs). In this way we can provide a demonstration of the benefits of habitat management to the hunting population, while still allowing for traditional outdoor recreational opportunities. This option is a gift to future generations.
454	Implement the BOMC Alternative 4 that honors the Badger Reuse plan
455	Utilize this rare opportunity to follow thru with 7 of the 8 stated categories. The primary emphasis being restoration, remoteness and peace for people, animals, and surroundings. It seems it would be achieved only with permanent management on site. It does NOT provide for public recreation that should fit with the goal and vision statements for the SPAR.
456	Horse trails need to be included.
457	i like it, leaving the land as is
458	The education sounds great!
459	I would add mountain biking and limit the hunting.
460	DNR should embrace the possibilities here- not great it like a vacant lot next to one of the most beautiful and interesting state parks in the upper Midwest.

461	Add mountain bike limited use through area.
462	I like the ecological and educational elements. There needs to be clear delineation between varying recreational uses (ie. hunting and hiking).
463	Weakest of the three alternatives. With the exception of cleaning up the debris from the ammo plant, little difference from the No Action Alternative . A waste of a valuable resource.
464	There are already properties in the region with a similar emphasis of ecological restoration. Fewer residents would benefit from adding one more.
465	Humm! this is nicer then doing nothing but no permanent staff stationed . This would lead to vandalism and land abuse we have to protect that which belongs to everyone!
466	There was limited access prior when the public was denied use of the land. There is nearby land that offers similar options to this proposal. Instead of limiting the benefit of this resource, we should maximize the recreational opportunities that can be offered.
467	See above
468	Grasslands should be preserved. There should be further development to enhance the area's attributes.
469	I do not support this option as there is already over 22,000 acres in Sauk County alone dedicated to uses such as this (state and county parks, natural areas and conservancy land). This area should be used to allow for more active recreational uses such as motorcycle/atv riding. There are very few areas available for this type of use in the southern part of the state and this site presents an unique opportunity.
470	I would support limited access in this proposal if the NBOAs did not exclude development for Mountain Biking-specific opportunities.
471	This sounds like the best option.
472	Lots of areas in this part of the state that severely limit access. Why keep it all inaccessible to a relative few.
473	This is a step in the right direction , but better yet is Alternative 4 of BOMC
474	I support this alternative, but ask that it be expanded to include compatible, low-impact educational and recreational activities identified and supported in previous planning efforts for this property.
475	This is the favorable alternative - and provides the right mix of restoration and preservation - while providing access, interpretation and education.
476	Fits well with the property's and region's extant resources.
477	I like the restoration and clean up efforts, but am concerned about having no staff. I love that schools will have access and support.
478	Please consider horse back riding.
479	Again, should be made assessible to everyone. There should be parking areas for vehicle use, so that people are not having to walk miles from their cars to enjoy the area. Need to have someone managing the area on a consistent basis, as safety and security needs to be a priority.
480	Not everyone in this state hunts, fishes, traps, skis or hikes. A large segment of the population will not be able to enjoy the area. Of these alternatives, only hiking would appeal to many of the people that I know. Failing to provide educational and recreation development is a waste. Ecological restoration should be one aspect, not the only emphasis.

481	Total agreement with this proposal.
482	I would like most the infrastructure removed to creat a more natural setting.
483	The scenery of this area is fantastic and while I fully favor recreation, I slant toward low/lower impact recreation in general, which would essentially emphasis on restoration with some facilities. I am an advocate of our State Park system and of using it and I do fear that this alternative may make it hard for people to do so. However, I also have sent many people to Pewitt's Nest and know that very few people access Lost Lake.
484	Heavy reliance in volunteer support is noble, but risky over a property this large.
485	I like to see a emphasis on restoration.
486	I think restoration should absolutely be the emphasis, with minimal development. To be able to enjoy nature in peaceful and beautiful surroundings is priceless. That is why a rifle range and dirt bikes etc. should have no place in the planning. There are provisions for their use in other locations.
487	I would think that this property would be a valuable classroom for learning more about the long-term ecological impact of groundwater contamination on all aspects of the immediate and surrounding lands and wildlife. If we could use this opportunity to learn from our mistakes it would make up for a lot of damage done by BAAP.
488	I'm in favor of the alternative, but with amendments to include more visitor access for low-impact activities and the educational opportunities described in Alternative 3.
489	Sounds like much of this vast amount of land will not be used by anyone. Sad.
490	While I like most conservation ideas associated with this project, I feel some limited uses to less than 10% of the property are in order; and these have been mentioned earlier in the survey. I think the greater public wants a balance, even if tilted heavily toward conservation.
491	Same as above. Like the bat research idea and the restoration.
492	All the people should enjoy the area.
493	It is a lot of land. I'm sure it can be divided fairly.
494	Let nature take it's course. Don't manage the area except to remove invasive species.
495	Native plants cultivated and invasive plants removed as needed.
496	Some forms of recreation are omitted. This does not expand to include dirt bikes or ATV's. There is plenty of room for all to enjoy the Bagerland area.
497	this area will have to be set apart from the atv and snowmobile trails and the shooting range. But I agree there should be a quiet untouched area. This is an area where wildlife will be able to thrive.
498	I think this would be the worst option. That's all I will say on this one.
499	See above.
500	The above sounds good to me

501	I agree with restoration of Savannahs and removing buildings and debris not useful but this option does not incorporate multi use facilities for the public or explain or promote any of the education or cultural history of the area which is part of your vision statement. We need some kind of buildings such as a museum or shelters that enhance the cultural history of this area. Some parts of this are good but it doesn't go far enough.
502	I like the quietness with it but the limited recreation I would not like.
503	This is a good alternative, but limits the amount of people that may take advantage of the beauty offered.
504	This is a large tract of land that is needed by grassland birds and other prairie species, both protected and not protected. The SPCA has been responsible for much work and surveys done on the property and the DNRs job is to protect those resources.
505	This is certainly one approach to be considered.
506	I like this alternative for the same reasons stated above, but this is an even better alternative because of the commitment to ecological restoration and use of the Area as an outdoor classroom for children and adults.
507	Whos going to pay for this ?
508	This alternative captures the most important opportunity of restoring this important landscape. If funds are severely limited, it would be the best use of those funds.
509	This is the best alternative. I support the restoration of this huge tract and the opportunities it presents. I think leaving some of the old structures would be cool from a historical perspective, though.
510	I bleive this one is excellent, however slightly more development for trails for biking would be good.
511	This is the best set of options.
512	Snowshoeing should be included. This should be the the primary option. This is such a rare opportunity to restore this grassland ecosystem and one we shouldn't miss. Educational opportunities are essential to move people through the process of learning, understanding and then a desire to conserve. Access for low-impact, quiet, human-propelled use is part of the educational process. It would be nice if someone could staff the property during peak tourist seasons. Perhaps collaborate with AmeriCorps.
513	no hunting.
514	Some good things here, but they can all be incorporated into the Outdoor Recreations Emphasis idea below.
515	Seems like a wasted opportunity to do more.
516	Bicycling should also be added as a permitted activity.
517	I like this alternative with the addition of horse trials, which are also quiet, natural, and low impact as regards wildlife and natural areas.
518	This is an active pursuit, accounting and sharing of the conservation value of the property. It is undeniably a conservation value for grassland birds and mammals dependent on those habitats, especially the ones requiring large, contiguous blocks of land. Limited vehicle access is probably fine, but it would need a few spurs that allowed the center or far reaches of the land to be accessed.
519	Don't like

520	I like the emphasis on restoration and removal and cleanup of debris and buildings that would occur. I also like the limit on vehicle access and emphasis on NBOAs. I think some of the aspects of educational benefits found in the Outdoor Recreation Emphasis alternative could be included with this alternative, but not to the degree of a full fledged visitor center. Connection with Devils Lake SP is also of interest via Burma Road.
521	I like this alternative, though I would not be opposed to the construction of a visitor center/management headquarters.
522	Limiting vehicle access is so important to the restoration of the area. Also rock climbing should be included in the recreation opportunities.
523	not enough volunteers to do any good
524	Again, add biking and horse back riding to the NBOAs
525	I like it all-but is it feasible without funding? (and yeah, let's keep the DNR guys off site, please....over-zealous recent grads that are just a tad too eager to make some noise.....!)
526	Like that is fairly cheap, but concerned a bit about cost. Like that it will be quiet, but dislike that it is managed, not wild .
527	Limiting? Why? Let as many as possible enjoy. 7,000 acres is a large chunk of land. Please let all enjoy.
528	Love it!
529	Sections of the land could be used for this purpose but it should not be completely dedicated to such things.
530	Sounds good for the most part.
531	Sounds good.
532	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.
533	This would all be fine.
534	This would undoubtedly contribute the most to the region's conservation value by providing key habitats at a scale sufficient enough to support a whole host of grassland birds currently losing habitat at a very rapid rate elsewhere. However, while I like the emphasis of this scenario I do think additional recreational activities can be supported and made available in a way that does not undermine these values.
535	too limited. include biking!
536	We have a unique opportunity with this large expanse of land to help our environment and species who are on the verge of destruction. I think this would be a great option for school outings.
537	Add mountain biking and remote hike in camping.
538	All sounds good.
539	I am concerned that mountain biking would not be allowed. It is not motorized and no trails need to be paved.

540	I like all the above here....great for hikers and hunters, two groups that have more in common than they think
541	I like this alternative with the exception that I would like to see biking and it does one of the activities allowed.
542	I like: ~the restoration or large unfragmented tracts of grassland and shrubland, etc. to support birds~ prairie restoration~limited vehicle access~outdoor education opportunities for schools~access for cross country skiing and hikingI am concerned about:~ the lack of on-site management/ no visitor interaction with staff~trapping / hunting~reliance on just volunteers to provide educational opportunities
543	I would rather see more public access
544	I would rather you include cycling.
545	Second best alternative if it is environmentally low impact.
546	Since many bird species have been declining, this option appears to offer a good hope to help restore populations of grassland birds and other wildlife.
547	sounds fine
548	Taking the unique opportunity to restore the ecosystem.
549	This alternative would be acceptable, but probably too draconian.
550	This scenario seems adequate if funding is not available. Would be nice to have more infrastructure for educational purposes. But if this is the intended final land use, I would be okay with it.
551	While I approve emphasis on ecological restoration in this alternative, it strongly limits the public's opportunities to interact with this property in a positive manner. The public should be allowed and encouraged to experience and assist in habitat restoration activities. Further, they should be allowed and encouraged to engage in low-impact educational and recreational activities to enhance their understanding and appreciation of the property. I support the Alternative Number 4, Conservation and Low-Impact Recreation Alternative and the associated Vision and Goals.
552	Worried that the limited DNR presence will attract unwanted visitor and it will turn into a party trash pit like Pewitt's Nest where the DNR has a total hands off view and the Sauk County Sheriff's Department is left policing it.
553	YES
554	Bad idea for this location.
555	That would not be too bad. That model would integrate well with the minimal development of a shooting range. However greater focus on the facility would be a greater benefit to the region.
556	This is a perfect alternative
557	Would like to see the addition of bicycling, and possibly limited vehicle traffic during certain times of year, much like the dike rd. at Horicon marsh.
558	This is a great alternative to maintain the sight for future generations to enjoy!

559	this alternative seems to prioritize the restoration and environmentally sound practices to make this area what it once was.
560	This would be Very Good, Restore it for Nature.
561	good, again established horse trails which will minimize damage to environment, and adequate parking
562	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.
563	I like all of the above, but think that limited visitor interaction with DNR staff may cause a management problem as people need supervision. Regretfully, not everyone is respectful of rules, laws, Mythe environment, etc.
564	We like the restoration ideas. No shooting ranges, hunting or ATVS and snowmobiles allowed.
565	Hunting and trapping can not coexist on a year round basis with hiking and cross-country skiing.
566	Best idea, though I would suggest a nature and educational center. This is a lot to be learned about wildlife habitat from prairie restoration.This also preserves the land for future generations.
567	This would be a wonderful option, except that if there are some building left that could be used to describe the areas past as a munitions plant. Those should be kept as a piece of history.
568	In theory this is a great idea. In practice it seems expensive and unnecessary. Let mother nature have her way with the place.
569	Limited access will prevent usage from the disabled recreational seekers. No staff is dangerous.
570	Why would take the time to resore this land and not open it up for publice use? Seems pretty silly to me.
571	provide more horse trails and a camping site
572	I somewhat like it .
573	I like all elements. Small is beautiful, quiet essential, and remoteness a priceless quality.
574	I like this best. It allows it to be a natural area with limited impact on it from use.
575	Why couldn't there be a horse trail through this part, horses would be able to travel through rougher terrain than a skier? Horse trails would cause less disruption.
576	I like, but some road travel would be exceptable. the are elderly that would like to drive thru.
577	This is just a step up from No Action, again wasting what is there for all to use.
578	A major part of the use of the property
579	Restoration good, but need access for interpretation and lo-impact recreation. Volunteer use good, but need investment from DNR, visitors center etc.Outdoor classroom great.
580	You need to allow horses, and trail riding on this property. Horses were and are a big part of our history.
581	This is the only way to go. It meets the Best Use case. Anything else would have elements of distortion and malevolence.

582	I am concerned that hunting & trapping activities will interfere with activities such as hiking & bird watching.
583	Would like to see horse back riding allowed even if only on the roads.
584	I think that everyone should respect each other at the park and watch out for eachother.
585	Allowing use of the property for bikers, hikers and cross-country skiers is good. Also providing classroom opportunities. I would add horseback riding to this list. Natural restoration of the land is really the key.
586	I like this alternative, but it limits its use as a public interaction with the site. It would be helpful to have SOME recreational use; however, those mentioned below seem too high-impact on the ecosystem.
587	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.
588	Again, not enough opportunities for gentle public use. See above.
589	This alternative has been drafted by the people who have been involved with planning a conservation future for Badger for many years. It is very similar to the alternative 9, but it removes the high-impact recreations of ATV trails and a shooting range, neither of which belong in the midst of quiet recreation and land restoration.
590	Why can't this option include low impact recreation? The idea that Outdoor Reaction (listed below) has to come with such a range of activities - putting, for example, bird watchers and ATVers in the same category - feels coercive and unfair. We can't have hiking if we don't also accept a shooting range? This is preposterous.
591	This is an example of acquiring land with out needing it. It would be used by a small number of visitors who do not represent the mainstream off Wisconsinites. This and the previous proposal are two examples of why the land should be returned to the families or their heirs who were displaced in the name winning the Second World War.
592	All elements listed here are good.
593	I like the possibility of using volunteers and providing outdoor classroom opportunities. Managing off site could be a problem. I like the restoration aspects.
594	I don't like this alternative at all. Again, the horseback riders are being left out. I don't like removing the infrastructure and the debris on the property. It is part of the property's history.
595	I think this is the best option for implementation .
596	This sounds great. But couldn't you add public uses like hiking and camping?
597	Not a good use of the land.
598	Of the three listed options this is the best, but doesn't compare to the 4th alternative.
599	I approve of the restoration work of the grassland ecosystem. I am concerned about the limited recreational options provided.
600	The part that concerns me is the NBOAs. Who determines what an NBOA is.
601	Okay

602	It should provide vehicle easy access to accommodate those of us who are not mobile but still want to enjoy the history and natural setting of Badger. Educational opportunities for the public and schools should be emphasized, not minimized, or what's the purpose of acquiring this classroom .
603	The best of those presented here, although I would think it good to have more active educational and interpretive activities.
604	this is acceptable as far as nature and conservation are concerned but wouldn't take full advantage of the site. I am particularly concerned that the bike trail be established and well maintained.
605	Inadequate use of the opportunity to manage the resource wisely.
606	There is sufficient land to achieve both objectives successfully.
607	I believe in restoration of habitats but I think the public should also have recreational usage of this property.
608	I like this approach best
609	Love the ecological restoration aspect, but I support BOMC Alternative 4.
610	Better than no action however hunting should be limited to Deer rifle season. I would prefer shotgun only or muzzleloaders
611	Opportunities for hunting
612	no
613	The site had limited vehicle access and perceived remoteness when it was an industrial site. This is largely because the public was denied use of the land. Now that we can change that, we need to make use of this property by addressing shortfalls in recreation opportunities for a large number of people that live within range of the property. We already have adjoining land that offers traits of what is proposed under this option. Tying up this property under this option would severely limit the number of residents that would benefit from the resource. We need to maximize the recreational opportunities at the site, not unreasonably limit how it can be used.
614	Removing of hazadrous materials is an asset.
615	again, where do horses come in to this plan? We're quiet, a horse trail need not be more than six feet wide (despite park policies that say otherwise), and animals have been passing through natural areas since before man. I support shared-use trails and am against significantly restricting access of land to the people who paid for the land and paid the salaries of those in charge of it.
616	Horse back riding can bring many options as well. Like camping etc.. could put up donation boxes etc..
617	Sounds good, except add horseback riding to the trails.
618	This is better than the No Action alternative but the recreational activities are very limited.
619	I like the idea. It concerns me that horse back riding is not included. We could share the hiking/cross country ski trails and provide a significant volunteer pool to help maintain them.
620	I would like to see equestrian use included as a quiet use along with NBOAs
621	Grassland ecosystems are increasingly rare in our state. The idea of having an area like this that is perceived as remote even though it is near urban areas is appealing.

622	See previous remarks above.
623	only serves a few, will make the property more habitat friendly to other species
624	I think this is a great choice. This is an opportunity to restore one of the most endangered ecosystems in the world. This is an opportunity to put back a tiny fraction of what was destroyed.
625	There are few opportunities to experience large unfragmented prairie or savanna zones in WI. While we have plenty of large woodland tracts, this is a unique opportunity.
626	please consider the low impact of non motorized horse back riding
627	I like all of it.
628	I think this lovely place would best be appreciated by silent sports . Little, if any, hunting and trapping which currently have many state funded places for it, would be allowed. It would enhance the natural wildlife/songbirds and be a one of a kind place. Reasonable fees could be charged to help with the management and upkeep which could encrease as facilities might be added?
629	I don't think this is good alternative to making it recreational and shooting.
630	Yes; see above
631	Not my choice
632	I like this alternative because it would provide the widest variety of benefits.
633	I think this is the best alternative, although I think the area should be open for recreational activities such as hiking, trail riding (on horses - low impact on ecosystem) and limited picnicing. I think there should be an emphasis on preservation, restoration and education. It would be impossible to maintain the area without some recreational activity, but it would be deleterious to the area to have RTV traffic and anything but very limited tent camping (no dumping facilities.)
634	This EcoEnviornmental package serves no purpose with the amount of land that is undermanaged now. Denied access has not helped the states National Forest tracts and I only see more of the same with no money, no staff and a large acreage setaside for what?! Meth production from the cities on a remote site!
635	Love this one!
636	Adjoining land already provided for some of the vision statements proposed. We need to maximize recreational activities by addressing recreational shortfalls. There is room for multiple use with this property.
637	This is an interesting alternative however it concerns me that this option intentionally excludes whole groups of taxpayer/owner/constituents from using the Area in a lawful manner, including shooting sports enthusiasts.
638	This is my favorite option but probably not possible due to politics.
639	Removal of buildings and etc costs lots of money, just leave it to mother nature.
640	outdoor classroom opportunities for schools whould be good
641	This is the alternative I prefer, if horse trails are included.

642	I agree with no vehicle access, it keeps the area open to silent sports. Unfortunately, what is does not do is recognize that Wisconsin has a significant equestrian population that is looking for natural areas to quietly ride and enjoy nature in. Again I would urge developers to look at other, out of state models that take into account the opportunities for multiple publics to enjoy the area.
643	I like limited to no vehicle access (except for parking). Recreational and environmental enthusiasts are all about getting out there in a non-motorized fashion, giving a cleaner, truer natural experience. Again, educate and USE those volunteers. And, again, hunting/trapping have no place in this facility. Can't we have ONE place in WI that is open to non-hunters/trappers year 'round?
644	I support this alternative
645	Sounds ok for nboa's, but would like to see horseback riding included as a nboa
646	I thought there were 4 alternatives - I opt for number 4 as the most balanced.
647	This is the best alternative!
648	This plan allows very limited public penetration which does concern me.
649	This would be the best option all the way around for people to not only have the opportunity to learn as well as be outdoors
650	Minimal use potential for general public.
651	An opportunity to access a resource of this size is rare. My concern is that by restricting the use of an area like this will limit its use and experience to a very few people. I am concerned with an apparent disinterest in the outdoor activities by younger people and declining use of a facility like this.
652	would be nice to add horseback riding trails
653	I feel that this is a wonderful start to this and if we can get more people involved in their surroundings it would be wonderful. I realize people are always so busy but we do need to stop and smell the roses .
654	Horse trails would help allow more access to these areas and be enjoyed by more visitors.
655	I think it is good. An ecological zoo might be useful to provide this concept. See the Myrick Park Ecological Zoo, La Crosse, WI.
656	this sounds great if Equestrian trails are included! It would be my second choice of alternatives.
657	Minimal restoration would be needed compared to residential or office development for public land.
658	This property would be an ideal location for school children to take field trips so that they could learn about responsible firearms handling.
659	Hopefully the area is not going to be left to grow up wild with scrub oak, prickly ash and other evasive species that will turn into a jungle that people will not be able to get through to hike, bike, snow shoe or horseback ride.
660	h
661	allow wisconsin people to love their land and enjoy the land- the two methods of use can be used. Classrooms can learn a lot from a horse!
662	This would be benefical to a small but vocal group and exclude a majority of tax payers in this state.

663	I would support this option over the other two. It provides more access for people, that is responsible and coexists with the environment. I spend lots of time on my property restoring shrubs/bird habitat, its worth every hour of time! I can trap on my land because there is habitat that wasn't there before, I can hunt turkeys and deer because I encourage oaks/other foodstuff for wildlife. Why can't we do this for such an incredible area! We only have one Premier State Park...these changes would help manage humans by encouraging them to enter into a natural area.
664	This is the best idea. My only concern is overuse by school kids.
665	no permanent staffing makes for difficult rules enforcement. restoring large areas of native communities would be good.
666	We cannot afford these costs with the present economy. Balance the federal budget before you spend on recreation.
667	You really need an on-site station to monitor the ecosystem to prevent any damage or to predict damage that may occur. Equestrian usage is certainly in keeping with the concept of non-motorized usage and historically horses were part of this area before any permanent settlements were in place. Quite frankly pedestrian traffic only would limit access for disabled or physically challenged residents. Horses are low impact unlike other modern means of transportation.
668	I would like this alternative if we'd strike the public hunting, fishing and trapping use. Don't think recreationally killing wildlife should be part of the usage goals or tools .
669	Please include trail riding for horse owners. They fit all the elements.
670	This is the ideal option! Sounds wonderful!
671	This is the best alternative. I am drawn by the remoteness and quiet, along with the maintenance of grassland and savanna. The less development the better. Restoring rare natural communities and species is a top notch goal.
672	NBOAs should include horseback riding. trapping presents hazards to persons engaging in the other activities.
673	Again if you are going to allow all those activities... why not horseback riding? I like the use of volunteers to promote community participation. Not sure I agree with taking down all the buildings.
674	I don't like that the site would have limited education opportunities and off site management. We are facing a global climate change that needs to be addressed by people who understand man's impact on the environment. Our job is to provide places for education of all people on the value of maintaining natural habitats for the health of everyone.
675	WHO IS PAYING FOR THIS? Its a question you will be hearing often. Hunting and in public lands is over rated.
676	As mentioned in the previous alternative, horseback riding and carriage driving need to be included in the definition of NBOAs. An online website would be beneficial to notify equestrian users when hunting activities are scheduled. Due to the size of BAAP, it may be beneficial to have an overnight camping facility for equestrian users.
677	This is better but needs ATV trails, horse trails, shooting ranges
678	We need more public recreational areas. The area should be developed to its full potential.
679	I like these suggestions as they would be my vision also.

680	Personally, I prefer this proposal because it limits access to the site and favors restoration and recover of native species of plants, animals, and bird. t is most likely the best proposal if Wisconsin wants a true natural area. But, I am not sure that it is politically viable given that the previous proposal for the area is now being reconsidered. I found the present suggestions to allow shooting ranges and and motorcross activities shocking. So, I believe that part of the area should be restored in this manner as set forth in BO<C Alternative #4.
681	I like this option if horseback riding is allowed and promoted in the summer and fall months
682	No horse trails
683	I favor this alternative because it emphasizes the value of this land as habitat for non-human species, and would therefore give people the opportunity to visit a type of landscape that is rare. I have concerns about whether off-site management would be adequate to protect the area.
684	I support outdoor rec emphasis.
685	I like limiting vehicle access, and that fact that hunting, fishing, trapping, hiking, and cross-country skiing would still be allowed. Preservation of native ecology is also attractive.
686	Again, no mention of horse use. I fully support reclamation of public use land, if it being done for everyone, not just select enthusiasts.
687	Yes as well, but why are all this limited Access?
688	I support this alternative.
689	I like this alternative because it is in line with the ecological significance of this area.
690	This would be fine at this time to keep the area in a state where it could be restored to a wilderness/natural area at a later date. It would protect the area from further damage from motorized off-road traffic. It would not cost the state much more than it currently does.
691	NO. This is a waste of the resource.
692	A good alternative to allow more access with low impact.
693	Restoration should be undertaken in slow, careful ways so that this ultimately becomes a major supportive area for migratory and non-migratory birds. To the extent that wildlife habitat can be improved, it would also complement much of the surrounding countryside.
694	These restoration plans seem viable to me at this time.
695	Fine
696	I favor this management concept with the addition of rifle ranges and clay target shooting ranges on the property to help meet the needs of people in south central Wisconsin.
697	I do not like this alternative. While I agree that parts of the proerty should be returned to it's natural state, this removes the property from a numbers of citizens who choose to recreate in different ways. An example, how many state parks are there that offer this experience already. How many state motorcycle trail riding areas are there?
698	Too far over to the other side.

699	Not good. This will remove one more location for families to recreate with ORVs.
700	I think just as important as restoration is education and awareness. I don't like this plan because it doesn't create the sense of ownership and pride that i think more people need to take in their state land.
701	i would really like it if you would consider adding horseback riding to the list of activites being allowed. Horseback riding and hiking really go well together both are quiet sports
702	This area is far too valuable for quiet sports to follow this management concept. Limiting vehicle access will be a smart move.
703	OK
704	My concern with this alternative is that it effectivly puts a fence around the property and severly restricts the publics use of the property except for some hiking trails. That type of user experience is readily available at other sites. The property should accomodate more user interests that are underserved in the area.
705	All sounds good!
706	This is the best alternative of those offered. However , hunting and trapping are inconsistent with all of the other activities listed above. There are already millions of private land opportunities available for hunting and trapping.
707	This plan essentially turns back time, but by disallowing horses you eliminate a harmless group of individuals from enjoying the beauty of the area in their preferred means of getting out into nature. Horses do not disturb wildlife or flora any more than humans do, and some of us who would not be able to walk such a trail, are enabled by our horses to do it. It becomes a disability issue.
708	This alternative is better than no action but still not ideal. I don't understand why horseback riding is not considered a Nature Based Outdoor Activity. It is more natural than the means anyone would use just to get into the area (ie vehicles). This option would be much improved by allowing horseback riding. But in order to accommodate horses, at least a large gravel parking area would need to be provided.
709	I like alternative 4... which provides a great balance of low-impact recreation (hunting, biking, hiking, cross-country skiing, etc.), family activities, conservation, outdoor education (including a visitors' center) and other fun nature-based recreation. Would prefer to exclude hunting altogether...not all public lands HAVE to include hunting...just saying.
710	all is good.....
711	I do not like this alternative.
712	Not the best option.
713	I like that that the ecological aspect of the land is restored, but the cultural and educational opportunities are squandered and the recreational opportunities are redundant with adjacent land.
714	Again, this option will negate new opportunity for many local and regional users to enjoy the land. There is already adjoining land that offers many of the aspects presented by this option. This option would unreasonably deny new recreational opportunities on the site. Recreation and ecological restoration are not exclusive of each other, and can easily exist under already proven best practices and thoughtful management.
715	More and more state and federal property are being limited to motorized vehicles. This leaves the motoring public with no where to ride/drive. I am an avid hiker, backpacker, mountain biker and motorcyclist. I believe there can be a balance of this in any property.

716	Horse people are very self sufficient, it would be fantastic if they had a parking area and access to trails which are very limited in that area.
717	Limiting public access/use is a concern.
718	Continued restricted access is not a reasonable alternative. This property can be used to address the shortfalls in recreation opportunities within the area. The adjoining site offers traits of what is proposed under this option. This alternative severely limits the number of residents that would benefit from the resource. We need to maximize the recreational opportunities at the site, not unreasonably limit how it can be used.
719	The site had limited vehicle access and perceived remoteness when it was an industrial site. This is largely because the public was denied use of the land. Now that we can change that, we need to make use of this property by addressing shortfalls in recreation opportunities for a large number of people that live within range of the property. We already have adjoining land that offers traits of what is proposed under this option. Tying up this property under this option would severely limit the number of residents that would benefit from the resource. We need to maximize the recreational opportunities at the site, not unreasonably limit how it can be used.
720	Prefer Outdoor Recreation Emphasis
721	I believe the best use of areas that are not considered needed for nature preserve be used to bring off road enthusiast to the area to help support local businesses. We are a diverse group with drive to help all concerned.
722	There are already significant natural areas in the state, many in close proximity to this land. This is an opportunity to turn this once industrial land into a recreational area that will serve many interests. This includes the currently underserved motorized recreational interests of many WI and Northern IL residents.
723	The site had limited vehicle access and perceived remoteness when it was an industrial site. This is largely because the public was denied use of the land. Now that we can change that, we need to make use of this property by addressing shortfalls in recreation opportunities for a large number of people that live within range of the property. We already have adjoining land that offers traits of what is proposed under this option. Tying up this property under this option would severely limit the number of residents that would benefit from the resource. We need to maximize the recreational opportunities at the site, not unreasonably limit how it can be used.
724	We already have adjoining land that offers traits of what is proposed under this option. Tying up this property under this option would severely limit the number of residents that would benefit from the resource. We need to maximize the recreational opportunities at the site, not unreasonably limit how it can be used.
725	I like this idea, clean the area and offer educational opportunities. As a horse drawn carriage driver I would support a facility that could offer safe, off road carriage driving trails as there are few opportunities to drive in a restricted vehicle situation. My concern would be that too many trees may be removed to restore the land.
726	I am not familiar with the area so I cannot comment.
727	safe buildings that can be preserved should be left unless public safety is a risk. Perhaps using them as shelters?
728	I believe this would limit the exposure of this property and it's opportunities to enhance lives. Limited access would be very unfortunate, and possibly illegal under the ADA or similar laws.
729	This is a much better alternative, however, it concerns me there is limited vehicle access. I would like to see both access for visitors and a trail system developed that welcomes use.

730	I like the restoration of habitat and limited use, including limited motor vehicle access. I would support equestrian trails in this area
731	Public land should be open for the public to use.
732	Preferred Plan
733	I own two of the three private land parcels on Burma Road. The remainder of the land is part of Devil's Lake State Park. My preference for the use of BAAP land is the Badger Oversight Management Commission recommendations for low impact recreation. I agree with keeping the public access areas as remote and quiet lands. During the winter Burma Rd. is not plowed and is a snow mobile trail with there is sufficient snow. In recent years the samll amount of snow greatly decreased the ability to snow mobile on Burma Rd. The snow mobile trail heads east along the BAAP fence line from the south end of Burma Rd. This snowmobile trail does not appear to be a popular trail, mainly due, I think, to the lack of snow. Snowmobiles and ATVx are noisy. The quietness of the BAAP land could not be maintained by allowing motorized vehicles. I like to listen when in the woods and open areas to hear the birds and animals. Motorized vehicles do not allow for quietness and many of them are being used at fast speeds.
734	Land health should always come before land use. Only healthy lands can support healthy people.
735	I like this alternative best, from the ecological perspective. There are remnant habitats and stunning natural areas. However, it would be sad to lose the human history that currently exists and draws much interest and intrigue.
736	This is excellent and comports with vision of designating certain lands as the Sauk Prairie Wilderness Area.
737	No NBOAs. Only limited soft recreation activities. Easy on the environment and inhabitants. The list of manangement concepts implemented by are great but do not infuse the NBOAs.. You are not implementing ECOLOGICAL RESTORATION if you INCLUDE THE NBOAs?