

## Report From Agency

### REPORT TO LEGISLATURE

Chapters NR 1, 11, 45, 51, 115, and 116, Wis. Adm. Code

Board Order No. PR-03-20  
Clearinghouse Rule No. 23-060

#### Basis and Purpose of the Proposed Rule

Chapter [NR 45](#), Wis. Adm. Code, is the primary chapter of NR (natural resources) code that governs the conduct of visitors to the lands and facilities owned, eased, or leased by the Department of Natural Resources (department). Additional chapters of administrative code also establish rules for department lands. These rules are reviewed periodically.

For this rule, the department's focus is ch. NR 45, with some revisions to department lands rules in other related chapters of administrative code to improve consistency and organizational structure between chapters, make updates of a housekeeping nature, and clarify and document existing conditions. Overall, these rule proposals document existing closed areas, update some fee structures, vehicle and boat use regulations, camping rules and hours of operation, technology regulations, rules relating to the possession of animals, general property use rules and property-specific rules. These rules also streamline language, minimize redundancy and clarify existing provisions in ch. NR 45 and related administrative code.

#### Summary of Public Comments

The department held a comment period from November 9 to December 10, 2023, to obtain public input on the draft rules and received 672 comments. A public hearing was held on December 5, 2023. Forty-two people aside from department staff attended the public hearing and fifteen provided comments during the hearing; a list is included later in this document (Appearances at the Public Hearing, page 7). Comments were largely focused on opposition to the prohibition of public nudity and the disallowance of fireworks at Lakeshore State Park. A recording of the hearing can be found here: <https://vimeo.com/891667898/5123e0195a>. A list of all public comments received during the public comment period can be found here: [https://widnr.widen.net/s/wjhlglhzvz/pr\\_03\\_20\\_comments](https://widnr.widen.net/s/wjhlglhzvz/pr_03_20_comments) and is also attached hereto as **Appendix 1** for reference.

The comments and department responses are summarized below, using a combination of narrative and "Q&A" type summary, depending on which best suits the subject. The comment summaries are organized by major topic areas addressed by the draft rules. Background information on specific topics is italicized.

#### **Lapham Peak State Forest Bow Hunting**

More than 500 comments in total were received both for and against bow hunting at Lapham Peak. Comments in favor of bow hunting cited issues with the current deer population including ticks, damage to landscaping, and the high potential for accidents on the county highway that runs through the property. A number of the people who commented in opposition to the proposal expressed concern about safety and the compatibility of different types of property use. While hunters and people engaged in other forms of outdoor recreation have a lengthy and positive track record of safely sharing our public lands, more than 40 comments mentioned horses (there are 4.8 miles of horse trails at Lapham Peak) and several cited an incident at Kettle Moraine State Forest

– Southern Unit in 2020 when a horse was shot with a bow and subsequently euthanized. Approximately 78% of comments were opposed to the hunting proposal and 22% were in favor.

The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey in response to significant feedback received during the comment period. Hunting by members of the public is generally the preferred way to remove and utilize wild game animals when they pose a nuisance because they are a public resource. However, the department has and will continue to investigate other available approaches and will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak.

### **Lakeshore State Park Fireworks**

*Since the opening of Lakeshore State Park in 2006, the department has had a lease agreement with Milwaukee World Festival for certain activities at Lakeshore State Park. Milwaukee World Festival produces Summerfest and manages the 75-acre Henry Maier Festival Park, which hosts a variety of festivals and other events annually.*

Seven comments were received from Milwaukee World Festival (MWF) and associated festivals and downtown Milwaukee organizations in opposition to the proposal to eliminate the administrative code provision that has been interpreted to allow fireworks events at Lakeshore State Park via special event permit. As a result, the department included language in this rule package that allows fireworks events at Lakeshore State Park via lease agreement with MWF and special event permits, with goals of ensuring public safety and resource protection.

### **Public Nudity**

The department received 28 comments related to the prohibition of going nude on department managed lands. One commentor supported the rule language prohibiting public nudity on department lands; the remaining comments were opposed. As a result of the public comments, the rule language was reviewed but the department decided to retain the rule language as written. The department determined that the rule should be applicable on department managed lands statewide rather than at an individual property so that the pattern of property use is not repeated elsewhere. Case law was reviewed in light of the public comments and a determination reaffirmed that it supports the language as proposed.

### **Shooting Range Rules**

The department received two public comments on shooting range rules that can be represented as follows.

- Question: Range rules should be determined on a range-by-range basis and not statewide.

Department response: The intent with the rule language is to provide consistent regulations that can be applied at all the state-owned ranges for the safety of range users and protection of range infrastructure, while continuing to provide shooting opportunities. Consistent regulations prevent confusion among shooters that may visit multiple state-owned ranges, and assume that the same rules apply at all ranges. Inconsistent regulations may result in the unintentional breaking of rules and require additional staff time to explain and follow-up with our customers. Infrastructure (backstop) protection is a consideration for all ranges owned by the state and restricting the use of large caliber rounds helps maintain the longevity of that infrastructure.

- Question: Why should law enforcement have to reserve ranges to use them?

Department response: Military and law enforcement agencies often use the state-owned ranges on days when the ranges are closed to the public. Asking them to reserve use of the range allows range staff to know who is using the range on those days, if range staff are contacted by neighbors and other members of the public that see the range is in use.

- Question: Do shooting range rules apply to military and law enforcement?

Department response: Yes, all users of the ranges, including military and law enforcement, are required to follow posted range safety rules. When the military and law enforcement agencies reserve use of the range with DNR staff, they are reminded of the safety rules and all safety rules are posted at each range.

### **Camping and Reservation Rules**

Four comments were received stating opposition to the change for the campsite reservation end time, from 3 p.m. to 1 p.m. (reservation start time would remain at 3 p.m.). Several comments noted that they did not see a problem with the existing simultaneous check-in/check-out time.

Commenters felt that changing the checkout time from 3 p.m. to 1 p.m. would diminish visitors' camping experience by making it more difficult to enjoy activities in the parks and surrounding areas on the last day of their stay. Commenters also felt that campsite maintenance was not necessary between stays and said that Minnesota state parks has a simultaneous 4 p.m. check-in/check-out time.

Department camping program staff reviewed the public comments related to the 1 p.m. checkout time proposal and do not recommend a change to the proposal. The proposed gap between check-out and check-in times is necessary to 1) reduce conflict that has been known to occur between arriving and departing campers and 2) accommodate maintenance tasks such as cleaning, mowing, or tree trimming or removal. The department also notes that many state park systems do have a gap between check-out and check-in times. These systems include but are not limited to Michigan, Maryland, Missouri, Iowa, Virginia, Kansas, California, New York, and Ohio.

### **Fees**

Minor fee changes are proposed and are intended to be at or less than market rate. One general comment was received related to fees, asking the department to try to minimize fee increases.

### **Vehicles**

Two comments were received in support of electric bicycle (ebike) use and adding class 2 ebikes, specifically for the benefit of those with a mobility disability, to the proposal to allow class 1 and class 3, with enforcement of the speed limit of 15 miles per hour. One comment was also received recommending the addition of language to the existing bicycle lighting requirements to make the provision consistent with light requirements in s. 347.11 (2), Stats., to minimize hazardous glare into the eyes of oncoming traffic (including other bicyclists and pedestrians). One comment was received stating that all-terrain vehicles and utility terrain vehicles (ATV/UTV) and off-highway motorcycles (OHM) should be required to follow the same rules as other vehicles operating on department roads. Two comments were received in opposition to ATVs generally.

Both the Wisconsin ATV/UTV Association (WATVA) and the Wisconsin Off-highway Motorcycle Association (WOHMA) submitted comments asking for additional changes in administrative code NR 45. Those changes were made when determined to be allowable in the current process (for example non-substantive or duplicative of existing state statute and not necessary for enforcement flexibility), such as the addition of utility terrain vehicles to provisions for all-terrain vehicles for purposes of the state trail pass and operation off of designated facilities. A request to add utility terrain vehicles to the list of authorized uses at Richard Bong State Recreation Area will be addressed during the master planning process for that property, which is expected to begin in mid-2024.

People with a mobility disability can use class 2 electric bicycles, and other devices to assist with mobility, on department lands through the power-driven mobility device permit system.

The request for additional bicycle lighting requirements and the comment stating that ATV/UTV and OHM should follow the same rules as other vehicles (i.e., be included in the NR 45 vehicle definition) warrant

additional consideration by the department. This will not coincide with this current rule package but could be included in a future rule proposal.

### **Noise**

Two comments were received specific to noise with one comment stating that generators should be allowed in state parks for bowfishing and a second suggesting that the department implement a scientific measurement such as evaluating sound volume in decibels instead of the proposed more subjective language.

A number of different options were investigated by the department and other public lands noise policies were researched (federal, state, and municipal). The department further investigate the concept of applying a decibel limit for noise-producing devices, including specific tests for specific devices (such as a 60-decibel limit for generators and anything above that would only be allowed by permit). The lack of a test, or even multiple established tests that are documented and could be used, and a lack of resources for enforcement, testing equipment and training were determined to be prohibitive.

### **Animals and Pets**

Three commenters spoke about rules related to pets. One comment opposed the removal of the prohibition on pets in observation towers. However, that prohibition was not removed entirely from the administrative code but rather was moved to a different section of code, so that all of the places on department lands where pets are prohibited are in one provision, i.e., the prohibition on pets in observations towers would remain.

The second set of comments (from one commentator) regards where pets are allowed (s. NR 45.06 (1) (b), Wis. Adm. Code), proposing that instead of being closed to pets unless specifically opened to them, the listed areas (buildings, observation towers, etc. and other areas determined to be closed via a property master plan) should be open to pets unless specifically closed. The commentator also stated that pets should be allowed off leash, unless posted closed, in (all) state forests.

Although the presence of pets in public has grown in recent years, this is the first proposed rule change to the pet rules that have been in place on department lands for a number of years. According to research conducted by the department in anticipation of this rule proposal, although the majority of visitors to department lands do not have a problem with pets on these properties, both pet owners and those without pets feel there should be places on department lands that are pet free. Additionally, there are some places (such as state buildings) that prohibit pets in statute. The department feels the proposed language is a positive move toward being more able to provide areas where pets are allowed while maintaining some areas as pet-free without wholesale changes to the existing rules that may be difficult to understand, post, plan for, or enforce.

- Question/comment: I'd like more opportunities for hunting dog training during the currently banned April 15 – July 31 period.

Department response: The restriction to keep dogs on a leash for the time period of April 15 – July 31 on department owned and managed lands is to ensure that dogs and dog trainers are not negatively impacting ground nesting birds. Additionally, during a portion of this time period, the spring turkey season is occurring and the interaction between unleashed dogs and spring turkey hunters could cause significant conflict as well as potentially serious situations.

- Question/comment: The proposed language in NR 45.06 (3) should be amended to include keeping pets off of groomed mountain bike trails.

Department response: Some mountain bike trails are also currently popular with other designated uses such as snowshoe and it is important to have a clear picture of potential impacts of such a policy change before formally proposing a change such as suggested by this comment. The department is undertaking an effort to more clearly identify which trails are being groomed for uses other than cross-country ski, and what other

designated uses those trails currently allow. Subsequent to this effort, it is expected that the department will be discussing with stakeholders potential etiquette and other rules for groomed trail users to preserve the often labor intensive trail grooming efforts for uses such as mountain bike.

### **Collecting**

Two comments were received about the proposed rule changes regarding rock and fossil collecting on department lands. The comments note concern that changing the approval process from a permit to written permission from the property manager will make it easier for this activity to happen, and thus, better facilitate the removal of these resources.

In the experience of the program staff who proposed and support this change on department lands, the public does not participate in rock or fossil collecting on a wide scale. The change in language represents the reality that DNR has not had a permit for this activity over the time in which the previous code was active; department property managers have allowed for this under written permission on a case-by-case basis. The department does not monitor rock collecting at a statewide scale and written permission is the best way to manage this activity at the property level. The comments also indicate concern about what appears to be a proposal to remove a number of property types from what was a prohibition of collecting of these resources.

Program staff have discussed this and determined that most of those property types that have been removed can facilitate this activity. Regardless of property type, individual property managers will evaluate collecting requests for potential impacts. Regarding State Natural Areas (SNA), the revision was necessary to acknowledge that while collecting is generally prohibited, it can happen if part of a research project and is subject to our SNA research permitting process. It now states: "NR 45.04 (b) 3. No person may collect rocks, minerals or fossil materials on state natural areas without first obtaining a state natural area scientific collector permit." This section had to be moved into a subsequent section because it is a subdivision creation rather than an amendment for the public review process, but it will still end up in the same place once incorporated into administrative code. This should address the confusion.

Concern is also indicated about the removal of bones and specifically antler sheds. While it is clear that small mammals will chew on antlers and bones, it is not clear if antlers are abundant enough (above other types of bony materials and mineral-rich foods) to have a significant effect on rodent populations, and the department has not identified research that has actually examined this issue. Further, it is also not clear if antler collecting, as popular as it is, has a significant impact on the number of sheds remaining on the landscape. Given this, along with the enforcement difficulties associated with this activity, the potential issues are not believed to be significant enough to warrant regulating this activity at this time; changes to the proposed rules allowing this activity are not suggested.

### **Special Property Use**

One comment was received specific to the proposed changes to create a general category of special property use and the concept that the department could allow uses on a property through authorized special use in an area or on a trail that is not designated for that use. Examples of past repurposing of trails for other than designated uses and the inconvenience to existing designated users as well as potential damage was cited as a reason to prohibit that kind of use. The comment also notes the difference in timeline for special events versus other special property uses and would like the timelines to be the same.

The requirements for special events on department lands are often more significant than for other types of special property use, generally require use of more area of a property, and often impact a property and other property visitors more than other types of special property use. For example, insurance requirements and including the department as a named insured can take more time, and there are overall more considerations, generally, for special events taking place on a property than other kinds of special property use. Therefore, it is

determined to be appropriate that special events require applications to be submitted earlier than other kinds of special property use. The department plans to develop guidance that will provide instructions and clarify requirements for special property uses.

Regarding repurposing of trails, the department feels this can be an appropriate way to share public lands. The potential for repurposing trails and other department lands and facilities should be determined through a master plan process.

### **Trail Cameras**

At least one person expressed concern with allowing the use of trail cameras on department lands, and one person commented in support of allowing cameras overnight on department lands. As the property owner, the department currently allows people to use trail cameras on lands it manages, in areas that are open to hunting by policy. These rules codify the current policy so that conditions, such as where cameras may be placed and that cameras show identifying information of the owner, can be more effectively enforced. The use of trail cameras to locate areas frequented by game is well established and is, for many hunters and others with an interest in wildlife, an interesting and enjoyable practice on its own. Our experience so far is that there have not been significant issues or concerns related to their use in hunting situations.

### **Rock Climbing**

Although no changes were proposed in the rule package directly related to rock climbing, sixty-three comments were received that were consistent in sentiment asking for retraction or revision of sections NR 45.04 (3) (r) and 45.13 (1) (e), Wis. Adm. Code, which respectively require specific permits for some rock climbing activities and prohibit rock climbing on most State Natural Areas.

The purpose of State Natural Areas (SNAs) is to protect outstanding examples of Wisconsin's native plant communities, significant geological formations, and archeological sites. Per Wis. Stats 23.28 (3), the department shall not permit any use of a designated state natural area which is inconsistent with or injurious to its natural values. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement.

With the exception of Dalles of the St. Croix State Natural Area and East Bluff State Natural Area, rock climbing is prohibited on SNAs because the scientific literature indicates that rock climbing can negatively impact sensitive, and uncommon, cliff communities including plants, lichens and cliff nesting birds. The department will continue to consider requests to climb at specific SNAs during the master planning process. Decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. The NHC program is developing criteria to evaluate State Natural Areas for the potential to allow rock climbing.

With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process with Wisconsin rock climbers that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.

### **Other Comments**

- One comment stating that the rule should have addressed cooperatively managed state properties and ensuring consistent rules and policies across political jurisdictions (e.g., different counties).
- One comment was in support of prohibiting drones and one comment was in opposition.

- Two comments were in support of the language adding the dunes at Kohler-Andrae State Park and Point Beach State Forest to the existing provisions for protecting the dunes at Whitefish Dunes State Park.
- Two comments asked that prohibitions in existing administrative code on collecting on certain types of public lands be continued.
- One comment expressed opposition to trail cameras (game cameras) as a tool to assist in hunting.
- Five comments related to satisfaction with the status quo for snowmobiling on department lands.
- Several other comments on miscellaneous topics also not directly related to proposals in the draft rule were received.

All 672 comments and department responses can be found in **Appendix 1**.

### Modifications Made

In consideration of public comments including testimony received at the public hearing, the department made several changes to the rule draft. These changes reflect central goals of the rule to improve rule clarity and compliance and to provide clear information for staff and for the public.

Modifications to the rule after the public comment period are explained in the response summary section in detail, and in brief as follows:

#### **Bow Hunting at Lapham Peak State Forest**

The department proposed allowing bow hunting for deer and turkey in some areas of Lapham Peak State Forest. That proposed rule language was removed in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at the property.

#### **Fireworks Discharge at Lakeshore State Park**

The department proposed disallowing fireworks at Lakeshore State Park, consistent with other department lands. In consideration of the public comments, the department will continue to allow fireworks at Lakeshore State Park under a lease agreement with Milwaukee World Festival (MWF), working together to accommodate the interests of both parties and ensure public safety and resource protection.

### Appearances at the Public Hearing

A listing of the persons who appeared or registered for or against the proposed rule at the public hearing (s. 227.19 (3) (c), Stats.) on December 5, 2023 is attached as **Appendix 2** (page 140).

### Changes to Rule Analysis and Fiscal Estimate

The plain language rule analysis was updated to reflect changes made to the rule language in consideration of the public comments and report from the Legislative Council Rules Clearinghouse. These changes include examples such as section renumbering, clarification of plain language interpretation of the effect of the rule, and correction of the explanation of the proposed change to the camping check-out time (the plain language analysis initially referred to this as the check-in time). No changes were made to the Fiscal Estimate.

### Response to Legislative Council Rules Clearinghouse Report

The Legislative Council Rules Clearinghouse submitted comments on FORM, STYLE AND PLACEMENT IN ADMINISTRATIVE CODE [s. 227.15 (2) (c)] and on CLARITY, GRAMMAR, PUNCTUATION AND USE OF PLAIN LANGUAGE [s. 227.15 (2) (f)].

All comments the department received from the Legislative Council Clearinghouse were incorporated into the proposed rule. Based on feedback from the clearinghouse, the department updated language used to describe rules for modification and cancellation of reservations. Modifications to the plain language descriptions were also made based on clearinghouse feedback. Changes to the form, style and placement of the proposed changes within the administrative code were also made, including organization of the sections on vehicle admission fees. These and other placement changes resulted in new renumbering of sections from the initial draft rule.

#### Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

State managed lands provide many outdoor related recreational opportunities and participation in those activities results in associated economic activity which benefits small businesses.

The proposed rules do not specifically regulate small business and would not impose reporting requirements. There are no design or operational standards contained in the rule. User fees modified by these rules apply to members of the public who recreate on department managed lands and should not impact small businesses.

Implementing these rules will contribute to the effective management of department lands and the continued availability of excellent recreational opportunities on these lands. Effective management will maintain the economic activity generated by people who participate in recreational activities on department managed lands.

#### Response to Small Business Regulatory Review Board Report

The Small Business Regulatory Review Board did not prepare a report on this rule proposal.



**Appendix 1  
Public Comments on PR-03-20**

**PR-03-20 Public Comments**

NOTE: Potential personally identifiable information is removed from some comments.

12/21/2023

	Comments	Department Response
1	Thank you for the opportunity for public comment on DNR Admin Rules. (1) Please allow online voting for the annual public hearings that affect many rules. (2) Please prioritize protecting and sustaining rich ecosystem diversity and health including top predators and profusion cycles. (3) Please offer the public purchase of Wisconsin Wildlife and Habitat Protection licenses to help fund DNR management of land, staff and resources for wildlife and habitat for all citizens who want to support non-consumptive nature enjoyment and do not want to have hunting and fishing access and usage drive DNR decisions based on funding needs.	These comments are on topics largely outside of the scope of this rule but have been noted and will be included in the record of comments. At this time, all citizens can donate to the Cherish Outdoors Wisconsin Fund to support habitat management on State of Wisconsin lands. See wisconservation.org/cherish to donate or access your GoWild account and donate when purchasing a license or other product.
2	Quick questions on the proposed rule changes topics, it was stated on the department website that: "The department will consider adding or modifying areas in which vehicles may be used and may clarify rules on whether ATVs/UTVs, snowmobiles, bicycles and electric bicycles can be used on roads and trails within properties." However, I didn't find any specific change in the documents that address ATVs and UTVs, if there are could you point me in the direction of where that is addressed? The second question is: You had mentioned at an earlier STC meeting that there may be a change made that would require ATVs and UTVs to pay a fee for using the roads within a state property, but I didn't find anything of that nature unless ATVs and UTVs are going to be defined as a motor vehicle. But, I didn't see any definition changes that would make them a motor vehicle within this proposed rule. Again, if there is, please let me know where that is addressed. Thanks for your help.	Potential changes were considered but not included in the current draft rule package.
3	I decided to go fishing today and bring my wife. We are going to rent a motor boat and buy some worms. First you need a license for each person and the need of fishing poles TAX or call them fees. The car ride there wasn't free either Gas tax Road Tax. We are not there yet there will be a launch fee and subject to DNR, Sheriff fine for not having the right size life preserver no-no throwable fine. Now with all that money coming in What do you spend it on?	This comment has been noted. Most of the fees mentioned and their associated appropriations are established in statute and are beyond the scope of this rule.
4	I would like to express my concerns with the proposed rule in NR45.05(3) regarding ebikes on DNR properties. My main concern is that class 2 ebikes are not included. The majority of ebikes sold and ridden in Wisconsin are Class 2's. If the intent was to not allow ebikes that have a throttle, the rule does not work for that anyway, since most definitions of Class 3 ebikes say that they may or may not have a throttle. If DNR truly wants their properties to be usable by all kinds of people, including seniors and people with physical limitations, Class 1, 2, and 3 ebikes NEED to be allowed. From a practical side, the speed limit on state owned trails will keep visitors safe regardless of whether someone is riding a Class 1, 2, or 3. Since ebikes are becoming so popular, especially with the older generation that can't ride long distances, ebikes are a great way for people to experience Parks, Forests, and DNR trails. Please consider adding Class 2 ebikes as allowed as well. Thank you for your time.	Any person with a mobility impairment can currently use a class 2 ebike, or other device, on DNR lands, via a mobility device permit. For more information, please see: <a href="https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/OpenOutdoors/PDMD">https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/OpenOutdoors/PDMD</a> .
5	The Wisconsin Off-Highway Motorcycle Association submits the following comments regarding revisions to NR 45.05. On page 6 of PR-03-20, it says that section 64 eliminates rule provisions associated with off-highway motorcycles that are no longer necessary due to the creation of a separate off-highway motorcycle program. We agree that the content specific to OHMs in NR 45.05(5) is now addressed elsewhere as a result of the OHM program now being addressed in s. 23.335 and NR 65.05 and can be removed from 45.05. Some of the content in 45.05 is in direct conflict with s. 23.335. On page 57 of PR-03-20, section 64 indicates that only NR 45.05(5)(b)5 is repealed which only deals with a trail pass. All of 45.05(5) should be removed. The enclosure is a summary of the provisions of 45.05(5) and citations from NR 65.05 and s. 23.335 where the topics are already addressed. This makes it clear that the 45.05(5) can be removed from 45.05 with this update.	The department has added repeal of s. 45.05 (5) to the draft rule.

6	<p>Is there a way to revisit open vs. closed areas for hunting in state parks, especially Willow River State Park. There are plenty of areas that could and should be open to hunting that are currently closed such as the prairie grass field with sparse woods north west of McDon ald Ln. In addition, the season dates should be changed also. Under the new dates, there is less days to hunt compared to the previous dates. All of the park is located within the St. Croix County metro subunit. The archery season goes through Jan 31 here so archery hunters don't have the opportunity to hunt the park for the last 6-7 weeks where we previously could. There is nothing in statute or code to chose these specific dates. Will there be conflicts, yes, but there already are. Public land should be open for all not just the non consumptive users. People can still visit the park between Nov 15 – Dec 15 while hunting is going on, but hunters can't use the park outside of these dates even though hunting seasons are still going on outside of these dates. I should go both ways.</p>	<p>State park hunting configurations are the result of a different process than for other property types. (State parks hunting provisions are in statute (ch. 29) while others are largely based in the NR chapters of administrative code.) At this time, no accepted process exists to make changes to what was approved with the original implementation of the widespread opening of state parks to hunting (2011 Act 168). Determinations made under the implementation of that legislation were approved by the NRB and represented what was determined to be the most feasible at the time (a little over 10 years ago).</p>
7	<p>The below comments refer to section 37 and the creation of NR 45.04 (3) (am) 1. and 2.:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The note under NR 45.04 (3) (am) cites Tagami v. City of Chicago, 875 F. 3d 375 (7th Cir. 2017), No. 16-1441, which was a dismissed case. This is not a very strong base for the nudity prohibition. One judge even dissented, and I would encourage any policymakers or anyone else interested to read judge Rovner's comments on the case as I agree with his assessment. The case is also relating specifically to female toplessness and not nudity as a whole, which brings up the question of gender equality.</li> <li>2. It seems that NR 45.04 (3) (am) was added largely to deal with the situation at Mazomanie Beach. A statewide ban is not necessary to solve this, and if it were banning sexual activity would be as effective and more appropriate to address the issue.</li> <li>3. People still visited Mazomanie despite it being known as a nude beach prior to the closure. It's noted in the summary of factual data that there were no complaints or disturbances once the nudity was normalized and expected. The combination of these two points shows that there are at least some members of the public interested in nude recreation and that nudity can be accepted. Therefore, a blanket ban on nudity for all properties would not be in the best interest of the everyone.</li> <li>4. Mazo beach was the only "nude beach" I have known located in Wisconsin and was likely one of the very few left in the Midwest. To put a blanket ban on nudity – something that is innate to every person - on public lands managed by the DNR would further reduce the opportunities of people who enjoy nude recreation. I will concede that banning nudity in populated areas, indoors, or in productive areas like popular campgrounds, visitor centers, or fish hatcheries respectively could be beneficial. However, I believe that banning all nudity, regardless of where it may be or even if anyone else is around (barring the rather short list of exceptions), is too strict and would limit the ability of the public to use public lands freely. In the case that nudity is "unofficially allowed" as long as nobody else is around to be bothered, the rule would still create a mental hurdle for anyone interested in nude recreation.</li> <li>5. The summary of factual data states "A prohibition of going nude will provide an expectation to property users and help set a standard for what is tolerated on department managed properties so that all guests can have an enjoyable experience." What a ban on nudity would regulate is essentially the appearance of a person, not any specific action. I do not want to assume this could be a slippery slope, however I believe this logic could be applied to other situations. Could another rule be created to ban other things that may bother others, such as revealing (but not quite nude as defined in the rule) clothing? Some people may find tattoos worrying, could a requirement to cover tattoos be acceptable as well? Some guests may find going nude to be enjoyable, should they not also be given the same opportunities?</li> </ol>	<p>DNR Legal reviewed this comment and reaffirmed that the case (Tagami v City of Chicago) is the controlling law in the 7th circuit.</p>
8	<p>Thank you for the help pointing us to the areas concerning Lapham Peak. I totally understand the concern regarding the over population of deer at Lapham Peak, and while I'm not sure turkeys are necessarily overpopulated, other people smarter than I can determine that. However, I see nothing in this document that addresses the practical implementation of such a program at Lapham Peak. Especially since Lapham Peak sees 50,000 visitors a month, with most (80% or more of those people) all visiting the east side of the park where the bulk of the hiking trails (and all the ski trails) are. Sure, many of the trails might be within the protected Hausmann parcel where no hunting can take place, but that just means to me that hunters might then crowd the trails that are open to them. Which months would you anticipate this hunting to be open at Lapham (estimated, as I know things change each year)? The entire bow season? Every day of those seasons? I'm trying to understand how you plan to educate park visitors that this will be happening, and if additional signage is planned for the trails. What to wear? Stay on the trails? Large dogs might want an orange vest? People tell me that this type of hunting happens in the City of Delafield, and that might be, but Delafield has about 7,000 people spread out over 7,000 acres, and Lapham Peak has 1,100 acres that gets at least 50,000 people a month. However, a better picture of our situation is 80% of those people visiting on the east side of the park, or 40,000 people visiting 500 acres each month. I would sure like to think that some additional rules might be needed to keep hunters some distance away from all marked hiking trails. A deer stand using an open hiking trail as a shooting lane does not feel save to me – but I see nothing that stops people from doing that. I would hope that the rules consider opening this up only on weekdays, and not on weekends when we see most of our visitors.</p>	<p>Department staff provided addressed these comments in correspondence with the commentor. The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
9	<p>It was difficult to find the link to the registration for the public hearing in the information I received.</p>	<p>Link and additional resources sent via email.</p>

10	<p>Below are the proposed updates that caught my eye, perhaps you could provide a little more explanation prior to NPS submitting a comment. I included my comment in italics below the proposed changes. Section 23.117, Stats., allows the department to post trails as open to use by bicycles, electric scooters or electric personal assistive mobility devices, and requires the department to regularly patrol trails in state parks and the Kettle Moraine state forest. <i>with the exception of the Ice Age NST?</i> Section 23.28, Stats., authorizes the department to designate and regulate state natural areas, and restricts the department from allowing uses of state natural areas that are incompatible with the natural value of those areas. <i>would this include hiking? or trails, trailhead parking, and dispersed camp areas being created in SNAs?</i> SECTION 110 removes "Cambrian Overlook" from "Dells of the Wisconsin River state natural area." Can you provide additional information, is this being removed as an overlook or just the name is being changed, will this impact the western bifurcation?</p>	<p>This is statute and not part of the scope of this set of proposed changes to administrative rule. But technically, yes, the department could open the IAT to those uses. This is statute and not part of the scope of this set of proposed changes to administrative rule. But yes, this has been an issue (State Natural Areas not wanting to host the Ice Age Trail). We have made some good progress on this as understanding of what it means for trails to be designed/constructed/maintained sustainably. DCAs would not be allowed in SNAs - - no camping is allowed in SNAs, but further, DCAs are only allowed on State Ice Age Trail Areas. This means that the state park system admission fee (windshield sticker) will be required for vehicles parked at any part of the Dells SNA (i.e., parking lots), not just at the Cambrian Overlook parking lot.</p>
11	<p>We are opposed to deer hunting at Lapham Peak Park.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
12	<p>I am a hiker on Wisconsin trails and a camper in Wisconsin State Parks. I have completed the Ice Age Trail and appreciate the partnership with DNR and IATA. In your consideration of trail use, please make ATV use separate from hiking trails. Hikers come to experience nature in a quiet, slower paced environment. ATVs are loud, fast, the vehicles effect tread on the trails, and drivers are sometimes reckless. Thank yo u.</p>	<p>Comment has been noted and entered into the record.</p>
13	<p>Hello just wondering why canoes and kayaks don't need to be registered? I understand there not motorized. Isn't one of the reasons for registering a boat is for any reason that vessel sinks or capsizes and there are missing persons it is easily identified who is the owner. I'm seeing more and more kayaks on the great lakes and larger bodies of water. Why do I have to pay for registering a boat and they dont.</p>	<p>At this time, registration for most nonmotorized boats exists in Wisconsin law as optional. Attempts to require registration for these vessels in the past has been determined to be contrary to the Public Trust Doctrine and therefore not allowed. More information about the Public Trust Doctrine can be found here (LINK).</p>
14	<p>Hi. just a suggestion regarding price of deer hunting licenses. With the dropping numbers of deer hunters and the deer herd increasing, why not reduce or eliminate the cost of a deer hunting license for people over the age of 65. Most of these pe ople are on a fixed income and food prices so high, it would be a win, win, all away around. Thank you</p>	<p>Hunting fees are largely determined by state statute and are not part of this rule proposal but your comment has been passed on to the programs who work with hunting license fees.</p>
15	<p>I'd like to see more opportunities for training rabbit hunting dogs on public land during the currently banned April 15 – July 31 period. I don't think rabbit hunting dogs have any known negative effect on the birds this time period is meant to protect. I'm a resident of Brooklyn, WI.</p>	<p>The restriction to keep dogs on a leash for the time period of April 15 – July 31 on DNR owned and managed lands is to ensure that dogs and dog trainers are not negatively impacting ground nesting birds. Additionally during some of this time period the spring turkey season is occurring and the interaction between unleashed dogs and spring turkey hunters could cause significant conflict as well as potentially serious situations.</p>
16	<p>1. No generators in state parks. It would be nice to be able to use a generator for bowfishing at night in state parks. I understand no generators in the camping areas due to them being loud, but to ban them from the lakes seems silly. A lot of state parks are open to outboards, it seems like generators should be able to be used in those waterways as well. 2. Having to have a registered atv, utv or motorcycle on frozen lakes while ice fishing. They're not being used on publicly funded trails or non county highways, so why should they have to be registered? Many farmer use their atvs for farm use only, but need to register an atv for the few times they go on the ice seems silly, especially when the ice doesn't need to be maintained by the dnr. 3. A bit obscure and maybe not relevant to this meeting or the department that receives this email - Not being able to register a homemade atv, utv or motorcycle. I made, and many others have made, highly modified vehicles made from parts and pieces from junked atv, utv or motorcycles, but if it's too modified, it can't be registered. I was told it has to be something mass produced with manufacture and a serial number. Can I use the part of the mass produced machine, modify the rest and still register it as the original vehicle? Where's the limit? (genuine question) Can a dirt bike with a track and a ski be registered? How about a three wheeler that's been converted in a motorcycle or a motorcycle that's been modified into a three wheeler? Maybe someone, for a fee, has to inspect the vehicle and make sure it meets specific dnr parameters</p>	<p>Comments have been noted and entered into the record and will be provided to the programs that work with ATV/UTV definitions and registration.</p>

17	<p>Im am suggesting to the state DNR as to access to some state forest areas and specifically about having a access to Governor Earl Peshtigo State Forest area specific to the separate beach area not the boat landing 9 turn off. This is in Marinette County and is the beach access to Coldron Falls. The state has done a beautiful set up for parking to the sandy beach and swimming area. Marinette County and especially the western portion of county is promoting and opening new routes and trails for ATV/UTV use. Marinette County provides a separate access for ATV/UTVs to Goodman County Park. If the state was to provide the same separate access and parking for them to enjoy only the beach area not interfering with autos for parking or travel. This distance off of Parkway Rd. In the town of Stevenson from Parkway Road to the beach area is only a quarter mile at best. Some RV users have in the past used the Boat Landing 9 access road but that has now been signed off with no access to beach by the many RVs that would like to go to the beach just a quarter mile away off of Parkway Road.</p>	<p>While there are no proposals in the rule package that is the subject of this public comment period related to this comment or that would help address this issue, we have asked the property manager to reach out to you to discuss the situation. The specific location you reference does have a space issue to allow separate access and parking for off road vehicles. Additionally, none of the 13 other boat landings throughout the Governor Earl Peshtigo River State Forest have off road vehicle access. To look at the potential of opening the beach area at Boat Landing 9 we would also need to consider local ordinances that restrict off road vehicle access in some areas around the State Forest. We are very willing to hear your thoughts and discuss potential options to help people access our public lands and waters, as well as prove some educational information.</p>
18	<p>I reviewed the proposed rule change topics pertaining to management of public lands by the DNR, and I thank you for the opportunity to share my opinion as it pertains to your “vehicle and boat use” rules... All of us who care about Wisconsin’s natural resources acknowledge they are a blessing for those who call our state home. One of the beauties of our natural resources is that they are just that – natural. (Natural is defined as “existing in or caused by nature; not made or caused by humankind”.) When we introduce vehicles and boats to public areas, we simultaneously remove nature, by definition. I understand we’ve grown to enjoy vehicles and boats as a means to access otherwise natural areas, and I own both and use our boat on public lakes. But I’ve watched our state open up more and more areas to motorized vehicles of both types in the 40+ years I’ve spent in them, and feel it is safe to say that while they may allow us convenience and a means to enjoy and exploit nature, they also detract from the purpose. We’ve had a family cabin in the Hayward area since 1982 when I was 7, and when I was young my dad and I loved walking for grouse on public lands. I’ll never forget my disappointment after hiking all the way back into a previously natural (and good grouse hunting) area, only to hear and see another hunter come rumbling past on his ATV with his gun onboard. I’ve grown accustomed to it now, with the amount of ATVs and access we have around the state. But that first ATV was a profoundly disheartening moment, delivering a profoundly disheartening message for a 12 year old boy, in terms of being able to enjoy something based on one’s willingness to walk a little further or work a little harder than others...something my dad had instilled in me from day one. I remember looking at my dad with a “What do we do now?” look, and dad simply saying “Nothing good lasts forever”. I think he was as deflated as I was, more-so for the undermining of his message than for the moment, in his case. Until a few years ago, we had another “honey hole” up near the cabin. This one was a lake that sat on public land but was very difficult to get to so required some sweat equity to enjoy. Boy was it worth it once you did. That lake is now part of an ATV trail system. The system is even named after that little lake. And the unique, relatively untarnished fishing experience we enjoyed for decades is now an other thing of the past, thanks to motorized vehicles and easy access. My son is 16, and I’ve seen the exact same look in his eyes when we arrived to find the old rowboat someone left on shore decades ago riddled with bullet holes, when we hear ATVs coming to the lake, when we watch guys keep fish, pick up their trash, and when we leave disappointed about our catch compared to what he and I and his grandpa used to catch and throw back in hopes something good would last forever. I want to share our family’s experiences with you in hopes you consider them...and the many more Wisconsin families’ stories they represent...when contemplating whether to open up access to more “natural” areas in our state. I understand and am even in favor of allowing boats and vehicles in many instances, but please don’t forget the importance of the word “natural” within natural resources...and everything it stands for, both literally and in terms of life lessons. A range of experiences on publicly owned properties, including some that have to be worked for and remain very natural, is something we are losing as we overexploit more and more of our public lands. Most people will always take what those who govern them give. But please know that some of us understand and respect that you are responsible for managing people as part of your role in managing wild life and wild places. It’s more than ok to say no sometimes. My purpose in writing to you today is the hope that years from now, when I can no longer access the very places I speak of, you get more letters...and that they’re thanking you for keeping our dwindling special places both wild and special.</p>	<p>Comment has been noted and entered into the record.</p>
19	<p>I don't hunt duck but I like to bank pole or set lines for catfish. Why can't you add or substitute bank poles or set lines on the Conservation Patrons license.</p>	<p>Comment has been noted and shared with the licensing and fishing programs. State statute s. 29.235, Stats., specifies what is in the patron license and we cannot change that through rulemaking.</p>

20	<p>It appears that you are attempting to restrict freedoms by disallowing public use of lands that are only detrimental in the minds of over-zealous liberal environmentalist assholes. Every year there are more and more restrictions on OUR lands because of your liberal policies. You don't give a rats ass about freedom for Americans. You push your liberal agendas only to satisfy your socialist desires.</p> <p>I served my country in the military for 33 years and if you liberal idiots would've done the same thing, you would better understand that freedom = LESS government restrictions not more.</p>	Comment has been noted and entered into the record.
21	<p>I would like to know why the DNR station in Sawyer county does not keep the facilities open until after Deer Gun Hunting. Tax dollars were used to build this facility and one of the biggest times of the year and the bathrooms, showers, water for campers are all shut down. This is ridiculous. Our tax dollars paid to have this facility and they are closing it down before hunting. Usually at the end of October. The facilities should be kept open until the end of November. We have a place that we count on these uses. We have no running water so this is the time of the year when we need these facilities. We spend most of the month of November hunting. The amount we contribute with licenses, and money spent to help local establishments these facilities need to be left open until after Deer hunting at least. I think they should be kept open all year long because you have winter activities that could also use these such as snowmobiling. Please consider this. It would be greatly appreciated.</p>	The department uses available resources to manage facilities. Specific building management is the responsibility of local personnel and is not subject to administrative rule.
22	<p>I have a suggestion regarding the proposed changes to NR 45. In Section 79, which expands the exceptions from shooting range regulations for military and law enforcement, please make it clear that all safety rules still apply. I've spoken with several range personnel who told me that the biggest violators of shooting at designated targets only are local law enforcement.</p>	All users of the shooting ranges, including military and law enforcement, are required to follow posted range safety rules. When the military and law enforcement agencies reserve use of the range with DNR staff, they are reminded of the safety rules and all safety rules are posted at each range.
23	<p>I don't do zoom. I would like to know what specific changes are going to be proposed. I can't find that info in this notice.</p>	<p>(Provided via email.) The specific changes are listed in the document that can be found here: <a href="#">LINK</a>. There is an attempt to provide plain language overview of the proposed changes in section 5. (bottom of page 2) of the document, and the specific changes start on the bottom of page 13. It can be helpful to view these changes in the context of the existing administrative rules, which can be found through this web page:  <a href="https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/code/admin_code/nr/001">https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/code/admin_code/nr/001</a>.</p>
24	<p>If ATVs and UTVs are allowed in state parks, they should have to follow the same laws as cars.</p>	Comment has been noted and entered into the record and will be contemplated in a future rulemaking effort.
25	<p>DNR License system - need a line item up front for a conservation patron license. Too hard to find in the system now. E.G., when go to apply for turkey tag - hard to find where you indicate you already have a patron license</p>	Comment has been noted and entered into the record and shared with the customer service and licensing programs.
26	<p>Reduce nonresident license fees. Nonresident gun hunting license fees increased by 25% this year. Resident license fees were unchanged. The number of hunters (license sales) declines each year. The DNR and insurance companies want more hunters; to kill more deer. The license fee increase is doing the opposite. Nonresident hunters bring a great deal of money to Wisconsin, boosting the economy. The outrageous fee increase is driving hunters away.</p>	Hunting fees are largely determined by state statute and are not part of this rule proposal but your comment has been passed on to the programs who work with hunting license fees.
27	<p>Yeah that's just what we all need, more government regulations and fees !! Disgust</p>	Comment has been noted and entered into the record.
28	<p>I am curious what the proposed changes are to drone use? I will likely have an opinion once it is explained to me what is being proposed. SECOND EMAIL: Okay, how does the law currently stand for drone use? If I am reading your email correctly, you are saying it's on a property by property basis on whether drones are allowed on public lands?</p>	<p>The change regarding drones is to add the technical term for drone (unmanned aircraft systems) to the list of examples of flying related activities that are restricted to areas posted open for the use on state parks, state recreation areas, state natural areas, Kettle Moraine and Point Beach state forests and Lower Wisconsin state riverway. SECOND EMAIL: Currently, drone use is prohibited on some DNR property types, within what is allowed to be restricted by law. These property types include state parks, state natural areas, Kettle Moraine and Point Beach state forests, and the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway. Drone use is automatically allowed on the other DNR property types (wildlife areas, northern forests, fisheries, etc.). All drone users must be in compliance with federal requirements (e.g. Part 107 rules), listed via the FAA drone website: <a href="https://www.faa.gov/uas">https://www.faa.gov/uas</a>.</p> <p>This rule proposal does not increase or decrease where drones can be operated</p>

		on DNR lands but rather adds as an example the use of unmanned aircraft systems as a specific type of restricted flying activity. The exact proposal is shown below. The underlined & highlighted language is what is proposing to be added to the rule.
29	Restore baiting in the Northwoods; why punish the entire Northwoods for the incompetence of a deer farm in Bayfield County. Why punish retailers who sell corn and apples and us hunters who abide by baiting laws and feed the two gallon limit. Why take our freedoms away? Its "WE THE PEOPLE"	This administrative rule package is specific only to department lands and does not address broadscale baiting and feeding.
30	Please try to limit the increases on user fees for Wisconsin. We are already heavily taxed in this state and pay fees for trail use (trail passes) and registration of said vehicles. You are encouraging people to avoid registrations by increasing the fees. Times are tough. Thank you,	Fees proposed in this rule package are intended to be minimal and at or below market rates for similar amenities.
31	\$200 for an out of state gun deer license is objectionable. Raise the already high price 25%? Come on.	Hunting fees are largely determined by state statute and are not part of this rule proposal but your comment has been passed on to the programs who work with hunting license fees.
32	<p>I'm writing to point out what appears to be an error in the plain language descriptions of the proposed changes to NR45.</p> <p>In the PDF document entitled NRB Order Number PR-03-20 [PDF] available on the DNR's website, one of the plain language descriptions of a proposed rule change reads as follows (see page 8 paragraph 2 of the PDF):</p> <p>SECTION 80 clarifies that camping permits are to be obtained where permits are required. Also establishes that camping parties may not move without prior approval from the department and revises the start of camping permits from 3 p.m. to 1 p.m. (camping permits will continue to start at 3 p.m.).</p> <p>I wish to draw your attention to the highlighted part. It appears to tell readers that the start time of camping permits will change, but then immediately tell them in the parentheses that the start time will remain unchanged.</p> <p>Looking onward to the full writings of proposed rules (see the last paragraphs of page 59 in the same PDF) it appears to state that the end time of permits will change, rather than the start time, contradicting the plain language section previously mentioned:</p> <p>(e) All camping permits begin at 3:00 p.m. on the first day of the permit and expire at 3:00 1:00 p.m. on the last day of the permit period.</p> <p>This error concerns me because anyone relying on the plain language descriptions to decide whether to comment on these proposed changes will not understand that, as proposed, they will be forced to leave their campsites two hours earlier at the end of their weekend camping trip (for example).</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter to help provide accurate information in the plain language descriptions of this rule change proposal. I will send a separate communication commenting on this particular part of the proposed rules.</p> <p>If I'm reading this wrong and there is not an error in the plain language descriptions please let me know.</p>	<p>You are correct. The plain language analysis is incorrect and should read that the end of the camping permit would change from 3 p.m. to 1 p.m. We will get that correct as able within the dictated process. In the meantime, I encourage you to comment on the specific language for Section 80 and otherwise. SECOND EMAIL: I am following up to let you know that we were able to make the correction and get that posted. Thank you again for bringing this to our attention.</p>

33	<p>Please consider the following comment on proposed NR 45 administrative rule changes: I encourage the department to reconsider the proposed change to NR45 section 80 which pushes campsite checkout time two hours earlier. I understand a defined gap between overnight visitors is necessary at a hotel, or a high-end RV park with meticulously-manicured grounds and full weeklong occupancy. The DNR's portfolio of campgrounds, however, represents a much different situation and should not command this occupancy gap written into formal rule. Many campgrounds across the state see high vacancy rates from Sunday night through midweek, with the majority of campers arriving late in the week and staying through Sunday. Under the proposed rule, these weekend campers will need to pack up and leave their site earlier on Sunday only to have the site (in most cases) sit vacant on Sunday night. Keeping the checkout time at 3pm allows families to retain a highly valued "home base" while enjoying their park or forest camping location for a majority of the final day of their trip. It spares these campers the hassle of packing and moving to a day-use parking area. In the system's busiest parks, these day-use lots may already be at capacity in the early afternoon. Further, retaining the campsite as a home base through mid afternoon allows campers to go out for meals in local communities and patronize area businesses without needing to worry about vacating their site immediately following lunchtime. At campgrounds connected to networks of hiking or biking trails, being able to stay in the site until mid-afternoon is likewise a valuable part of a weekend camping experience. It seems that weekday vacancies at the majority of the department's campgrounds should provide ample time for mowing, shoveling firepits, and performing other maintenance. For properties that see continuous occupancy of their site inventory all week, I'd suggest the department consider a property-specific exception to the current rule. This, though, should only be pursued if natural variations in visitor departure and arrival truly don't allow for maintaining campsites. From a visitor standpoint, this seems to be the way things have been handled for years without issue. I hope the DNR considers engaging their visitors in more practical ways prior to implementing a change of this magnitude. Very few of the thousands of campers using your system are likely to be aware of this notice-and-comment rulemaking process, and it's unfortunate their feedback will not be heard. This proposed change in checkout time could easily be posted on campground bulletin boards in-season or shared on the department's social media to seek input from a broader audience prior to bringing it in to rulemaking. Given the reasons provided, I hope this proposed change can be left out of the rule revision package.</p>	<p>The change to checkout time is proposed to allow staff and camp host volunteers time to inspect and, if necessary, perform maintenance, at campsites in between reservations. We have had issues with clean up, repairs or other maintenance work being needed in-between occupants. Additionally, the change is proposed to help minimize conflicts that have happened between campers running late to check out and those who have the next reservation.</p>
34	<p>Hi , thanks for the prompt response on that. I'm not sure how many people read these legal proposal documents but am guessing those who do are more likely to read the plain language than the full text of the rules.</p>	
35	<p>Thank you . I'll send a comment and potentially speak at the hearing if my schedule allows.</p> <p>Since the website and press release about the rule changes indicates we can ask questions, can I ask what the reasoning is for this change in campsite checkout time? Can I also ask if property visitors, campers or the general public was engaged in the potential change at all prior to it being inserted in this rulemaking process?</p> <p>I've camped at numerous state parks and forests in recent seasons and have not seen any postings - nor heard from the DNR staff that I've conversed with in those visits to parks and forests - about this potential change.</p> <p>I'll comment regardless of whether you can reply to the above questions, but if you are able I'd be grateful for a brief response from a staff member who is able to answer in regards to that aspect of the rule change.</p>	<p>The change to checkout time is proposed to allow staff and camp host volunteers time to inspect and, if necessary, perform maintenance, at campsites in between reservations. We have had issues with clean up, repairs or other maintenance work being needed in-between occupants. Additionally, the change is proposed to help minimize conflicts that have happened between campers running late to check out and those who have the next reservation.</p> <p>Surveys were undertaken of visitors at department properties (intercept surveys and paper and electronic surveys) about topics related to camping and other potential changes, to help inform this rule package. The draft rule package itself is an opportunity for the public to review the proposed rules. This is the first step for agency-initiated rule changes. Next, the proposed rules changes will be adjusted as needed in light of comments received, then the package will go to the Natural Resources Board for their consideration (likely at their January 2024 meeting). That is another opportunity for the public to review and comment on the proposals. After that, the proposals go to the governor and legislature, where there may be additional opportunities to comment as well.</p>

<p>36</p>	<p>Please consider the following comment on proposed NR 45 administrative rule changes:</p> <p>I encourage the department to reconsider the proposed change to NR45 section 80 which pushes campsite checkout time two hours earlier.</p> <p>I understand a defined gap between overnight visitors is necessary at a hotel, or a high-end RV park with meticulously-manicured grounds and full weeklong occupancy. The DNR's portfolio of campgrounds, however, represents a much different situation and should not command this occupancy gap written into formal rule.</p> <p>Many campgrounds across the state see high vacancy rates from Sunday night through midweek, with the majority of campers arriving late in the week and staying through Sunday. Under the proposed rule, these weekend campers will need to pack up and leave their site earlier on Sunday only to have the site (in most cases) sit vacant on Sunday night.</p> <p>Keeping the checkout time at 3pm allows families to retain a highly valued "home base" while enjoying their park or forest camping location for a majority of the final day of their trip. It spares these campers the hassle of packing and moving to a day-use parking area. In the system's busiest parks, these day-use lots may already be at capacity in the early afternoon.</p> <p>Further, retaining the campsite as a home base through mid afternoon allows campers to go out for meals in local communities and patronize area businesses without needing to worry about vacating their site immediately following lunchtime. At campgrounds connected to networks of hiking or biking trails, being able to stay in the site until mid-afternoon is likewise a valuable part of a weekend camping experience.</p> <p>It seems that weekday vacancies at the majority of the department's campgrounds should provide ample time for mowing, shoveling firepits, and performing other maintenance.</p> <p>For properties that see continuous occupancy of their site inventory all week, I'd suggest the department consider a property-specific exception to the current rule. This, though, should only be pursued if natural variations in visitor departure and arrival truly don't allow for maintaining campsites. From a visitor standpoint, this seems to be the way things have been handled for years without issue.</p> <p>I hope the DNR considers engaging their visitors in more practical ways prior to implementing a change of this magnitude. Very few of the thousands of campers using your system are likely to be aware of this notice-and-comment rulemaking process, and it's unfortunate their feedback will not be heard. This proposed change in checkout time could easily be posted on campground bulletin boards in-season or shared on the department's social media to seek input from a broader audience prior to bringing it into rulemaking.</p> <p>Given the reasons provided, I hope this proposed change can be left out of the rule revision package.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>The department does not propose to change this rule language. The proposed gap between check-out and check-in times is necessary to 1) reduce conflict that has been known to occur between arriving and departing campers and 2) accommodate maintenance tasks such as cleaning, mowing, or tree trimming or removal. The department also notes that many state park systems enforce a gap between check-out and check-in times. These systems include but are not limited to Michigan, Maryland, Missouri, Iowa, Virginia, Kansas, California, New York and Ohio.</p>
<p>37</p>	<p>Hello, I'm writing to comment on Section 80 of the proposed rule changes for management of DNR lands. It seems that Section 80 is proposing a change of check out time for campers from 3pm to 1pm. My husband and I have camped at many WI State Parks and have greatly enjoyed the ability to stay at our campsite until 3pm. This allowed us time to fully experience the recreational opportunities of the parks, going hiking, biking, or swimming, and also have time to enjoy what local businesses have to offer around the park, for example, going out for a brunch, visit shops or a farmer's market, without having to worry about getting back to pack up at our campsites. I believe this creates opportunities for the local businesses and allows campers to fully enjoy their time at the campgrounds. I understand the initiative is to give staff the time to clean up the campsites but according to my experience with the current check out time, most campers leave the sites clean with minimal need for clean up on a daily basis, the natural variance of people's arrival time at the campground creates gaps between check out and check in, and there's plenty of opportunity to clean up the site during weekdays when campgrounds are less busy. As a comparison, Minnesota state parks allow campers to leave and check in at 4pm with no gaps and we have never encountered any issues with this set up. I hope the DNR would reconsider this change and continue with the current check in and check out times.</p>	<p>The department has reviewed the comments and has determined that this proposal will be submitted as written. The proposed gap between check-out and check-in times is necessary to 1) reduce conflict that has been known to occur between arriving and departing campers and 2) accommodate maintenance tasks such as cleaning, mowing, or tree trimming or removal. The department also notes that many state park systems enforce a gap between check-out and check-in times. These systems include but are not limited to Michigan, Maryland, Missouri, Iowa, Virginia, Kansas, California, New York and Ohio.</p>



38	<p>I am writing to provide comments on the proposal for the Department to allow bow hunting of deer and turkeys within designated areas of the Lapham Peak Unit of the Kettle Moraine State Forest. The specific provision is shown in what I believe to be a proposal on changing a variety of rules regarding parks, and is designated as PR-03-20. The specific item comes up under Section 140 (18) – Page 68.</p> <p>I am personally opposed to the referenced provision. Lapham Peak is a small park close to the largest population concentration in the state. It is visited by more than ½ million people each year, with activities in virtually every part of the park. One of the most attractive features of the park is that no hunting is permitted, allowing visitors, including their pet dogs, to freely roam the park without fear of being shot by a gun or arrow.</p> <p>I have seen the proposed map that was available at the park office, showing the potential areas open to bow hunting. I noted that prohibitions on hunting within the deed-restricted area would remain, and that other areas would be excluded based on NR 11 and proximity to park buildings. The proposal would create a patchwork of areas open to bow hunting that would be impossible to delineated or interpret in the field. No amount of signage would be sufficient to warn unwary visitors that they were entering a hunting zone, or to identify to hunters that they cannot hunt in specific areas.</p> <p>Of particular concern are areas within the east and west sides of the park that have extensive public hiking and skiing trails. This includes the paved Paul Sandgren Trail on the west side of the park, and a small but significant section of the snowmaking trails on the east side of the park. Winter activities, such as cross country skiing, snowshoeing and winter bike riding are very popular at the park. However, the largest number of casual visitors to the park occurs during the fall, and would coincide with bow hunting seasons, exacerbating the potential for incidents. I would speculate that many of these visitors would not have the blaze orange clothing recommended for hiking in areas where hunting is active. The horse trails on the west side of the park are almost entirely within proposed bow hunting area, creating an opportunity for more incidents similar to the recent shooting of a horse in the Southern Unit.</p> <p>I urge the department to reconsider the inclusion of the provision for creation of bow hunting areas within Lapham Peak.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
39	<p>Got it. Thank you for the clarification. For what it's worth, I am STRONGLY opposed to use of drones on any public property particularly for the use of scouting and deer recovery. It's cheapens the experience of those out enjoying the quiet of nature to have an unmanned aircraft flying overhead. It is mutually exclusive with fair chase ethics to be used for scouting and in the case of deer recovery, blood trailing dogs are far more effective and less intrusive than drone use. I am not sure if you are one with the ability to effect wildlife policy but I wanted to make my views known in case you are.</p>	<p>Currently, drone use is prohibited on some DNR property types, within what is allowed to be restricted by law. These property types include state parks, state natural areas, Kettle Moraine and Point Beach state forests, and the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway. Drone use is automatically allowed on the other DNR property types (wildlife areas, northern forests, fisheries, etc.). All drone users must be in compliance with federal requirements (e.g. Part 107 rules), listed via the FAA drone website: <a href="https://www.faa.gov/uas">https://www.faa.gov/uas</a>. This rule proposal does not increase or decrease where drones can be operated on DNR lands but rather adds as an example the use of unmanned aircraft systems as a specific type of restricted flying activity.</p>
40	<p>The Wisconsin ATV / UTV Association values the department's review of Chapter 45 of the Administrative Code and appreciates the chance to provide feedback on the existing regulations and proposed changes. Below are our comments: · Amend NR 45.05(1)h "No person may operate an all-terrain vehicle or Utility Terrain Vehicle off the developed portion of a designated all-terrain vehicle trail." · Amend NR 45.12(3)a "TRAIL FEES. (a) No person 16 years of age or older, except pedestrians or snowmobile or all-terrain vehicle and utility terrain vehicle riders, may use trails posted pursuant to par. (b) unless the person has in his or her possession a valid state trail pass." · Create NR 45.13(17)(d)26 "26. Utility terrain vehicles" · Regarding Section 40, the department has amended NR45.04(3)(e) by including "gasoline powered devices" in the list of devices that no person may operate at a volume that interferes with the enjoyment of the area by others or is likely to cause a disturbance. We suggest a more precise approach using scientific measurement, such as evaluating sound volume in decibels. All-terrain and utility terrain vehicles as gasoline powered devices, already adhere to statutory standards. The subjective terms "volume" and "enjoyment" could be better defined. While noise is typically an unwanted sound, perceptions of sound and noise vary among individuals. · In Section 54 the department has created NR45.05(1)(a)4 referring that "No person may operate any vehicle in a manner which is unreasonably loud". We propose a more specific and scientific criterion instead of the subjective term "loud". WATVA and its area clubs have a worthy record of working with state, federal and county land managers, always willing to assist the DNR in the developmental process while sharing ideas and alternatives in providing for opportunities that address</p>	<p>Amendments to NR 45.05 and 45.12 have been included in the rule proposal. The proposed amendment to NR 45.13 (17) (d) should first be addressed through the property master planning process, which is expected to begin in 2024. That potential rule change, and the addition of a definition of utility terrain vehicle, can be addressed in future rulemaking. The department contemplated adding language to the rule to specify that lawful and authorized operation of ATV, UTV, OHM, and motor vehicles on department lands generally is not a violation of s. NR 45.04 (3) (e), Wis. Adm. Code, but determined that it is not necessary as vehicles are not encompassed by the plain language interpretation of this section. A number of different options were investigated by the department and other public lands noise policies were researched (federal, state, and municipal). The department further investigated the concept of applying a decibel limit for noise-producing devices, including</p>

	<p>motorized recreational access. The Wisconsin ATV / UTV Association and its chapter clubs, its many businesses and travel partners that provide an invaluable economic stimulus to the State of Wisconsin thank you for this opportunity to comment.</p>	<p>specific tests for specific devices (such as a 60-decibel limit for generators and anything above that would only be allowed by permit). The lack of an independent, standardized test, or even multiple established tests that are documented and could be used, and a lack of resources for enforcement, testing equipment and training were determined to be prohibitive.</p>
41	<p>I am writing to advocate for changes to two codes in the current administrative code on the management of DNR lands.</p> <p>1. NR 45.13(1)(e): No person may engage in rock climbing except at the Dalles of the St. Croix state natural area in Interstate state park and the East Bluff state natural area at Devil's Lake state park, or other areas where the management plan allows rock climbing and in which climbing is allowed by posted notice.</p> <p>The prohibition of rock climbing in State Natural Areas is unwarranted and lacks evidence that climbing has a negative environmental impact. The climbing community as a whole has a commitment to conservation, and disagrees with the imposed regulations that apply to us as a user group, as they stretch beyond that of other recreational activities. I propose a revision to NR 45.13(1)(e) to allow climbing in State Natural Areas, working with the climbing community to identify sensitive areas and on stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas we all hope to recreate in.</p> <p>2. NR 45.04(3)(r): Climbing permits. The department may require organized climbing groups to obtain a permit prior to engaging in rock climbing activities. Permit requirements shall be posted at the administrative office for the property subject to the permit requirement. The department may use the permit to limit the number of climbers and the time, manner and location of the climbing. No climbing group or member of a climbing group may engage in climbing activities without a permit or contrary to permit conditions when at a location subject to a permit requirement.</p> <p>Unlike trail users (backpackers, mountain bikers, cross country skiers) or gamesman (hunters, fishers), permits/licenses have never been a requirement of climbers. I encourage you to rescind NR 45.04(3)(r) and consider revising to enact a legitimate permitting system. I specifically propose a free permitting system that is self imposed by climbers (Minnesota currently serves as a great model). Some of the benefits of a permitting system include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Recognizing the number of climbers recreating on DNR managed lands.</li> <li>● Identifying where climbers are climbing on DNR managed land (conditional on revisions to NR 45.13(1)(e)).</li> <li>● Understanding what types of climbing users are engaging in.</li> <li>● Preventing incidents from being miscategorized as climbing accidents.</li> </ul> <p>I would love to discuss these alternatives in further detail. You can reach me at xxxx. I look forward to hearing from you soon.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
42	<p>I do feel that preserving "what is left of farmland and green spaces should be addressed". To me it is sad that farmers get more \$\$\$ for the land than the crops. How to get the next generation interested in farming and protecting green spaces is essential so that the entire state does not become "one large city". Your website is not "always user friendly". I have asked for pictures of the WI. river and other natural areas and have yet to see anything. Air quality will only get worse if more and more of the green spaces are made into concrete places. It would be good if the part of the Hank Aaron trail that goes near the V.A. would provide information about Veterans. The V.A. should not be a place where "wildlife takes over the buildings".</p>	<p>This comment has been noted and your suggestion for providing information about the Milwaukee VA Soldiers home, through which the Hank Aaron State Trail passes, is appreciated. You may be interested to know that in 2016, signs were installed along the trail explaining the history of the Milwaukee VA Soldiers home, highlighting some of the historic buildings and other information about this important facility.</p>
43	<p>I do not agree with allowing archery hunting at Lapham Peak SP ever. This park's trails are heavily used. Any hunting on this property would be dangerous.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

44	I have a comment regarding NR 45.05 (3) (fm) Lighting requirements. I frequently ride the Hank Aaron State Trail at night. Many times I am blinded by bicyclists with front lights that are aimed high, or are flashing or both. When either of these occur, but especially when both occur simultaneously, it blinds me and all other riders and pedestrians travelling in the opposite direction. I suggest that NR 45.05 (3) (fm) be clarified to insert the word "steady" into the proposed rule in the manner indicated in bold font. I also suggest adding wordings similar to Wisconsin Stats. 347.11 (2) regarding the aiming of the front lamp. Suggested wording is noted in bold font. No person may operate a bicycle or motor electric bicycle during hours of darkness as defined in s. 340.01 (23), Stats., on a trail designated under s. NR 51.73 (1) unless the person or the bicycle or motor electric bicycle is equipped with a lamp emitting a <b>steady</b> white light visible from a distance of at least 500 feet to the front of the person or the bicycle or motor electric bicycle and a lamp emitting a steady or flashing red light visible from a distance of 500 feet to the rear of the person or the bicycle or motor electric bicycle. <b>The lamp emitting to the front shall be so adjusted or operated that the glaring light rays therefrom are not directed into the eyes of the operator of any oncoming bicyclist, pedestrian, or other trail user.</b>	This comment has been noted and will be shared with advisory bodies to the department on issues related to bicycle and other trail use, and may be contemplated in a future rulemaking effort.
45	I am against bow hunting at Lapham Peak State Park since it is heavily used by people & could end in a casualty. Although not the same, I remember skiing a long time ago at Scuppernon Trail & a hunter was shooting from the trail around Thanksgiving.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
46	I am a frequent user of Lapham Peak Unit of the Kettle Moraine Forest in Waukesha County. I have been a purchaser of annual trail passes for the past 25+ years. In all seasons, myself and families of all ages use the trails. I have seen very young children cross country skiing, as well as people in their 80s. It is a terrible idea to open ANY sections of the Lapham Peak Unit of the Kettle Moraine Forest to bow hunting. That's an accident waiting to happen. Is it really worth it to risk the lives of families to allow such a dangerous activity? Bow hunting is not possible to be restricted to a certain area. There is no telling how far an arrow could travel and kill someone unintentionally. Let's keep the current safe, NO HUNTING rules in place. Do not place people's lives in danger.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
47	Good morning. There should be an easier way for a disabled person to get a fishing/hunting license, without having to prove they're disabled every year. My son's disability status will never change. How about a permanent disability status on his go wild, dnr number card? Whatever....this would make it easier for any disabled person to get a license with proper ID. This has been a thorn in my side for years. Let's do something to help these disabled folks out! And make it easier for us to get them into the outdoors!! Thanks	We appreciate your input. We have asked for this to be brought up for discussion at the next DNR Disability Advisory Council meeting.
48	I understand that DNR is considering opening up the Lapham Peak ski trail areas to bow hunting of turkeys during ski season. Please DON'T. I want to be able to ski without the worry of errant arrows whizzing by or striking me as I ski. Some people also ski off-trail, so no place would be safe from bow hunters. I appreciate bow hunting, but not in the one area where I cross country ski on a regular basis.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
49	Opposes ban of fireworks at Lakeshore State Park. The ethnic festivals have been using the property to launch fireworks which have been very successful. It helps bring the public into our festivals and brings revenue to the state.	The department has changed the rule proposal to continue to allow fireworks at Lakeshore State Park under a lease agreement with Milwaukee World Festival (MWF), working together to accommodate the interests of both parties and ensure public safety and resource protection.
50	Executive Director and General Counsel for the American Association for Nude Recreation headquartered in Kissimmee, FL. Opposes nudity ban because it's too broad and violates the 14th amendment. Argues for economic impact and that public perception has changed around nudity.	The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.
51	Representing Polish Fest. Opposes fireworks ban at Lakeshore State Park. The ethnic festivals have used Lakeshore for a long time to launch fireworks. Cites that the festivals have a big financial festival for the organization.	The department has changed the rule proposal to continue to allow fireworks at Lakeshore State Park under a lease agreement with Milwaukee World Festival (MWF), working together to accommodate the interests of both parties and ensure public safety and resource protection.
52	President of the Greater Milwaukee Committee. Opposes fireworks ban at Lakeshore State Park because it makes the park like any other park. Cites the long standing tradition of fireworks/festivals (30 years) for Polish Fest, Italian Fest, Summer Fest, Pride Fest and Roman Fest. These festivals establish Milwaukee and bring people from around the country.	The department has changed the rule proposal to continue to allow fireworks at Lakeshore State Park under a lease agreement with Milwaukee World Festival (MWF), working together to accommodate the interests of both parties and ensure public safety and resource protection.

53	Opposes nudity language. Believes the ban is too board and should only apply to Mazo Beach. Cites inability to relieve yourself while hunting or engaging in harmless skinny dipping.	The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.
54	Representing Friends group. Supports removal of the prohibition of alcohol at Havenwoods State Forest. The Friends group partners with local businesses who often request beer and wine be served during events.	Input has been noted and entered into the record.
55	Argues nudity language is too broad. States being naked isn't a problem, it's the behavior that's associated with it. Also states concerns about property closures. If a property closes what impact with that have on the economy, including property values.	The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.
56	Represents the Four Wheel Drive Coalition of WI. Expresses concerns over quarries closing. States that quarries are a great play areas. Also expresses concerns regarding active quarries. Explains the coalition members would be very interested in the se quarries for recreational use.	Requirements for reclamation of quarries (non-metallic mines) in Wisconsin are addressed in rules not contemplated by this administrative rule package. They can be found in chapter NR 135 of Wisconsin administrative code.
57	Opposes nudity ban. Stated he's 23 and has been involved in nude outdoor recreation his entire life.	The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.
58	Opposes fireworks ban at Lakeshore State Park. Cites long standing traditions, economic impact, etc. of summer/ethnic festivals. States that all events adhere to strict safety and cleaning guidelines.	The department has changed the rule proposal to continue to allow fireworks at Lakeshore State Park under a lease agreement with Milwaukee World Festival (MWF), working together to accommodate the interests of both parties and ensure public safety and resource protection.
59	A resident of Texas but has family in WI. Against nudity and cites that the ban isn't realistic due to hunting due to lack of outhouses. Also states female hunters would have a more difficult time with this.	The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.
60	Opposes trail camera bans (that are in place elsewhere). States that the public is taped when they go in public (i.e. Walmart, banks, gas stations, etc.). States concerns over fair chase.	This rule proposal would allow for placement of trail cameras, with certain requirements.

61	Cites concerns regarding rock, fossils and fossil collection. States that they deserve protection. Also opposes trail cameras, pets in observation towers and collection of bones. States that he's in favor of additional dune protection.	<p>The comments stated concern that changing the approval process for rock collecting from a permit to written permission from the property manager will make it easier for this activity to happen, and thus, better facilitate the removal of these resources. In the experience of department staff, on department lands, the public does not participate in rock collecting on a wide scale. The change in language represents the reality that DNR has not had a permit for this activity over the time in which the previous code was active; DNR property managers have allowed for this under written permission on a case by case basis. The department does not monitor rock collecting at a statewide scale and written permission is the best way to manage this activity at the property level. The comments also indicate concern about what appears to be a proposal to remove a number of property types from what was a prohibition of collecting of these resources. However the department feels that most of those property types that have been removed can facilitate this activity. Regardless of property type, individual property managers will evaluate collecting requests for potential impacts. Regarding State Natural Areas (SNA), a revision was needed to acknowledge that while collecting is generally prohibited, it can happen if part of a research project and is subject to our SNA research permitting process. It now states: "NR 45.04 (b) 3. No person may collect rocks, minerals or fossil materials on state natural areas without first obtaining a state natural area scientific collector permit." This section had to be moved into a subsequent section because it is a subdivision creation rather than an amendment for the public review process, but it will still end up in the same place once incorporated into administrative code. This should address the confusion. Concern is also indicated about the removal of bones and specifically antler sheds. While it is clear that small mammals will chew on antlers and bones, it is not clear if antlers are abundant enough (above other types of bony materials and mineral-rich foods) to have a significant effect on rodent populations, and the department has not identified research that has actually examined this issue. Further, it is also not clear if antler collecting, as popular as it is, has a significant impact on the number of sheds remaining on the landscape. Given this, along with the enforcement difficulties associated with this activity, the potential issues are not believed to be significant enough to warrant regulating this activity at this time; changes to the proposed rules allowing this activity are not suggested. The comments also note concern over the removal of the prohibition of pets in observation towers. However, that provision is only moved to another section of the code, so that prohibitions on where pets are allowed are now in one location: the prohibition on pets in observation towers will remain, just in a different location. Finally, opposition to allowing trail cameras on department lands is noted.</p>
62	President of Milwaukee World Festival. Long standing tradition of 30 years, fireworks are broadcasted, festivals financially impact many organizations and the community. Alternative launch options not feasible due to cost. MFW contributed \$2M to park development.	The department has changed the rule proposal to continue to allow fireworks at Lakeshore State Park under a lease agreement with Milwaukee World Festival (MWF), working together to accommodate the interests of both parties and ensure public safety and resource protection.

63	Friends of Lapham Peak President. Against bow hunting at Lapham Peak. States the areas are very small, especially on a map and will cause confusion for visitors and hunters. There aren't other parks that see the high levels of visitation. Explains there must be other ways of dealing with deer population.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
64	I was surprised that bowhunting has been proposed at Lapham Peak. I have cross country skied at Lapham and would be concerned for my safety if hunting of any kind was allowed in the park. This park is important to skiers from southern Wisconsin. Please protect cross country skiers.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
65	As a volunteer of young inner city children and a member of the Nordic Ski Club of Milwaukee, I am vehemently opposed to your proposal to introduce bow hunting at Lapham Peak. For SO many, Lapham is the closest natural area for outdoor recreation. Especially on weekends, but also throughout the week scores of people hike, bike and ski there. Schools take young children hoping exposing them to the beauty of nature will foster future citizens who regard natural areas as valuable to mankind. I personally chaperone field trips for young children. For many of them this is their first experience with the natural world. Over the years a surprising number of them fear being outdoors. We as adults, assure them there is nothing of which to be frightened. That certainly would not be the case if bow hunting is introduced. These children do not have the means to purchase blaze orange clothing. In fact, from the MANY times I have hiked at Lapham, just this fall, I have not seen any blaze orange on hikers. All believe this is a safe place. It certainly won't be if bow hunting is introduced. Then there are the crowds of people who hike with their dogs. Will it take an arrow in the body of a child or a pet to prove bow hunting in Lapham Peak is not a wise idea. Perhaps future law suits levied by individuals maimed by an arrow will emphasize the gravity of this situation. I, along with my many friends and fellow volunteers hope you reevaluate your proposal and come to your senses.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
66	I am an ardent outdoor enthusiast. One of my favorite activities is hiking at Lapham Peak/Southern Kettle Moraine especially during the fall months starting the end of September through December. It is my understanding that Wisconsin's DNR is considering opening Lapham Peak, or, at least a part of it, for bow hunting. This is one of a very few areas I can still hike where there is no hunting of any kind. <u>I implore you to keep the area free of all types of hunting for those of us, a large number of hikers, who need a safe, quiet, wooded place to hike.</u> Please keep the area as it is.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
67	Please rescind the language regarding bow hunting in the park. I believe the recreational activity of the users of the park far exceeds any benefit and creates a safer environment.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
68	I am concerned about the recent proposal to allow bow/crossbow hunting at Lapham Peak. As a biologist, I understand the need to regulate deer herds, especially to control CWD. I also understand that the DNR must provide hunting opportunities on public land. However, Lapham Peak has extremely high usage and many interconnected trails, making the risk of a tragic accident too high. The posted plan is confusing regarding where hunting would be allowed within the unit. There are literally dozens of trail intersections, making it difficult to communicate when a person is about to enter or leave an area where hunting is permitted. By design, the trails loop around and crisscross, so there are very few places on trails where a shot would not cross another section of the trail. Users of LP are accustomed to it being a safe place to take their families throughout the year. Skiers are very concerned about anyone walking on groomed trails. It's likely that there will be conflicts between user groups. That's in no one's best interests. The goal of controlling deer and turkey populations could be met more safely. One method would be using sharpshooters. If hunting is allowed, it would be safer to have a very brief season and allow hunting only in areas where there are no trails. This will allow all user groups to safely enjoy the park with less risk.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
69	I think the administrative rules are negligent by not addressing the issue of cooperatively managed State Properties having consistent rules and operating policies when the property is shared by entities with separate Master Plans. Example: The Gandy Dancer State Trail runs through two counties. The rules and operations vary between the two. The maintenance is better in one County. One allows "special events", mixing motorized and non-motorized users, the other doesn't. All State Properties should be consistent in appearance and operation. If I buy a State Trail Pass required to ride on a trail advertised as a bike trail, I shouldn't have to meet a ATV UTV parade next to a sign that says "no summer ATV use".	This comment has been noted and entered into the record.

70	<p>I wish to learn what is being proposed in the Administrative Code of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources which will affect the Lapham Peak Unit of the Kettle Moraine State Forest. The copious information I have seen links to is way more than I can wade through. If you really want knowledgeable input you need to provide clear information about what is being proposed and the implications of the proposals. Sending information that uses all sorts of bureaucratic jargon is not useful to the average citizen for formulation of a clear explanation of a person's beliefs, attitudes and wishes. If you really want input you need to make it clear what you want input about. I would like to see a map on which it is clearly marked, which areas are being proposed to have deer hunting on them at Lapham Peak Unit of the Kettle Moraine State Forest. I believe decreasing the number of deer on the Lapham Peak Unit property is a good idea. I would like to be sure the hunting is done as far from the many hiking trails as possible. Since I have not been able to find a clear explanation of what is being proposed for the Lapham Peak Unit of the Kettle Moraine State Forest I am unable to choose a position. What is the meaning of this text: Board Order PR-03-20 ? What is being "proposed"? What hours are being proposed to be the hours Lapham Peak Unit will be "open to the public"? Thank you for any useful information you can provide so I can offer feedback on what is being proposed. I am a frequent user of the Lapham Peak Unit and many other Wisconsin State properties. I am an active member of the Friends of Lapham Peak Unit Kettle Moraine State Forest.</p>	<p>Here is a direct link to the actual package of proposed changes:  <a href="https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/sites/default/files/topic/Rules/PR0320DraftRule2.pdf">https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/sites/default/files/topic/Rules/PR0320DraftRule2.pdf</a>.  More information about the process and an attempt to explain in simple terms the process, which is determined by the Wisconsin legislature and overseen by the Wisconsin Legislative Council, can be found here:  <a href="https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/parks/codechanges">https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/parks/codechanges</a>. The Lapham Peak-specific proposed changes are best represented in the linked document at the following locations: Section 3 on pages 23-24: a map of the locations that would be closed to bow hunting (in addition to the areas already closed to hunting through other laws or codes); Section 36 on page 53: formally establishing the open/closed hours at Lapham (the same hours that are already used at the property, open 6 a.m. – 9 p.m.); Section 140 on page 68: would allow the department to open areas of Lapham Peak to deer and turkey bow hunting (those that are not shown in closed in the map referenced above or already closed through other laws or codes, like buildings, roads and picnic areas). Lapham Peak property management staff are copied on this message and can provide you a map showing what areas could be opened to bow hunting as a result of the proposed administrative code changes.</p>
71	<p>I had a question but could not get the Raise Hand or Q&amp;A to work in Zoom... kept toggling to "disconnected" I am 50 years old... have been hunting the same 200 acre piece of public hunting grounds my entire life... this November 6th... a large section of that public hunting grounds was closed to hunting and was aligned to the rules of a state park... this is not a state park and is miles from one... I want to contest this but do not know where to start.. I understand the land has an ice age trail going through it (not a historical trail but a recreational loop into and out of this property)... I understand someone looked up the purchase deed from years ago and argued it be closed due to the purchase agreement??? I do not know why the DNR would purchase land for public hunting and then restrict hunting on the land... I want to argue to have the land opened back up for bowhunting during any legal bow hunting season framework... what are my next steps? If I can't hunt this land... I will probably quit hunting... too old to try and find new land to hunt... This is just another reason why the DNR is losing gun hunters at an alarming rate.  Response from 12/6: <a href="https://maps.app.goo.gl/qysZfLjv1dwCy9VD6?g_st=i">https://maps.app.goo.gl/qysZfLjv1dwCy9VD6?g_st=i</a></p>	<p>Hello, Thank you for taking the time to write in. Can you give me more information about the location of the land, such as the location? The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
72	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45 during this public-comment period, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>

73	<p>I am writing to voice our opposition to legislative changes proposed by the Department of Natural Resources that would discontinue the long tradition of fireworks at lakefront festivals and other events in the City of Milwaukee. The proposed legislation would end the ability of Summerfest, the United Ethnic Festivals, and others from launching fireworks from Lakeshore State Park – a tradition that is older than the state park itself. I am the Executive Director of the Historic Third Ward Association which represents over 450 businesses and 3,000 residents just south of Downtown Milwaukee. The Henry Maier Festival grounds are included within our association and BID boundaries. The HTWA was founded in 1976 and acts as a catalyst to guide the District as an innovative, livable, and exciting mixed-use neighborhood while preserving its historic and creative character. We are of the understanding that the proposed legislation is an administrative rule change identified as PR-03-20 which can be found here: <a href="https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/sites/default/files/topic/Rules/PR0320DraftRule2.pdf">https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/sites/default/files/topic/Rules/PR0320DraftRule2.pdf</a>. Section 145 of the proposed rule change repeals various sections of the Administrative Code that are specific to Lakeshore State Park, including all sections pertaining to fireworks in the park (specifically, NR 45.13(26)(b)3 and 5). The City of Milwaukee is known as the City of Festivals and fireworks are a long-standing tradition that embodies what the City of Festivals, and in particular the lakefront festivals, are known for and represent. We know that all events hosting fireworks on Lakeshore State Park are required to comply with strict safety and clean-up procedures that keep the events safe for patrons, park-users, and the natural resources in and around the park. Currently there is a limit of only 10 fireworks events in Lakeshore State Park per year – a number which allows the tradition to continue, but limits disruptions on park-users and the natural environment of the park. We fully support those current limits and requirements that have worked well for over 30 years. Without the ability to use Lakeshore State Park, the lakefront festivals will be left with very few and cost-prohibitive options to continue the fireworks tradition on Milwaukee’s lakefront. Summerfest and United Ethnic Festivals are our neighbors and have been important components of the growth, vibrancy, and re-birth of the Historic Third Ward. We work constructively with all the event hosts regarding their production and hosting of the fireworks displays over the lakefront and downtown. Thousands of residents of Southeastern Wisconsin come to the Historic Third Ward and Milwaukee’s Lakefront to enjoy these fireworks displays each summer season. We see no reason to discontinue the current administrative language that governs Lakeshore State Park, and the firework displays. The park is a unique and special circumstance created by the Harbor Commission and Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewage District in 1991. It has been an incredible success story and more so after it was established as a State Park in 2007 with unique parameters for operation. On behalf of the HTWA, we urge you to reject the proposed changes and allow fireworks to continue to be a fun, safe and important part of the lakefront festivals in the City of Milwaukee.</p>	<p>The department has changed the rule proposal to continue to allow fireworks at Lakeshore State Park under a lease agreement with Milwaukee World Festival (MWF), working together to accommodate the interests of both parties and ensure public safety and resource protection.</p>
74	<p>I recently heard that you are contemplating allowing the hunting of deer and turkeys with archery equipment at Lapham Peak State Park. I am writing to tell you that as a Fall season hiker, the <u>only</u> place that I feel truly safe hiking in the Fall has been Lapham Peak State Park expressly because it is the only state forest in the area that does not allow hunting of any kind. Please continue to forbid hunting of any kind from Lapham Peak State Park so that there is one place we can all go. There are other public places in the Northern and Southern Kettle Moraine State Forest that hunters can go if they must hunt on public hunting grounds.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
75	<p>I am writing in opposition to the bow hunting proposal for the Lapham Peak Unit of the Kettle Moraine State Forest. The Lapham Peak Unit is a gem in the greater Milwaukee area which is an oasis for outdoor recreation far removed from the dangers of hunting. It is a popular destination for hikers, bird watchers, trail runners, cyclists, cross country skiers, and many more groups of individuals who care to enjoy the outdoors without having to worry about their personal safety during the hunting season. The area is a refuge, especially as many other public lands periodically open to hunters throughout the year. It is such a welcome refuge because many choose to recreate in Lapham Peak during early morning and evening hours when visibility is low and safety is at a premium. I hope that the Lapham Peak Unit will continue to remain closed to hunting so that all those who wish to enjoy the trails and woods can safely do so at any time during the year. For that reason, I am opposed to opening Lapham Peak to bow hunting. Please feel free to contact me at this email or the below contact information for further comment.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>



76	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45 during this public-comment period, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
77	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45 during this public-comment period, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
78	<p>Where is this coming from? Lapham peak, for those decision makers who have never been there, is a highly used recreational park for hiking, biking and skiing. It's not a seasonal park. Activities are occurring all year long. Why would you want to throw hunting in the mix? Does not seem to correlate. Also millions of dollars are currently in the mix from private investors to build a new shelter at Lapham peak, which will encourage additional recreational usage. The presence of more people does not go along with the hunting theme. Again where is this idea coming from? Whomever, it is not a good one.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
79	<p>Hello, I am writing to say that I do not support allowing hunting of any form at Lapham Peak. My wife, daughters, and I enjoy our time there hiking, running, and skiing. Allowing hunting is just asking for conflicts and accidents. I wouldn't be comfortable taking my kids into a park where hunting is going on. Please keep Lapham Peak a no hunting area. Thank you for your time</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

80	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45 during this public-comment period, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
81	<p>Outside of any necessary population control measures that may exist, I am strongly against the idea of allowing hunting at Lapham Peak. This park is popular spot for cross country skiing, hiking, trail running, bird watching, etc. and it is already overcrowded during the weekends, including the early mornings. I fear adding another activity would only add to that and I don't like the idea of running in the morning while hunters are out doing their thing in my general area.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
82	<p>To Wisconsin DNR, I have recently become aware that it is under consideration to allow bow hunting at Lapham Peak. I do not think this is a smart move for the following reasons: This is a very crowded space with skiers and children which does not mix well with hunting. Skiers wear sport specific clothing which is not safety orange. Proposed hunting areas overlap with ski trails and will inevitably result in hunters walking on ski trails. This will set the stage for on-going conflicts since foot traffic is not allowed and severely damages ski trails. Many children take large group ski lessons in these areas and will overlap with hunters. Lapham Peak is the most (or at least one of the most) heavily used public parks in Wisconsin during the fall and winter months due to the robust hiking and cross country skiing communities that use the park with recent numbers of up to 60,000 visitors per month during December and January.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
83	<p>A DNR proposed deer bow hunt zone borders our property, a part of the Meadows of Delafield subdivision. We walk the park, and we have grandchildren that play in the park just as our now-grown children were raised. Any kind of hunting in our back yard would be dangerous. No one knows where the arrows fly when they miss their marks. We have always enjoyed the wildlife that passes through our property. While the deer do appreciate some of our plantings we would never wish to see the deer deterred from us. We have no wish to see half dead arrowed deer die in our yard or other parts of the subdivision. We do not feel that there is an overabundance of deer in the park. For these reasons we are completely against the DNR proposal. We request that any discussions of such a proposal be made public and communicated directly to us at the above email address or the below mailing address.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
84	<p>Do NOT allow any hunting at Lapham Peak. Lapham is one of the state's most utilized parks! I'm there multiple times weekly to hike, bike and ski. It's the only local place where I can ski on man made or natural snow. People travel from Illinois and from all over Wisconsin to ski, snowshoe, ride horses and hike on the trails. Seeing the wildlife is part of the experience. I am in favor of hunting and animal conservation in general but hunting at Lapham Peak State Park is potentially dangerous and detrimental to park usage.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
85	<p>This email is to dissuade you from allowing hunting in Lapham Peak State park. I enjoy the wildlife as a trail runner and skier year round. There are multiple places to hunt in our area and it would be sad if the state park was added to that list as well</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

86	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45 during this public-comment period, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
87	<p>We have been XC skiing and MTN biking at Lapham Peak since 1979. We donate to the Friends of Lapham Peak snowmaking, and we hike there every month of the year. This Bow Hunting proposal is insane !!!!</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
88	<p>I am writing in support of some particular proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45 during this public-comment period, specifically the retraction or revision of <b>NR 45.13(1)(e)</b>, which prohibits rock climbing within most (Wisconsin) State Natural Areas (SNAs). I believe that such dramatic prohibition is unwarranted and lacks precedent when compared to other forms of recreation within SNAs. What's more, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation and engages with the DNR on stewardship initiatives at a far greater rate than many user groups. With appropriate regulations, education, and infrastructure in place, rock climbing need not be incompatible with conservation; thus, the use of a special regulation (beyond what applies to other recreational activities) is unwarranted and unnecessary. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code could be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking; doing so would effectively mitigate the impacts of the climbing community and work towards a consistent ethic of land use that is shared among user groups. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
89	<p>Dear DNR staff, Urging you strongly to withdraw proposal to allow hunting at Lapham Peak. The overlap of skiing and hiking trails with hunting is in no way safe or appropriate. There are plenty of other state lands that allow hunting. Lapham Peak is a high use area and winter ski season is already a limited time frame. We should not be left with only options of not skiing due to hunting or risk harm to ourselves or our children around hunters. Sincerely</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
90	<p>As an avid and seasoned user of Lapham Peak park and a frequent traveler of the Kettle Moraine Forest I am reaching out to you today to express my sincerest OPPOSITION to the proposed changes to DNR rule section (18) that would allow for archery hunting for deer and turkeys on portions of the Lapham Peak Unit of the Kettle Moraine Forest in Waukesha County. This park is extremely trafficked year round and opening bow hunting would be critically detrimental. Again, I strongly oppose the changes that would allow bow hunting on portions of the Lapham Peak Unit of the Kettle Moraine Forest in Waukesha County. Any response and updates would be greatly appreciated.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

91	<p>Obviously, you should not be allowing hunting in parks. What are you even thinking? People run and walk and kids ski in these places, and you want to put drunken crossbows here. Get a brain. Or refund me the \$500 we just donated towards the new Lapham lodge.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
92	<p>I am writing today to voice my opposition to the legislative changes proposed by the Department of Natural Resources that would discontinue the long tradition of fireworks at lakefront festivals in the City of Milwaukee. The proposed legislation would end the ability of Summerfest, the United Ethnic Festivals, and others from launching fireworks from Lakeshore State Park – a tradition that is older than the state park itself. I have been part of the Historic Third Ward neighborhood for nearly 17 years and played witness to its great success story during that time. My current role is Executive Director of the Milwaukee Public Market and Third Ward Business Improvement District #2, where I'm provided the privilege of leading a team of talented individuals tasked with overseeing the BID's operating businesses, as well as increasing awareness about the district and adding economic value to all stakeholders. The BID operates and maintains the Milwaukee Public Market, two parking structures, and nearly a dozen pocket parks and public spaces throughout the neighborhood. In addition, we act as a commercial property landlord with nearly 20 leases with locally-owned small businesses. The Public Market is one of the major assets within the BID portfolio, with roughly 2 million annual visitors and total vendor sales of over \$25 million, making it one of Milwaukee's top destinations for local dwellers and out of towners from around the world. The City of Milwaukee is known as the City of Festivals and fireworks are a long-standing tradition that embodies what the City of Festivals, and in particular the lakefront festivals, are known for and represent. All events hosting fireworks on Lakeshore State Park are required to comply with strict safety and clean-up procedures that keep the events safe for patrons, park-users and the natural resources in and around the park. Currently there is a limit of only 10 fireworks events in Lakeshore State Park per year – a number which allows the tradition to continue, but limits disruptions on park-users and the natural environment of the park. Without the ability to use Lakeshore State Park, the lakefront festivals will be left with very few and cost-prohibitive options to continue the fireworks tradition on Milwaukee's lakefront. In my observation, the fireworks at Lakeshore State Park have provided important value to the greater downtown area and have helped draw families and out of town travelers to the area to support the economic interests of the neighborhood and enjoy this unique experience in one of our treasured public spaces along the lakefront. It is one of the hallmark traditions of our shoreline, creating significant media impressions and a heightened awareness of the greater downtown activities, including Lakeshore State Park itself. The purpose of all public spaces should be for the safe and healthy gathering of people to socialize, recreate and enjoy the outdoors in our great state in as many ways possible. As someone who's in the business of managing public spaces, I fully understand and support safe practices that ensure no long-term damage or liability to our parks. And given the successful history of firework displays hosted by United Ethnic Festivals and others for decades; I would strongly encourage this practice to continue in a safe and healthy manner for all parties. I'm told the proposed legislation is an administrative rule change identified as PR-03-20 which can be found here: <a href="https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/sites/default/files/topic/Rules/PR0320DraftRule2.pdf">https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/sites/default/files/topic/Rules/PR0320DraftRule2.pdf</a>. Section 145 of the proposed rule change repeals various sections of the Administrative Code that are specific to Lakeshore State Park, including all sections pertaining to fireworks in the park (specifically, NR 45.13(26)(b)3 and 5). I would urge you to reject the proposed changes and allow fireworks to continue to be a fun, safe and important part of the lakefront festivals in the City of Milwaukee.</p>	<p>The department has changed the rule proposal to continue to allow fireworks at Lakeshore State Park under a lease agreement with Milwaukee World Festival (MWF), working together to accommodate the interests of both parties and ensure public safety and resource protection.</p>
93	<p>I am writing in support of some particular proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45 during this public-comment period, specifically the retraction or revision of <b>NR 45.13(1)(e)</b>, which prohibits rock climbing within most (Wisconsin) State Natural Areas (SNAs). I believe that such dramatic prohibition is unwarranted and lacks precedent when compared to other forms of recreation within SNAs. What's more, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation and engages with the DNR on stewardship initiatives at a far greater rate than many user groups. With appropriate regulations, education, and infrastructure in place, rock climbing need not be incompatible with conservation; thus, the use of a special regulation (beyond what applies to other recreational activities) is unwarranted and unnecessary. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code could be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking; doing so would effectively mitigate the impacts of the climbing community and work towards a consistent ethic of land use that is shared among user groups. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will</p>

		engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
94	I'm writing you to let you know my feelings on regarding allowing bow hunting at Lapham Peak. Lapham peak is one of the only state parks in the area where I feel safe going to hike, ski, run because I know it is a no hunting zone. I am not opposed to hunting, in fact I am a hunter. However, I feel there needs to be area that are protected from hunting to allow families to utilize the park system without having to worry about being a victim of a hunting accident.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
95	NO. The Lapham Peak State Park is an Urban Park. I'd like to hike in the fall and ski in the winter and not get shot with a crossbow.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
96	I am writing in support of some particular proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45 during this public-comment period, specifically the retraction or revision of <b>NR 45.13(1)(e)</b> , which prohibits rock climbing within most (Wisconsin) State Natural Areas (SNAs). I believe that such dramatic prohibition is unwarranted and lacks precedent when compared to other forms of recreation within SNAs. What's more, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation and engages with the DNR on stewardship initiatives at a far greater rate than many user groups. With appropriate regulations, education, and infrastructure in place, rock climbing need not be incompatible with conservation; thus, the use of a special regulation (beyond what applies to other recreational activities) is unwarranted and unnecessary. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code could be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking; doing so would effectively mitigate the impacts of the climbing community and work towards a consistent ethic of land use that is shared among user groups. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
97	I am emailing to request that you do not allow bow hunting on the Lapham Peak Unit of the Kettle Moraine State Forest. My husband is a hunter so I appreciate the sport, but my family and I also appreciate having places to visit and hike where we can be assured there will not be people hunting.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

98	<p>[I live in] Delafield, a property that backs up to Lapham Peak and is incredibly close to some of the new proposed hunting grounds. I am writing to express my vehement disapproval for the proposed bow hunting in the park. I purchased my home sight-unseen in 2021 specifically because of its proximity to the park. I enjoy walking my dogs in the park each day and worry for their and my safety if this proposal passes. I have two large brown dogs that could be easily mistaken for deer. During Covid, the park's popularity exploded as people looked for a way to safely get outside. The park's popularity hasn't waned since the pandemic. During the fall, the park is full of people enjoying the changing leaves. As a cyclist, I use the mountain bike trails across Highway C all fall when I train for local cyclocross races. When training, I often share the park with local National Interscholastic Cycling Association (NICA) teams from area schools. There are often 20-30 kids all riding their bikes and practicing for their races. How can the DNR in good conscience expose middle and high school age kids to that potential danger?? Lapham is one of the few state parks that doesn't allow hunting, creating a peaceful respite for everyone to enjoy, and a park where non-hunters can feel safe getting outdoors during hunting season. During archery and crossbow season, September to January, is when the park is at its busiest. People come from all around to enjoy the changing leaves in the fall. There is a race in the park almost every weekend, and come winter, the park is a destination for cross-country skiing. I have friends in Madison who routinely drive to Delafield because the park's ski trails are some of the best in the area. Allowing hunting would destroy the peaceful environment of the park and endanger the safety of all who enjoy it.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
99	<p>Dear Members of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, I am writing from Rockford, IL to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45 during this public-comment period, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I, along with friends from our YMCA and high school outdoor club and family have participated in park clean up, graffiti removal and trail projects at Devils Lake WI. My rock climbing friends and I are active and cooperative stewards of WI parks and trails. There is ALWAYS at least 1-bag of garbage removed from previous park users on our rock climbing outings. Please consider us "Illinoisans" as allies of yours in any maintenance or expansion of trails and climbing areas. My appreciation of your parks and wilderness areas explains why we travel to WI at least 30-days a year! Thanks for your works and your commitment to keeping these places so accessible.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
100	<p>Lapham Peak is an urban park with high volume, multi use. Please DO NOT open any part of the park to hunting. There are few natural places of this size that are free from the concerns of those of us hiking, skiing, biking, horseback riding to enjoy without concern of hunters. I am by no means against responsible hunting but our state has many acres of private and public land already dedicated to hunting. Again, please protect LAPHAM PEAK and DO NOT ALLOW HUNTING on any portion of the property.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
101	<p>I am writing in support of some particular proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45 during this public-comment period, specifically the retraction or revision of <b>NR 45.13(1)(e)</b>, which prohibits rock climbing within most (Wisconsin) State Natural Areas (SNAs). I believe that such dramatic prohibition is unwarranted and lacks precedent when compared to other forms of recreation within SNAs. What's more, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation and engages with the DNR on stewardship initiatives at a far greater rate than many user groups. With appropriate regulations, education, and infrastructure in place, rock climbing need not be incompatible with conservation; thus, the use of a special regulation (beyond what applies to other recreational activities) is unwarranted and unnecessary. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code could be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking; doing so would effectively mitigate the impacts of the climbing community and work towards a consistent ethic of land use that is shared among user groups. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific</p>

		administrative code proposals.
102	I am sending this email to let you know I support bowhunting for deer in Lapham Peak State Park. My opinion is all areas need to be identified and all special hunting areas should be available somewhere online.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
103	Please do not allow any type of hunting at Lapham Peak State Park. My husband and I hike there almost every morning all year round and the area suggested would make it very dangerous for us and numerous others as this is a very popular park.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
104	I am a local resident, lapham peak ski club member, hiker, trail runner, trail bicyclist, roller skier. I live within walking distance so I'm there multiple days of the week. I feel I can speak for all of my friends, acquaintances who use the trails similarly when I say that allowing hunting of ANY sort on those trails would be devastating. When I am on trails I watch for rocks I could trip on, deer that might jump out, unleashed dogs...the trails are sometimes steep and always rocky. They require attention at all times. But add in the danger of errant bows, needing to wear bright orange and yellow 6-8 months of the year? Now it feels like the Hunger Games. I love the trails for the quiet, solace, contemplative beauty. Please this is not the location to blend these sporting activities. Doing so would completely change Lapham peak; and not for the better.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
105	PLEASE, don't allow bow hunting! We all walk at so many different times. I think bow hunting will be DANGEROUS!	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
106	I am writing to vehemently oppose the allowance of hunting on shared land at Lapham park; this is important land for skiing, hiking and biking. There is more than sufficient hunting land already. Do not put safety at risk for the rest of us who rely on limited outdoor space that is either private or allows hunting already. This space is very heavily used by all ages.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
107	The rule is overbroad and equates nudity with lewdness. They are not the same. Persons have a right to be nude on public lands as long as they are not offensive. There is room for the allowance of persons who wish to be nude on public lands without causing objections from those who believe public nudity is somehow wrong.	The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.

108	<p>I am writing in regards to administrative code NR 45, which is currently under review, in order to voice my support for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e). As you know, this legislature limits rock climbing in all State Natural Areas except for Interstate state park and Devil's Lake state park. I believe that climbing and conservation can be compatible, and climbers are generally a respectful group of people that know how to appreciate the outdoors and keep their surroundings in a good condition, and a specific regulation to ban climbing is unnecessary. I think that with proper management and oversight, opening up SNAs to climbing could be a net positive, especially to local communities. Take for example the town of Sandstone in Minnesota; while climbing was frowned upon back in the 80s, nowadays it sees climbers all months of the year who contribute to the local economy and show up for park cleanup and trail maintenance days. With that being said, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on this issue, and I thank you for your continuous commitment to land management.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
109	<p>I do not support hunting in Lapham peak It's too small and for hikers and skiers</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
110	<p>I am writing in support of some particular proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45 during this public-comment period, specifically the retraction or revision of <b>NR 45.13(1)(e)</b>, which prohibits rock climbing within most (Wisconsin) State Natural Areas (SNAs). I believe that such dramatic prohibition is unwarranted and lacks precedent when compared to other forms of recreation within SNAs. What's more, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation and engages with the DNR on stewardship initiatives at a far greater rate than many user groups. With appropriate regulations, education, and infrastructure in place, rock climbing need not be incompatible with conservation; thus, the use of a special regulation (beyond what applies to other recreational activities) is unwarranted and unnecessary. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code could be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking; doing so would effectively mitigate the impacts of the climbing community and work towards a consistent ethic of land use that is shared among user groups. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
111	<p>I am opposed to any hunting at Lapham Peak. Most DNR properties in Southern Wisconsin allow hunting, making it difficult for other users to enjoy them during hunting season. This has been one place for others to recreate with some sense of safety, and I would not want to lose it as an option. The park is also heavily used, creating greater potential for conflict. Additionally, it strikes me that most of the park is relatively close to developed areas.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>



112	<p>I live in Delafield , approximately a mile from Lapham Peak State Park. My choice to live here was heavily influenced by my love for Lapham Peak. For decades, my family, now including my small children, have frequently visited the park for various activities such as hiking, skiing, biking, snowshoeing, mushroom foraging, and geocaching. These activities are peaceful and have always seemed compatible with the safe, family-friendly environment of the park. The introduction of bowhunting into this setting, however, stands in stark contrast and is deeply concerning. The possibility of allowing hunting in Lapham Peak is honestly shocking and, in my view, entirely inappropriate for a state park in such a populated area and full of public trails. While hunting may have its proper place in Wisconsin, Lapham Peak simply isn't the place. Lapham Peak has established itself as a hub for family-friendly outdoor activities, featuring premier trails, massive ski infrastructure, children's center, observation tower, butterfly garden, and theater for the arts. The addition of deadly weapons to this list would be a drastic change, undermining the decades of effort put into building this reputation. As I write this, I am looking at photos from one of my many winter hikes last year with my small children. The memory is one of exploration, learning, and building their love of nature which Lapham also built in me as a child. The photo was taken at Nnemahbin Spring, directly underneath the arrow marking open hunting on the attached map (starred). The idea of encountering hunters lurking in the woods for the purpose of shooting deadly weapons anywhere near this memorable event is not only alarming but would also irreversibly change the way we, and many others, view and experience the park. In fact, it would drive me away completely. This concern is not hypothetical. I vividly recall a personal experience from my youth when I came across hunters while mountain biking in the Southern Kettles. It was a startling encounter that has left a lasting impression on me, altering my perception of safety and freedom in Wisconsin parks. Moreover, the idea of safely or discreetly integrating bowhunting into Lapham Peak is questionable and seemingly built on a limited understanding of the park. As just one blatant example, the decades-old path to the popular Nemahbin Spring landmark that I mentioned above is completely missing from the attached map (highlighted in blue). The park includes not only a sprawling primary trail system that a politician sees on the map, but a huge number of secondary trails, additional snowshoeing trails (since walking on ski trails is prohibited,) connector trails to neighborhoods, and off-trail attractions like teepee forts, geocaches, mushroom patches, raspberry bushes, historical stone fence lines, and rock outcroppings. Lapham Peak Park simply does not allow for a clear separation between recreational users and hunters. Again, following the theme of Nemahbin Springs, I implore you to look at the image on this page for the landmark: <a href="https://secure-web.cisco.com/10t3Auru1EG6R5kMLxuF0PKLTB8SI8dcCj8SHZ3eYKezTmH-3it2BEEHj7WJyFwEsS0_Pc4L2V6gWvA7IPzBVH2fz68sYa_gCZp-ALJPA4DJkkTAwcEK7VABSQMRFDWr4pB6vDD6NZZAU7u5YQdhr_IPREsctwbPncK7rMGf4fcs8YCCo8MtrQcH1K4jbp0SVSzav3HcXrgM1w6neGXDH-I_Kiy8IXroXmXa3fMlFxfZWV1rJAd7LcYf89lzfDtEnW-sTj5-UmvxTbscyEyS5SuQp6fCmGm4aDla8zlnkFVH1qZ2MVkVKC3B0YF64-H/https%3A%2F%2Flaphampeakfriends.org%2F2023-nemahbin-spring%2F">https://secure-web.cisco.com/10t3Auru1EG6R5kMLxuF0PKLTB8SI8dcCj8SHZ3eYKezTmH-3it2BEEHj7WJyFwEsS0_Pc4L2V6gWvA7IPzBVH2fz68sYa_gCZp-ALJPA4DJkkTAwcEK7VABSQMRFDWr4pB6vDD6NZZAU7u5YQdhr_IPREsctwbPncK7rMGf4fcs8YCCo8MtrQcH1K4jbp0SVSzav3HcXrgM1w6neGXDH-I_Kiy8IXroXmXa3fMlFxfZWV1rJAd7LcYf89lzfDtEnW-sTj5-UmvxTbscyEyS5SuQp6fCmGm4aDla8zlnkFVH1qZ2MVkVKC3B0YF64-H/https%3A%2F%2Flaphampeakfriends.org%2F2023-nemahbin-spring%2F</a> , and honestly ask yourself if it is appropriate for people with crossbows to be in the background of this scene. In conclusion, the proposal to introduce bowhunting in Lapham Peak State Park is deeply troubling. It goes against the very nature of what the park represents and risks alienating the families and individuals who have long seen it as a safe haven for nature exploration and donated their time and money for decades to build it into what it is. I urge you to reconsider this decision and preserve the character of Lapham Peak as a place for peaceful, family-oriented activities. Thank you for considering my perspective on this important issue. If I'm misunderstanding anything, I would be eager to learn more. I would also be interested in hearing about further opportunities to have my voice or vote heard on this issue.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
113	<p>I am writing in regard to the proposed rule change which would open portions of the Lapham Peak unit of Kettle Moraine State Forest to bow hunting. I am firmly opposed to the proposed rule change and believe that it would pose a significant threat to public safety in one of the most heavily accessed pieces of public land in southeast Wisconsin. I personally access Lapham Peak as a cross country skier, hiker, and runner. As one of the only locations in the region that produces man made snow, the trails at Lapham Peak attract skiers from across the region - as the parking lot pushed past capacity each winter weekend can attest. Hunters certainly should have access to some public lands, but this is not an area that makes sense given its current heavy use.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
114	<p>I am a mom of two school aged kids and a dog who loves hiking. We frequent Lapham peak a lot. Mostly fall and winter. It's the closest state park/forest to us. I feel that allowing any kind of hunting on Lapham grounds would be very Dangerous. It is a very popular park all year round. It's actually one of the few places I go during most of the hunting season because I know there isn't any allowed. So many people don't wear orange or bright colors as it is on hunting grounds so I feel if you allowed hunting there's a large potential for injuries. If it's popular control your looking at couldn't you allow a weekend or two for hunting only? Also there's usually a lot of events at Lapham on weekends in the fall and winter and again a lot of city folk come out and aren't aware of what dangers could be out there (even with signs I see it a lot actually during hunting season on lands used for hunting). Again please don't allow any hunting at Lapham. Keep it safe for us who are running out of safe places to hike!</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

115	I am thankful that Lapham Peak is one of the state parks I love that I can feel safe hiking at because there is no hunting allowed. Please reconsider this plan to allow bow hunting there. There should be some parks residents can go to that do not allow hunting whatsoever. Some of the proposed areas you could allow hunting in are very close to where my elderly mom and I love to hike and I would have to choose to go elsewhere during that hunting season. That would be very disappointing and sad. As someone who buys a state park pass every year and supports parks in other ways, I hope you consider where I am coming from.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
116	hi- I live in New Berlin. I see lapham peak as a sanctuary to wildlife and a wonderful location to hike. I absolutely do not agree with allowing any hunting. I love seeing the deer looking relaxed and enjoying the land. I appreciate being able to hike in a safe quiet place. Please leave lapham peak 100% hunting free.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
117	I'm a diehard xc skier at Lapham and a diehard bowhunter as well. The proposed allowing of hunting at a portion of Lapham sounds like a dream come true!	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
118	Hello, I have been informed that there is a proposal to allow hunting at Lapham Peak. As a neighbor of the park, I feel this is a bad idea for safety reasons. The park is heavily utilized by people of all ages as well as dogs. People hike, walk, and ski in the park all the time and allowing hunting doesn't seem to be a safe mix. Also, we are long time residents directly on the west side of the park (red parcel outlined below). Our house is very close to the park boundary (indicated with red asterisk), which is also a safety concern as we also have young children and a dog. Allowing hunting that close to properties/houses such as ours also doesn't seem safe. Last, there's a trail in the park that is not shown on the map. I indicated it in blue. This trail gets used a lot by people in neighboring properties. To summarize, there are so many recreational uses and trails in the park, and properties/houses such as ours directly adjacent to the park, that allowing hunting in any form does not seem safe.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
119	I wish to express my concern for opening parts of Lapham Peak, with my biggest concern being the east side. I spend many weekend hours running the trails in preparation for trail races. Even with blaze orange, there is risk of being injured when hunting and hiker/runner/skier areas are overlapped. I encourage the DNR to look for creative solutions that will keep all recreation activities safe, including scaling down the proposal, limiting to weekdays and limited hours when the park is less active.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
120	I understand there is a plan or proposal under consideration to open Lapham Peak to bow hunters. <u>I am going to highly, highly discourage this. Reason for this is for safety.</u> I have been using Lapham Peak for at least 10 years for recreational running and hiking. I've been skiing there for the past 5 years. There is too much hiking and running traffic that goes through the extensive set of hiking trails on a regular basis. If bow hunting is allowed, that puts the running and hiking community at enormous risk. I go there to hike, and I've gone there to run. I go there to get away from the problems of the world and to reconnect with nature and relieve stress. The last thing on my mind is to have to dodge arrows from a bow hunter. I can't state enough the amount of danger this proposal would place upon the hikers and the runners of Lapham Peak. Once again, there is too much hiking and running traffic that goes through the extensive set of hiking trails on a regular basis.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
121	DNR. Please do not allow bow hunting at Lapham Peak. There are so many, many pedestrians on the trail and the presence of hunters would turn people away. Also the mere presence of a hunter would mar the experience of those who chose to use the trail.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
122	I am a resident of the Town of Delafield. My understanding is that the DNR has proposed that hunting be permissible at Lapham Peak during bow hunting season. I am writing to express my concern and disapproval of this proposal. Lapham Peak is a high traffic, recreational park that is family-friendly. I have three school-aged children, and we often hike Lapham's trails during the fall. If bow hunting were allowed, I would not feel comfortable walking through the trails, let alone bringing my children to do so. Please consider alternatives to managing the deer population.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

123	I am in Greendale, WI, and I oppose opening Lapham Peak for bow hunting. I grew up hunting in Bayfield county, and while I appreciate the sport, it does not belong so close to an active hiking and skiing area.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
124	As a frequent user of the trails at Lapham Peak, I am dismayed to read a proposal to allow bow hunting in the park, and I write this email to express my concerns. I am one of the founders and group leaders of the Waukesha chapter of Trail Sisters, a national group aimed at getting women outdoors and on trails for running and hiking. Our group is over 1,000 members strong, rivaling the size of Trail Sisters chapters in famed trail cities like Boulder, CO. Safety is a huge topic of conversation and concern in our group, and hunting season is always a subject of confusion due to the various times and places that public lands and trails are open to hunters. While we have lots of discussions about wearing blaze orange during hunting season, many women fear that isn't enough and simply avoid all trails open to hunters for the entirety of the hunting season (i.e., not just gun season). However, Lapham Peak has always been an easy choice for safety because no hunting is allowed. Our chapter frequently meets at Lapham Peak for group runs. It is always our choice for one of our most popular meetups, the "Veterans and Newbies" run, where we pair new trail runners with a seasoned trail runner to help take the intimidation out of running on and exploring trails. Lapham has always felt like a safe and welcoming place, particularly for women who are new to trail running and hiking. We also have our "BYOK" (bring your own kid) hikes there - family friendly meetups aimed at giving moms of younger kids some outdoor time with their kids and other moms. But I fear that by opening the park to bow hunters it will take away that sense of safety that we all have there. I come from a family that hunts, and I myself own a bow and love the sport. But there are plenty of already existing options for hunting right here in Waukesha County and the surrounding areas. Adding Lapham Peak to the mix seems unnecessary, and it could really take away what so many of us love about that park: a sense of safety and security. Thank you for the opportunity to voice these concerns. If you would like to discuss this further or have any questions, please reach out to me at your convenience.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
125	As an avid xcountry skier, I can honestly say that my two favorite things about skiing at Lapham peak are the owls and the deer. There are two owls that hoot as dusk settles in the main forest by the magic carpet ride. Ask anyone. And then there are white tailed deer that roam around. Always timid but always there. They grow thick hair during winter. They peek out at us skiers wondering what we are doing. They are a part of what little natural escape we urban dwellers have in SEWI. Let the bow hunters go north a bit. There is no true need for them to be hunting in a carved out recreation area that is already crowded and held dear by so many in this area. Thank you for considering this plea —no bow hunting in Lapham Peak.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
126	I strongly disagree with allowing hunting in Lapham Peak State Park. I am an avid ice age trail hiker. During hunting season I only hike in Lapham Peak to be safe. Please leave one area completely free of hunters !	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
127	I am writing in support of some particular proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45 during this public-comment period, specifically the retraction or revision of <b>NR 45.13(1)(e)</b> , which prohibits rock climbing within most (Wisconsin) State Natural Areas (SNAs). I believe that such dramatic prohibition is unwarranted and lacks precedent when compared to other forms of recreation within SNAs. What's more, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation and engages with the DNR on stewardship initiatives at a far greater rate than many user groups. With appropriate regulations, education, and infrastructure in place, rock climbing need not be incompatible with conservation; thus, the use of a special regulation (beyond what applies to other recreational activities) is unwarranted and unnecessary. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code could be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking; doing so would effectively mitigate the impacts of the climbing community and work towards a consistent ethic of land use that is shared among user groups. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.

128	<p>I live very near the Lapham peak unit. I would like to give my full support to opening bow hunting for deer and turkey hunting. There is a lot of concern about bow hunting being dangerous, but it is from a select few misinformed people who don't have proper education around the topic. As a bow hunter myself, I understand the need to control the overabundance in the population, especially since harvest numbers are way down. The first point I would like to bring to attention is the need for a hunter safety course for all hunters purchasing a license as stated in the Wisconsin hunting regulations. An important practice is applying TABK when hunting. Knowing your target and what is beyond is a basic part of hunter safety. Combined with the fact that most all deer are harvested from within 40 yards, usually 20 yards, there should be no confusion for hunters. Regarding stray shots, even hunters shooting from ground level won't see their arrow go more than 50 yards before hitting dirt. A majority of hunters like to hunt from elevation, meaning they are shooting at the ground. There shouldn't be a need for non hunters to wear blaze orange as bow hunters themselves will be wearing camouflage. As we already addressed, identifying the target and beyond isn't difficult at such short ranges, so there isn't a need. It should be encouraged for non hunters to wear bright colors as it provides more safety, but it isn't a big concern. Obviously, hunters will follow all regulations and wear orange during gun season unless otherwise stated by dnr. Some concerns about hunters being near others may be brought up by others. As far as the map indicates, it seems that most of the hunting area is in the low traffic areas of the unit. As far as I understand, most of the unit is still restricted for heavy traffic areas. Again, some of these concerns may be from misinformed viewpoints. Another quickly refuted point is people's concern for their dogs. Dogs should be on leash at all times during the bow season and turkey season. Otherwise, just don't allow coyote to be harvested and there would be no confusion. If it is a big concern, another option people have is to get high visibility dog collars, jackets, etc. An effort should be taken by hikers to avoid hunters regardless. Same situation with any other animals, for example horse riding. People should keep their animals in their control, but also rest assured that bow hunters are not going to confuse them with deer or turkey. On approval, a suggestion might be to educate the misinformed and non hunting community to reassure them about allowing bow hunting. It is very safe and the community who uses bows are well versed in hunting regulations. Hunters are still required to carry all items out of the woods that they brought in on that day. I would suggest allowing hunters to leave just trail cameras as an exception to the rule. If population is really a concern, allowing ladder stands to be left up would be very helpful, especially if anyone could use them. There has been similar deer management efforts in the area that place ladder stands out for hunters to use. Thank you for considering allowing bow hunting on this unit. Since Lapham is in Waukesha, extended archery should also apply, making the season end on Jan 31st. I look forward to being able to use the property for the remainder of the season once approved.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
129	<p>this is a test...</p>	<p>We have received your email. Please let us know if you have any comments on the proposed administrative rule package. More information can be found here: <a href="https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/parks/codechanges">https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/parks/codechanges</a>.</p>
130	<p>Farmers are becoming old and there does not seem to be much interest from the younger generation so when the older farmers die the farmland will also die. Which means Wisconsin will be one large city and all of the green spaces (except for parks) will be gone. Air quality and water quality will be much worse than it is today. Farmers still get more \$\$\$ for the land than for the crops. Does any "human person read this"? Thank You</p>	<p>Yes, I read the public comments submitted to this mailbox. At this time, we are soliciting comments on proposed changes to Wisconsin Administrative Rules, package PR-03-20. Thank you for your comment, it will be included in the record of public comments on these proposed changes.</p>
131	<p>We write you in opposition to the proposal for deer hunting in portions of Lapham Peak State Park. We oppose the proposed four month period for bow hunting in LPSP and some of the areas in the Park. We submit these comments prior to your Dec. 10 deadline. We live just outside the Park boundaries, south on Cushing Park Road. We walk into the south end of the Park west of Hwy C every day using the Paul Sandgren Trail. We walk the trails throughout the Park from the south end to the north end. This portion of the Park is largely prairie and we do not encounter many deer west of Hwy C as we encounter many more deer east of Hwy C. The hunting area should be focused on the area that has the most deer, and that is east of Hwy C. I do not want to unknowingly walk into the hunting area of hunters who will be hidden and I can't see, and interrupt their hunting. I don't want to walk in front of a loaded crossbow. The proposed four month hunting season includes the whole Fall season when many people enjoy the Park. This is too much to ask to give up the best time of the year. I strongly suggest the hunting season be limited to the last two weeks of the season in late December and January. I also note there is no area for hunters to park cars and trucks along Cushing Park Road and the adjacent Town Roads. There is no shoulder area to get a car off CPR for safe parking. The Town of Delafield has posted these local roads as no parking. In summary, the proposal has too big of an impact on other users of the Park, west of Hwy C and for the entire Fall season. Please remove these areas from the proposal.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

132	<p>While the excess deer population in Lapham Peak State Park is a problem significant enough to warrant a solution, opening the park to public hunting would be a bigger problem. As a frequent user of and volunteer at the park I have witnessed both the abundance, even excess of deer as well as people in the park on a daily basis. The volume of people in all areas of this relatively small, but heavily visited park is constant and large. It would be a mistake, and quite possibly a tragedy to have public hunting for almost one third of every year. This would cause certain animosity, fear, and the high chance of an accidental shooting. This is all completely preventable at no loss of hunting habitat to the public. A far more efficient, uncontroversial and safer option would be to allow limited deer harvesting by professional hunters. This has been done in towns and counties across the country and would be more likely to solve the deer overpopulation problem than would permitting public hunting in one of the state's busiest and smaller state parks. I would urge the DNR to continue the current policy of not permitting public hunting in Lapham Peak State Park.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
133	<p>Good morning, I'm writing to oppose the plan to open sections of Lapham Peak to bow hunting. As a hunter, a father of three young children, and a frequent visitor of Lapham Peak, I do not believe your plan ensures all users could safely enjoy all the park has to offer. If the plan is approved, I'm concerned I would not feel safe in certain sections of the park. Therefore, your plan is a direct contradiction of your mission that you will support "the well being of our citizenry." To consider offering that there would be plenty of other places in the park to visit it is not a suitable solution. That being said, I would consider supporting the plan if it only included areas of the park that are not designated for other purposes. I appreciate you taking the time to review my concerns.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
134	<p>Hello Wisconsin DNR, Thank you for recognizing that there is a deer overpopulation problem in Lapham Peak State Park and the surrounding areas of the City of Delafield and the Town of Delafield. I live in the City of Delafield off of Cushing Park Road just south of I-94. We have deer in our yard and our adjacent neighbors' yards several times per week, probably every night while we are asleep and unaware. We see them quite often while driving along Cushing Park Road in either direction, especially during the rut season in the fall. We definitely support the need to reduce the herd to keep them healthy and reduce the damage they cause to our landscaping. But I am opposed to the current proposal to allow bow hunting in LPSP for the full length of the bow hunting season. I am also opposed to allowing hunters in the NW area of the park that is prairie and contains a portion of the IAT and the Paul Sandgren paved recreational trail along the western boundary of the park. I walk my dog in the prairie almost daily. It is a high use area for hikers, bikers, and even horses. It is an open area where I rarely see deer, except in the early morning. Also, there are deer stands for bow hunting just to the north in the Dela-Hart sanitation land for bow hunting already. That area is not open for recreation, especially mixed recreation, and seems a more suitable location. I feel the deer go to the wooded area of the park east of Hwy C when people are using the park, especially southeast area that is a lower use area (the area that contains the IAT from the tower to Hwy 18). Again, it is a challenge of keeping people safe and harvesting a sufficient number of deer to make a difference. I would be open to a shorter hunting season in the park or even closing the park entirely for a short period of time to allow hunting. I am not an expert, so I don't know what the solution is. I feel we have not had much success in reducing the herd in the City of Delafield with just two areas to hunt. Would hunters need to apply for a nuisance tag? Would there be set designated stands and signage about these stands around a shooting radius? How would this be regulated and the public made sufficiently aware of the hunters in the area? Thank you for taking steps to address this issue and for listening to our concerns. It is a balancing act!</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
135	<p>While I understand the need to thin the deer population at Lapham Peak, this is also a frequented park for day use winter activities. My family regularly cross country skis this park and even with restricted areas I would not risk bringing my children to a space where hunting is active. The risk of confusion for where hunting is allowed and where it is not is too great, and the possibility of lethal outcomes too high of a risk to implement the plan in this manner. Please consider closing the park to all except hunters for more limited amounts of time in order to achieve the goal of reducing the deer population.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
136	<p>Please be advised that as a frequent user of Lapham Peak State Park for recreational walking and hiking through the numerous pedestrian trails, I am totally opposed to hunting being permitted at Lapham Peak. I wish to continue full access to the park for non-hunting, recreational purposes. I do not wish to be worried about being hit by an arrow during my recreational activities with my children and at Lapham Peak Park. Please close the park and allow professional marksman using rifles to cull the deer herd if that is necessary. Bow and arrow hunting is an inhumane method of reducing the herd. Arrows may injure rather than kill animals, especially when it is done by amateurs. I have a season pass and use the park 2 to 3 times weekly for hiking exercise for my health. I will not use the park during any when hunting of any kind is taking place. It is unfair to purchase a season pass to use the park and then find that it cannot be used for a period of months because risky activity is being permitted.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

137	I believe bow hunting would be a safe and cost effective way to manage the deer population in the park. I am an avid cross country skier and do not feel safety would be an issue.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
138	I'm very concerned about the idea of hunting at Lapham Peak! I walk there on many trails several times a week. If there is hunting I'll certainly need to find another safe place to hike/walk. It's very disappointing that this is being considered. Please reconsider your plans.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
139	Please do not open Lapham Peak to general public bow hunting. I have always known Lapham Peak as a place where hunting was not allowed and it was safe to hike the trails. Perhaps to cull the deer, the DNR could have a very short duration hunt with the public well informed, i.e maybe close the park for a day or two.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
140	I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45 during this public-comment period, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
141	Lapham Peak Hunting As a frequent user of the park facilities at Lapham Peak, I am opposed to opening up the park to bow hunting. The season coincides with what is usually a busy season for those who ski and for hikers. Please do not endanger those who...	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
142	Please do not allow hunting at Lapham. I use the trails a ton and I am already limited as to what is available when cross country season starts. Also, the cross country skiing is a vital part of the Lapham culture during the winter. It is a huge draw and even through I don't ski, I enjoy watching all the people that utilize the trails.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
143	I live in Delafield. We have been alerted that the DNR is considering a proposal allowing BOW hunting at Lapham Peak park. I personally walk the park daily using both sides of HWY C and have done so for over 23 years: sometimes on the Ice Age Trail or using ski trails when season permits access. I also have a disabled daughter who uses the paved trails frequently. School groups make heavy use of the park during the time frame proposed for bow hunting season. ALLOWING ANY TYPE OF HUNTING AT THE PARK WOULD ENDANGER HUMAN LIFE. In addition, it would disrupt the peacefulness that comes only with exposure to the beauty nature provides. I would invite you or your loved ones to take a stroll through the trails knowing there were hunters out there gunning for deer. There HAS to be a better way to control the deer population in the park besides using bows (or bullets). I beg you to reject this misguided idea.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

144	I am writing to express my concern that deer hunting may be opened at a highly trafficked state park with many hikers involved. The Ice Age trail runs right through the area where hunting will be allowed. There will not be any extensive background or skill test for these archers who wish to enjoy the outdoors in this way. Thus, I urge that we retain the ban on hunting at Lapham Peak and allow for hunting in other designated areas.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
145	I was a long time resident of Waukesha, WI and have used Lapham Peak for 30 years. This park is unique in that the intensity of use by pedestrians (walkers, hikers, and visitors), skiers, bikers, and snowshoers is very high, and the density of people per square foot in the park is much higher than other nearby areas (e.g. John Muir, Nordic, or Scuppernong trails or Ottawa area). Allowing hunting of any kind while the park is used for other activity is an ultra hazardous activity. That is, it cannot be made safe. If hunting must be done, I respectfully suggest hunting at times the park is closed (night to dawn) or to close the park on low visitor days, such as weekly on a Monday or Wednesday, and allow hunting then. Lake County, Illinois Forest Preserves controls its deer population by doing its own, non-public nighttime hunting on designated dates. I would suggest you contact them to see if you could adopt that model because it works well here.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
146	To whome it may concern: I am deeply against this proposal that affects especially people who use the sun to ease the pain and emotional stress of past experiences both physical and emotional! I personally deal with anxiety and depression and being out in nature with the sun shining on me and the wind blowing through me eases my anxiety to the point that my troubles are non existent, no pills no alcohol nothing but pure natural remedies! I have been a Naturist/ nudist for many many years, we gather in non sexual friendships to achieve one common goal and that is to be accepted as we are! I have NEVER met a angry nudist we are accepting of all regardless of size, color, sexual orientation or religion beliefs I do believe that this world needs so badly. Please don't pass these bills it will only be a regression in evolution of kindness and decency 🙏. Thank you for listening.	The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.
147	I belong to the New Fane Kettle Riders Snowmobile Club and have enjoyed usage of the trail system through the NKM Forest for many years! As a snowmobiler & trail maintenance individual, I would appreciate the benefit of the trail the way things r presently! Thank you for your service & support over the years	Comment is noted and has been entered into the record.
148	As a regular hiker and skier at Lapham, I am concerned for the safety of those like myself if hunting is allowed. I am also concerned that if there is hunting it will discourage visits to the park for hiking. I generally don't go to a park if hunting is ongoing even if not in the sections of the park where I am active. The more we can encourage active living as weather starts to cool the better. I understand the overpopulation issue so perhaps a shorter window of time for hunting could be an acceptable compromise	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
149	Strongly disagree with the idea of bow hunting on Lapham Peak Grounds. Way to many people in the park for this to be a safe venture for all involved. OVER 1,000 people average daily in the park. All trails have to much foot traffic for this to be a reasonable proposition. Very little impact on skiing with most done on man-made at this time of year that coincides with hunting season if skiing is possible at all. Much more appropriate on the other many open areas in the Southern Kettle. If deer herd managment is necessary there are other more managed ways th an open bow hunting.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
150	Making nudity illegal on state lands is a violation of the rights of your state's citizens. Nudity is harmless to children, and multiple studies have found that it is in-fact beneficial for the development of children. I will not stand by and watch people who want to restrict the rights of hone st working folks, all to capitalize on rage for culture war clout. I strongly oppose these ame ndments, and I think you should too.	The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.
151	We cherish Lapham Peak during hunting season as it is the only safe place to hike without worrying about becoming a target for hunters. Please do not open Lapham Peak to bow hunting! Lapham Peak is the second most used State Park. There should be enough revenue coming in to hire sharp shooters. Designate specife times and dates for sharp shooters to decrease the deer population.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

152	<p>Just yesterday I said to a friend that I loved my autumn and early winter hikes at Lapham Peak because I do not have to worry about being hit by a bullet or an arrow. Then I heard about this consideration. Allowing bow hunting from mid-September through early January would make hiking at Lapham Peak wildly dangerous. Folks with large dogs would have to avoid that park - absolutely. Lapham Peak State Park is rather small - <i>but it is the most visited park in the state</i>. Its proximity to Milwaukee is the reason why. From the proposal, there would be "open season" for 1/3 of each year. That's far too long. It interferes with all the way Lapham Peak serves people in a wide variety of ways. Lapham Peak is a big draw to cross-country skiers who use the park to train for the Birkebeiner Ski Race. With their snow-making equipment, skiers can and do train for many weeks - many of which would be in your bow hunters' season. They won't be willing to risk injury while training. While I fully understand and support the role of responsible hunting to help control the deer herd, bow hunting at Lapham - especially as proposed - is not appropriate. As a member of the City of Delafield's Common Council, I am also concerned about the strong negative impact unregulated bow hunting will have on our downtown businesses. Right now our city benefits measurably by the revenues generated via hunger hikers and skiers. The City of Delafield allows both gun and bow hunting in specified areas around the city. The DNR would be wise to contact our Deer Management Committee and find out how we do it. Please reconsider your options. Do not declare "open season" on Lapham Peak.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
153	<p>I am against the anti nudity law, I enjoy nudity and others do also.Repeal the anti nudity law!!!</p>	<p>The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.</p>
154	<p>I echo these concerns. There are constantly hikers on the trails and do not want hunters allowed. Please DO NOT allow bow hunting at Lapham Peak</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
155	<p>I'd just like to note by opposition to bow hunting in Lapham Peak. The park is an enormous resource for xc skiing and the only park in the State that offers reliable skiing. The park is at capacity most December weekends and could not accommodate an additional use. I'm all for bow hunting but would encourage hunting at any number of parks which don't offer man-made snow.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
156	<p>I believe that bow hunting should be allowed in the designated areas of Lapham Peak. Allowing hunting to PAY to harvest deer to lower population numbers would be more fiscally responsible than the state PAYING bow-sharshooters to cull. I believe archery only in this area is the way to go. Thank you for making a common sense proposal to increase access to publicly owned lands!</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
157	<p>Us hikers already loose the majority of the park due to fake snow and cross country skiing. This would be more denied access to a place many people visit regularly. The accommodation for the entitled is getting ridiculous.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
158	<p>I support limited bow deer hunting at Lapham Peak—their needs to a balance with safety and other rec opportunities. There are too many deer at that location and they are preventing natural regeneration of the forest. Eventually, they will destroy their food source and starvation and disease will happen.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
159	<p>Hello, I am voicing my opposition to allowing public bow hunting in Lapham Peak. My property directly abuts the park and I am concerned for the safety of my family and friends who regularly use the park. I understand that the deer population must be controlled, but it shouldn't be at the cost of public safety. My 17 year old son uses the Lapham Peak park trail system on a regular basis to train for cross country and track. I don't feel comfortable knowing there are hunters with bows in the same area where he would be running. I also wouldn't feel comfortable enjoying my backyard knowing that an errant arrow could go flying by. When my son got a bow as a gift I thought about setting up a target in my back yard to practice, but decided against it because I feared that it would pose a risk to the hikers in the park. Now I would have to worry about arrows</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>



	coming from the park. Geocaching and orienteering activities taking the public off trail I think also introduce the risk of a hunting accident happening. There has to be a safer way to control the deer population. I can replace property damaged by deer, but I can't replace my son.	
160	I strongly object to the proposed bow hunting or any hunting at Lapham Peak. I visit Lapham Peak many times a year and have participated in events there as well. I appreciate the fact that I feel safe while hiking or walking my dog there year round because there is NO hunting allowed. I cannot say this about Waukesha County parks like Nagawaukee which I stay away from during hunting seasons. Sadly, It is just a matter of time before someone mistakenly shoots a dog or person instead of a deer in these public places where hunters are allowed at the same time when people are enjoying parks. Lapham Peak is a heavily used park, especially in fall and winter, and I do not think it would be prudent to allow hunting in this park any time of year. If this is approved, I would definitely avoid the park during times when hunting is allowed. There is enough other land in SE WI for hunters to kill deer and turkeys on. A better solution might be a building moratorium or more land conservancies supporting land for wildlife preservation instead of land being taken away from them by suburban sprawl or put out a feeding station with their natural foods if you are concerned about them starving.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
161	I am sending an email to express my concerns about allowing bow hunting at Lapham Peak State Forest. My husband and I enjoy walking the beautiful trail and we do not want to be walking when and if hunting is allowed. It sure doesn't sound too safe. I also don't want to witness an injured deer while I am enjoying the beautiful trails.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
162	As a frequent hiker of Lapham Peak I am strongly opposed to the idea of bow hunting. Lapham Peak is one of the very few places to go where hikers don't have to be worried about getting shot at. Lapham is a very busy, family friendly park. NO reason hunters need to go there. I will not be going there if bow hunting is permitted.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
163	Comments: As a long time resident of Waukesha, and a frequent year round user of Lapham Peak for trail running, hiking, and snow shoeing, I'm adamantly opposed to the proposed change to s. NR 45.13(18), Wis. Admin. Code, which would allow the WDNR to designate areas where hunting deer and turkeys with archery equipment, but not with firearms or airguns, is allowed. As one of many that cherish Lapham Peak State Park for its diversity of terrain, flora and fauna, and as a safe bastion to explore and commune with nature, the introduction of hunting would significantly diminish such attributes. The proposed encroachment of hunting in close proximity to current recreational uses threatens the tranquility for and the safety of those engaged in such activities. In due consideration of such factors and the fact that there are numerous areas open for hunting, I urge you to maintain the sanctity of Lapham Peak State Park as an area where one can continue to visit year round without the stress and concern for personal safety, which would otherwise accompany the allowance of hunting.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
164	Comments: I hope this does not happen. Lapham is a very busy park with hikers and skiers. I think it would be unsafe and also a terrible place to hunt.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
165	Dear DNR, your proposal for 5 months of bow hunting deer in the above park is not an acceptable plan. You are interrupting the purpose and mission of this suburban wildlife area for almost a half year. You are taking away from ordinary people, the use of this sanctuary. You are not following your own tenets. If you must hunt deer in the area, you must consider human use as well. Establish two weeks in fall and two in winter for bow hunting. Monitor numbers of deer eliminated during each hunt. Only then, consider your options. Keep the area residents fully informed of your progress. A scientific approach that involves the area residents is best utilized under the circumstances.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
166	I understand the need to thin out the herd in Lapham Peak Park but I think this is a bad idea. To many people walking dogs, hiking, riding and I really don't want to see gut piles in the park.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will

		pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
167	We are neighbors who live next to Cushing Park's western border, and have enjoyed the natural beauty of the park, including Lapham Peak since moving here 21 years ago. I understand the ramifications of overpopulation deer herds on the natural habitat and road hazards to drivers, but I am against opening the park up for normal archery season for deer and turkeys in 2024. Although I believe there should be a culling period for the park's excess deer and turkey, I don't believe that opening it up to normal hunting parameters is rational, safe or timely. I would rather see an assignment of professional / qualified bow hunters (in designated areas as listed) set up with specific times of harvesting that are less invasive and safer than "open" bow hunting. This would be more precise, trackable and timely for herd reductions and less impactful to unaware park hikers and visitors. I believe a shorter period of time, possibly two weeks in late October, would be best for all parties involved in this wonderful park.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
168	There are too many deer in the area and they should be reduced. You could do something like they do at Nashota Park, where they open at one week for bow hunting.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
169	We support the proposed limited bow hunting of deer at Lapham Peak. Our property borders the state of WI Wales School property and it is a short hike along the old Ice Age Trail to the Tower at Lapham. We have major issues with the deer population including ticks (my husband and I have both had Lyme disease multiple times despite dressing carefully, tick spray, etc), thousands of dollars of damage to landscaping and higher than normal potential for accidents (we have personally had several close calls) on Hwy C. We have also had deer come down next to our home foaming at the mouth potentially a result of chronic wasting disease. We have hiked for many years with no issues in Southern Kettle Moraine where hunting is permitted. We use Lapham regularly for hiking and look forward to the same experience there.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
170	There aren't many safe places for anyone or anything (animals) due to development etc. While intentions to restrict sound good; our present society needs to little advisement. Please add NO to the vote.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
171	Hi there. I am NOT in favor of bow hunting at Lapham Peak. Lapham Peak is a core community recreation place and hunting of any kind would be disruptive. Imagine the unfortunate accidental events that co-locating hunters and non-hunters (and their companions) in the same place.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
172	Deer hunting in the State Park is a crazy idea. Who wants to visit a state park with the chance of being killed with an arrow. What are you thinking?	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
173	I am writing to respectfully request that options other than hunting be used to control/curb the deer population at Lapham Peak. I am a frequent recreational user (hiker/cross country skier) at Lapham Peak. Anytime I visit Lapham Peak I find other people on the hiking and skiing in all areas of the park trails, not just in the areas close to buildings, campsites, etc. I have read that Lapham Peak is one of the most heavily visited state parks in WI with an estimated 600,000 people using the park each year. My experience as a frequent visitor there is that Lapham Peak has way too much foot traffic to allow hunters to access the park safely. Allowing hunters into Lapham Peak is a reckless action and an accident waiting to happen. On a personal note, I hike with my 80 lb. Goldendoodle Farley who has the size and coloring of a deer. I have noticed that Archery hunting season is currently runs from mid September through the first week in January - if hunting is allowed Lapham Peak will be unsafe for recreational users for approximately 4 months out of the year. I would definitely not feel safe using the park during Archery Season which effectively closes Lapham Peak to this citizen and other citizens like me for a significant amount of time each year. For the reasons listed above I am imploring that Lapham Peak not be opened for hunting at anytime of the year.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

174	Too many deer not many Spring ephemeral wild flowers no wolves or cougars in park main predator is Hwy 83 traffic I see two dead deer a month there All hunters I know are ethical	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
175	I live in Delafield WI 53018. Where I live now, I consider Lapham Peak our family's "backyard." I grew up in Delafield, right off of Cushing Park Road. Growing up, going to Lapham Peak and hiking to the observation tower was a year-round activity. Now that I'm back in Delafield, I am so happy to visit Lapham Peak. Currently, I walk/run/hike Lapham Peak a few times a week. The beauty of Lapham Peak is that it is a wonderful way to get back to nature-I have a sense of peace there. I take my daughter hiking in Lapham Peak. I see my neighbors taking their dogs on the trails at all hours of the day. By allowing bow hunting, I would lose that sense of peace. While my family participates in bow hunting in a safe manner, I do not trust other people to do the same. Especially in an area where we utilize the trails so frequently in the northwest region. Additionally, the city of Delafield offers permits to bowhunters, in fact, my dad has one. Last week, I saw a gentleman loading up a deer he had shot on city of Delafield property, less than a mile away from Lapham Peak. I am comfortable with this because Lapham Peak is currently off limits. At the very least, please do not allow hunting on the northwest region of Lapham Peak. There are too many trails, too many people, too many dogs that would be put in danger.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
176	I've recently learned about the proposal of bow hunting to the area of Lapham Peak. Please reconsider this. Lapham Peak is such a heavily used park in which tons of people use the trails regularly and can feel safe doing so. There are more than enough hunting options available and us runners and hikers shouldn't have to feel at risk due to the overlap. We should get to enjoy a space without having to wear bright colors and trust hunters to not accidentally cause us accidental moving targets injury or even potential death. We already have to be very mindful for the majority of other trails that allow hunting, please let us keep one worry free safe space. If you want further input or contact feel free to contact me. I use Lapham Peak trails as my primary training grounds for races due to the beautiful sights, nature, and challenging terrain and it gives me great stress thinking I may need to rely on the judgement of others with weapons for my own safety on these trails that are so close to my heart.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
177	I amend my original comments that I submitted in my first email msg. Now I understand the proposal would allow bow hunting within all Park areas west of Hwy C. I oppose the proposal as it is too broad and will have the most impact on other Park users for too long, for the proposed four month period. The highest concentration of deer are found east of Hwy C and this is the area where the hunting should take place. There are too few places for hunters to locate on the west side of Hwy C without conflicting with the numerous other Park users. We don't want to unknowingly walk in front of the hunters and their weapons. We don't want to give up our enjoyment of the Park for four months including the entire Fall season. I suggest you limit the hunting to the last two weeks of the season. There are no parking areas along Cushing Park Road and the adjacent Town roads, except the very north end with the very limited parking lot, usually full with hikers. Please pare down this proposal as it is too broad and has the maximum impact on other Park users west of Hwy C. I believe we have a coyote problem, not a deer problem. NOTE: See comment #131 for commenter's original submission.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
178	Please...no bow hunting in Latham Peak. This is a horrible decision and an accident waiting to happen. Also, the deer need somewhere to stay in this mellow area.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
179	I heard that the DNR is considering opening Lapham Peak to bow deer hunting. Yikes! Terrible idea! I hike Lapham Peak almost every week through all the seasons and know all the trails. It rare that you are ever more than 100 to 200 feet from another trail, they wind and wrap around so much. It's absurd to think this could be safely hunted without an errant arrow endangering hikers. There's plenty of other areas for hunters and other means to cull deer herds if that is truly necessary.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
180	It has come to my attention that the DNR is considering allowing bow hunting at Lapham Peak State park to address the over population of deer. As a long time park user, and currently a member of the Friends of Lapham Peak, I do not want to see hunting of any kind allowed on that land. This would effectively eliminate the multitude of uses by thousands of non hunters every year. How? Because I do not believe the DNR could manage the regulations and behaviors of hunter adequately, safely, and effectively. It would be unsafe for other visitors to enjoy the park during the very long bow season. There are many ways to manage a deer herd with allowing the randomness of public hunting to intrude into that space. Please consider those options and study their effectiveness before surrendering the land to a few to enjoy, and eliminating as a safe place for	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

	children, families, hikers, campers, skiers etc.	
181	I am in complete shock the DNR is even considering this! Please stop ruining our state. First the hunting of wolves and bears and now this. My children will be playing next to Bow Hunters?	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
182	Please see my concern about the proposal to allow now hunting at Lapham Peak. While I am concerned about wildlife, I doubt one human injury or death equates to saving a wild turkey or deer. It does not make logical sense to increase the danger level for hikers, skiers, family's and park users of all ages when there are many state lands within 15 minute of Lapham Peak. I officially object to this proposal on the basis of public safety.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
183	I learned recently that the DNR is proposing opening parts of Lapham Peak to bow hunting. I am strongly against this idea! My family and I have hiked, skied and enjoyed the quiet nature at Lapham Peak for decades. My daughters learned to cross country ski there. We go there regularly for years. One of my favorite aspects is feeling safe from hunters. I have hiked in many forests that are open to hunters and have always felt uncomfortable needing to be extra vigilant. Please keep all of Lapham Peak free from hunting.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
184	Please do not allow hunting in Lapham Park. Fall is a favorite time to spend time in the woods and we are very appreciative of WISDNR posting no hunting in select parks. Lapham Park is not only close, but a favorite due to the diversity of trails. During hunting season, we do not visit State Parks that allow hunting. Thank you for considering our thoughts to continue non hunting in Lapham Park.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
185	In regards to the updating of NR 45 it is requested that all snowmobile trail related items for the Northern Kettle Moraine State Forest remain status-quo and unchanged. A strong history of partnership between the DNR and local snowmobile clubs has effectively managed these assets under the current protocols established by the existing Administrative Code. No changes or updates are needed.	Comment is noted and has been entered into the record.
186	I strongly object to this proposal and DO NOT want any part of Lapham Peak open to bow hunting. I have nothing against hunting or hunters but want to keep this urban park gem accessible as is for non-hunting activities,,,hiking, skiing, biking and horseback riding without interference and concern about hunters, We have few places to <b>safely</b> recreate outdoors during hunting seasons. Unlike gun deer season, bow hunting is an extended amount of time. Also, In Syracuse NY where my in laws live, they have a HUGE urban deer problem. They use a very specific and very brief cull period where bow hunters come into the area and take care of business. This method could be employed on several specific days as needed at Lapham Peak with the park closed for a few days rather than dangerous for hikers for a full season, especially during peak beauty of the fall leaves. Thanks for your consideration.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
187	To whom it may concern: This email is to voice my opposition to bow hunting at Lapham Peak. The park sees a huge number of visitors and this will be an unsafe change. While I understand the need to control deer populations, I believe alternative methods should be used.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
188	I think opening Lapham to archery is a great idea and can't wait to utilize this land!! I know a lot of runners/hikers have safety concerns, but I think they are unfounded. As a bow hunter, we don't shoot running animals. We follow rules that we must know what lies beyond our target with the expectation of missing. There is very little public accessible land for hunting and most is private so having this state land available is great for animal population control and future generations of hunting conservation. Arrows from a bow travel a limited distance even in an open field; if it hits a branch it's significantly shorter. I think the risk to people on the trails is very minimal and hope you take these comments into consideration.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

189	<p>I am a frequent runner at Lapham Peak (along with running the IAT and other southeastern WI state parks), and saw the Facebook post about the proposed allowance of bow hunting on certain areas of the park. I fully support this proposal to allow bowhunting, as the majority of the current hiking trails that the public use at Lapham Peak state park are not even going to be impacted by this proposal. The fear mongering of the non-hunting runners &amp; cross country skiers are probably driving a lot of rejection emails, however, if they took the time to see where exactly the proposed areas are, they would realize this is not a big deal, since the trails they are mainly using in the park are in the non-hunting proposed areas. They also likely don't realize that bowhunting is not the same as gun hunting (distance to target is significantly smaller, etc.). That being said, there are a lot of deer &amp; turkey within the park boundaries (population is getting significantly increased with each year), and wildlife population management is a necessity. I hope that this proposal passes, and hope that my email helps push this forward.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
190	<p>Lapham Peak deer hunting- I strongly oppose.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
191	<p>I'm writing in the hopes that you may consider opening the Coulee Experimental Forest in La Crosse County to snowmobile traffic. Several years ago, I reached out to our local representative who informed me that this use is not currently permitted, but that use would be open for public comment in a couple years. I asked to be on the email list for the next time it's opened to the public so that our group could weigh in. This tract of land comprises about 3000 acres of forest that stretches several miles in the heart of La Crosse. As a person responsible for local snowmobile trails and their expansion/maintenance, having 3000 continuous acres in the center of our County/trail system denied snowmobile trail access has made it impossible to build another corridor from our Great River State Trail to points/Counties south. Our clubs are already looking at the bleak future of new snowmobile trails running in the ditches, as more and more properties are broken down for sale or inheritance. Several forests in the state of Wisconsin currently share natural wonders like the Coulee Experimental Forest with other recreational activities like cross-country skiing, hunting, and hiking without incident. The Chequamegon Forest actually holds a giant CC Ski Race every year where the 2 sports play side by side. A trail could easily be planned through this huge forest that doesn't interfere with other uses, and further utilizes this property to another group of people that would enjoy and protect it. Furthermore, the snowmobile clubs help maintain their trail systems, meaning that the other groups could actually benefit from cleaner, more maintained trails. A little about me. I'm the son of a lifelong Barre Mills family. My father and mother have been active in local government their whole lives. My father Gene was even a Barre Mills Town Supervisor for many years until taking a job with the town as their patrolman. I am very active in our local community as a Lions Officer, Barre park board member, and a coach for my children's school sports. I currently hold the positions of La Crosse County Snowmobile Alliance Secretary, and West Salem Table Rock Riders Snowmobile Club President. I grew up on Logging Road. A dead-end road that nearly abuts the Coulee Experimental Forest in the town of Barre. As a child, we'd hunt and horseback the forest, and as an adult, my family still frequents it. It is truly a gem and I'd like nothing better than to expand its use to another hobby that I'm quite passionate about. I've copied our Alliance President Steve Falkenberg on this message as well. Please reach out to any of us with questions you have. We'd love to help!</p> <p>Response from 12/7: Thank you so much Brigit! Any help we can get is greatly appreciated. Yoyi, Paul, and Prichard, Please let us know what we can do to be included in the discussion, and please feel free to reach out to Steve and I as well with any questions. Thank you again for your efforts on getting us on the right path!</p>	<p>Hello and thank you for writing in. While the subject of your email is not contemplated by the package of administrative code proposals currently soliciting comments to this email address, I am passing along your comment to property and program staff on the Coulee Experimental Forest. I do believe also that the property is in the Western Coulees and Ridges ecological landscape that is currently being master planned by the department. I believe there would still be time to propose this as part of the master planning process, and I have copied the planner on this email. More information about the planning process can be found here:  <a href="https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/fl/PropertyPlanning/WesternCouleesAndRidges">https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/fl/PropertyPlanning/WesternCouleesAndRidges</a></p>
192	<p>Lapham peak is the largest outdoor recreational resource for the large populations of Waukesha county and surrounding. Thousands of people including youth sport teams visit every week to hike, enjoy nature, ski, train for other athletic endeavors. This is a place where there should be no hunting.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

193	<p>My name is Kelcy Boettcher, I reside at 834 Criglas Rd, Wales, WI 53183, and I am a life member of the Friends of Lapham Peak. The Friends sent out an email notifying their membership of the proposal by the DNR to open certain areas of Lapham Peak to bow hunting. I visit Lapham Peak on a nearly daily basis, accessing park property via the Ice Age trail south of the property, which is barely a mile from my home, as well as by Lapham Peak's parking lots within the park and the lot off of Cushing Park Rd. I hike at Lapham with my dogs, run at Lapham, ski at Lapham, mountain bike at Lapham, orienteer at Lapham, participate in trail running races and adventure races at Lapham and have covered nearly every square inch of the property, on and off trail. There are far too many deer at Lapham, that is obvious to anyone that uses the property. The deer are not particularly bothered by humans and are overpopulated within Lapham's boundaries. However, bowhunting - and according to the map of the very limited areas of Lapham that will be open to bowhunting - cannot possibly be a viable option to control the deer population in my opinion. Lapham Peak is simply too high use of an area to have animals that have been shot - and not immediately killed - by an arrow. I live with a bowhunter and am aware that even the best hunter does not generally kill an animal instantly with a bow and arrow. Those animals not immediately killed will run - and will run through every part of Lapham, including around and in sight of families that will be horrified by this instance - and must be tracked by the hunter - through every part of Lapham Peak. With the incredibly high population of visitors to Lapham Peak - even in the areas off trail that are proposed to be open to bow hunting - I can only imagine the conflicts of interest and the public outcry this will cause. While I have no experience with land management, would it not be possible to close the park to the public on certain days during the week and allow sharpshooters to manage the population of whitetail deer? Perhaps the deer could be donated to local food pantries and create a more favorable opinion by the public of managing this overpopulation? Thank you for reading my comments and good luck with the management of the overpopulation of whitetail deer at Lapham Peak. I hope you are able to find a viable option.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
194	<p>I do not agree with the proposal to allow bow hunting at Lapham. As one of the most popular hiking and running parks that draws many people, I would think that it would not be a great environment for hunting. There are plenty of areas that are not as populated and draw as many people that allow hunting. I do not see the need to put so many people at risk just for a few hunters. Despite having to be closer to your target and have a good sight line and such, bow hunting is dangerous and an errant arrow can be fatal. I think it was last year that a horse was shot with an arrow in a nearby State Park. A beautiful new shelter is being built to encourage even more people to enjoy what the park has to offer. More people will come and the risk will increase. As soon as someone is hit or killed, I am thinking the park population will drastically decline and we could lose a wonderful escape from the stresses of life and the city just so a few hunters have a 10 minute less drive time to do what they do... I hope one special interest group does not have the power to destroy such a wonderful park...</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
195	<p>I am deeply opposed to any hunting at any time in Lapham Peak State Forest or Park. Over 600,000 people visit the park each year. Over 50,000 visit each month. The western end of Waukesha County, commonly known as Lake Country, is experiencing rapid residential growth. More families and individuals will be accessing the park year-round. Autumn and winter are favorite seasons for many to hike in the park/forest. Asking hikers to wear blaze orange and be on the lookout for hunters is a terrible idea.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
196	<p>Please reject the proposal to open Lapham to hunting. This park is one of the few places where I can count on being safe during the long hunting season for hiking, skiing, and running with my family. Lapham is a great and popular option for us because it's one of the closest state parks to Milwaukee. There are a myriad of other hunting opportunities nearby and this park is in close proximity to homes and is bustling all year. I run all year long on the black loop and ice age, and urge you to keep park regulation as it currently stands.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
197	<p>As a regular visitor to Lapham Peak with my four year old son, I am asking you to reconsider the proposal to allow bow hunting there. I can't believe how close the permitted hunting areas are to the butterfly garden, purple trail loop and other areas that are accessible and appealing to children. We would not be comfortable sharing such close proximity with hunters as we know accidents do happen even when every precaution is taken, and would be sad to miss out on Lapham Peak's beauty and accessibility in the fall. If it must be done for deer control, PLEASE limit the hunting to a short part of the season and communicate the dates very clearly. Lapham Peak is a beautiful, accessible area close to the most densely populated parts of the state. Allowing hunting there does not seem like the way to go.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
198	<p>As a friend of Lapham Peak, I feel that this is a good idea to allow archery hunting in the park in designated areas. Where it would allow it to be done in a safe manner allowing more users of a valuable resource Wisconsin State parks. Everyday Wisconsin deer and hunters lose land to new subdivisions. So by opening up parts of the park to control the growing population of deer, at the same time giving hunters a place to hunt sounds like a great idea.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

199	I am in favor of bow hunting in Lapham Peak State park. I understand the issue with overgrazing and herd health. As a member of the Lapham Peak ski club I'm also concerned with the number of deer that nonchalantly cross trails when I'm flying downhill!	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
200	Please, for the safety of citizens, NO HUNTING of any kind should be allowed within Lapham Peak!!	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
201	For safety, any kind of hunting in Lapham Peak will require closing down the area entirely for the duration of the hunt. Bow hunting indulges the wishes of a few, probably unskilled hunters, for an unproven and probably ineffectual solution to too many deer. I understand the problem of overpopulation of deer, but surely there must be a less dangerous way of solving the problem.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
202	Please...no bow hunting in Latham Peak. This is a horrible decision and an accident waiting to happen. Also, the deer need somewhere to stay in this mellow area.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
203	I am a neighbor of Lapham Peak State Park on the North side off Lapham Peak Rd. Another neighbor next to me advised me of the proposed bow hunting to the park. I have lived here for close to 30 years and I typically feel like I know what is going on. This proposal caught me off guard and uninformed. I am asking if it's possible to get on a future communication list if possible. Please advise Thank you	Email #1: There are two ways I would suggest you can best keep informed in the future. One is to work with property manager Colton Kelley to be included in property stakeholder communications and the second is to sign up for DNR news releases. Email #2: I have more information for you on signing up for DNR news releases. If you would like to be signed up, we can do that here using your name and email address. Or, you can do it yourself at this link: <a href="https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WIDNR/subscriber/new">https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/WIDNR/subscriber/new</a> . Email #3: Done! And thanks for the response. The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
204	Lapham peak is very crowd all year round, we use this for hiking, party picnic, trail run, xc ski, mountain biking, especially very very crowd in Autumn season. It will post serious risk to public safety to allow bow hunting in the park or nearby.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
205	I understand that the DNR is considering allowing bow hunting at Lapham Peak. This is wonderful news. I live within walking distance to the park, and I know that the area is overrun with deer and turkeys. Thank you for considering. Please vote yes!	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
206	There are multiple adult voters in my household and we all oppose opening Lapham Peak up to hunting in any way. We go there for hikes year-round, with pets and small children. More than just the safety concern we also do not wish to be around such activity, endorse or support it. This park is the main reason we purchase our state park sticker every year, and one of the things we love most about that park is the wildlife. We have	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will

	so many memories of walking within mere feet of gentle deer, and the idea of paying to be at a park that would allow the hunting of those creatures, let alone risk being exposed to it is repulsive. Please do not allow this change. We do not support hunting in these areas. There are plenty of places elsewhere for hunters to go to kill things.	pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
207	I saw that the DNR is possibly thinking of having bow hunting for deer and turkeys at the park. I just wanted to chime in and say I'm against this. I hike at Lapham Peak at least once a week with my dogs for the past 20 years, I would go more but I live a half hour away. It's one of the parks I can go to during hunting season and feel safe. I like to do the Ice Age Trail but don't feel safe on that anytime any sort of hunting is going on. Lapham brings in so many people for fall hiking and the Mammoth Challenge, I think hunting would be such a disservice. Please reconsider.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
208	The DNR proposed deer bow hunt zone borders our property in the Meadows of Delafield subdivision. We and our child regularly walk and play in the park. We also regularly spend time outdoors in our yard. We oppose the proposal. You never know where an arrow will fly when it misses its mark. We deserve to feel and be safe being out in our yard as well as within Lapham Peak State park. We are not bothered by the deer nibbling on our plants; instead, we plant things they are not interested in. We really enjoy all the wildlife that comes near and onto our property. We have lived here for seven years and do not see an increase or overabundance in the deer population at Lapham Peak. We request that any such proposal discussions be made public and communicated directly to us	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
209	Hi I am all for this. Looking forward to being able to hunt there	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
210	I believe Lapham Peak should not be opened to bow hunting. The park currently is a safe haven for hikers and skiers since there is no hunting. There is plenty of state land nearby for hunters without the crowd. Also, Lapham is more residential and attracts many people who don't need to navigate hunters. Thank you for receiving comments on this issue.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
211	Regarding the consideration to allow Bow hunting at Lapham, I am very much against it. I run, hike and ski at Lapham and am at the park multiple times a week, and have done so for years. I believe the quantity of people at the park, the multiple crossing of paths along with the Ice Age running parallel to other trails would create confusion for hunters as to where they can and cannot hunt. The fact that the deer are not particularly scared of humans mean this wouldn't be a hunt, but more of a slaughter. Having bow hunted for years, populated locations were places I stayed away from. There are plenty of hunting grounds in the area to choose from, Lapham should not be one of them. The last thing a family hiking thru the park needs to see is a deer stumbling thru the trees as it gasps it's last breath.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
212	Writing to express my concerns over discussion of opening Lapham Peak for deer hunting. I understand that there will be restrictions for the areas able to be hunted but this seems to me to be a disaster waiting to happen. Lapham is extremely busy with skiers, snowshoers and hikers during the months of bow hunting season. I honestly cannot see how allowing bow hunting will not result in injury or worse. This will impact many families who used to enjoy these activities with children who will no longer feel safe at Lapham. Please reconsider.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
213	I am a resident of Delafield and I am strongly against bow hunting or hunting of any kind on the grounds of Lapham Peak state park. I take my dog there regularly for hikes, especially in the prairie off of Cushing Park Road and enjoy the quiet and serenity of the trails, especially seeing natural wildlife like birds, squirrels and deer. Allowing hunters to occupy this land will change the natural chemistry of this protected state park and invite unwanted risk to hikers, school groups, dogs, horse riders, runners, bikers and everyone in our community that enjoys this space without having to calculate the danger they could face. My hope is that you take this comment, and those of our residents, very seriously in making this vote.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
214	My husband, dog and I enjoy hiking at Lapham peak especially during the hunting seasons. We do this for to avoid places where hunting is allowed for a safe hike. People hike and ski in this state park. There are plenty of public hunting sites. Please do not allow hunting at Lapham Peak - a safe haven for individuals, families, pets and wildlife.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.



215	I have partipated in naturist activities since 1980. Montara Beach and Grey Whale Cove in California offered relaxing opportunities to enjoy the Pacific ocean and coastal areas. Wisconsin has beautiful areas that enrich the lives of residents and visitors. Please don't hastily withdraw state land from public use and enjoyment by naturists. We always leave the sites better than we found them, and we ourselves are better for having enjoyed your resources.	The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.
216	Dear Members of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45 during this public-comment period, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
217	Hi there, I'm a member of the Lapham Peak ski club and I'm always up in Wisconsin at a variety of parks skiing, camping and hiking. I also love hunters, as — like me — they respect the land and are just out enjoying themselves the way they like to. That said, I think it'd be great if hunting with archery equipment would not be allowed at Lapham Peak. I just love that there's one park that I can go to where I don't have to worry about being shot. I mean, I wear the orange, I check with the folks at the parks to find out where people are hunting and try to avoid that area, but part of what makes Lapham so wonderful is that you can just get out and enjoy nature.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
218	I live in Watertown. We love Laphem Peak and frequent a lot on the "off" months because of how accessible and easy to hike during winter. We would be absolutely disappointed if hunting was allowed close to trails we love and walk. Especially the trail that runs through homestead hollow and the butterfly garden. This would heavily influence and alter our usual hikes. Please consider other options!	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
219	I have been using Lapham Peak both for hiking, cross county skiing and even fishing for 20 years or so. I really enjoy the park!! The fall season which of course runs inline with deer bow season is a great time to hike and enjoy the park. While I do somewhat understand deer management issues in WI, fair to say I would prefer to use the park without having to worry about the hunting risk. It seems to me we are perhaps heading for deer management issues throughout the state with deer harvest declining as many people my age and baby boomers are retiring from the sport and many millennials are not taking up the sport. Perhaps in 5-10 years we will have deer management issues in the all Wisconsin and hopefully there are solutions that can be entertained. Considering Man is likely the only major predator of deer, it is very concerning the number of deer I see and risks they will cause all of us on deer vehicle crashes and of course no one wants any animal to starve because of over population.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
220	After visiting Lapham Peak on horseback with a group on numerous occasions, we have noticed that there are deer seemingly everywhere. With the knowledge of harmful diseases such as CWD, we feel that hunting should be permitted (in designated areas is fine) at Lapham Peak. As a more humane option before disease runs rampant or before snipers are needed to come in and reduce population, ultimately not providing sustenance for any local families that bowhunting harvests provide for our hunters in the area. The specific section states: (18) KETTLE MORaine STATE FOREST, LAPHAM PEAK. No person may take, catch, kill, hunt, trap or pursue any wild animal, or discharge any firearm or air gun, bow, crossbow, slingshot, or spring-loaded device designed for shooting a projectile while on any department lands designated by posted notice within the Lapham Peak Unit-Kettle Moraine state forest. The department may designate areas where hunting deer and turkeys with archery equipment, but not with firearms or airguns, is allowed.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

221	As a homeowner with property adjacent to Lapham Peak, we see a lot of daily deer activity throughout our property, raiding each of our bird feeders, and congregating together. We do not want to see disease throughout the community and feel strongly that opening bow hunting will assist in reducing the numbers ultimately creating less vehicle collisions, occurrence of disease, and a stronger deer herd with ample resources and feeding area available for the population. We are FOR ethical bowhunting in the area and appreciate the DNR keeping track of populations for local homeowners who do not have property to assist in managing populations appropriately themselves.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
222	Please do not allow bow hunting at Lapham peak. It is a extremely busy park all seasons and brings in a great amount of revenue now, hunting would decrease this, there are many near areas that allow hunting. Thank you . Please listen to my voice I am a voter and supporter of politics who listen to me	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
223	I am in full support of allowing bow hunting in Lapham Peak.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
224	I live in Jefferson. I think having a bow season is a great idea for the park and the community. As an avid bow hunter, having another area for the public to hunt only benefits hunters, the park, and surrounding farmers as well. With the park being so well loved, family friendly, and with an abundant deer herd, it would be a fantastic place to teach kids the love of the sport. Many people also fill their freezers during deer season to feed their families for the year, another opportunity means more families fed! Many people who don't understand bow hunting are going to immediately say no to this. I think the public would need education that bow season is much different than gun deer season. People don't shoot more than 30-40 yards with a compound bow (if even), maybe 50 with a cross bow. It's a very safe way to control the deer population in a busy area. Many subdivisions also allow bow hunters to harvest deer within city limits now because the deer are so over populated. I hope this idea is given a fair shake and not immediately shot down.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
225	Please do not open Lapham Peak for deer hunting. Too many hikers, joggers, skiers count on this park. There is a lot of hunting land in the area.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
226	Please do not allow hunting at Lapham Peak. It is so very nice to have a place during the hunting season with so many outdoor recreation options, and not having to worry about interfering with anyone's hunt. I am an avid geocacher and I'm taking a group of 5 new people specifically to one of the areas that is proposed for further hunting tomorrow to geocache. I intentionally chose the area because of they're not being hunted and I have been there several times in the past as well for that specific reason. Our family is also involved in Scouts BSA. My daughter is currently working on a hiking badge which we have used areas at Latham for as well that are now on the proposed draft for hunting. I do not think this would be a positive change for our community, there are so many other outdoor recreation, groups, and hobbies that use the area.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
227	I have been visiting Lapham Peak on a regular basis since I was a child (30 yrs +). My family would walk there (including our dog) almost once a week. My mom visited multiple times a week and it was her safe, go to place when she needed some personal time. My grandmother was a frequent hiker at the park as well. I have started taking my children there on a regular basis as hiking is my own form of therapy. When I lived in Milwaukee I would drive 40mins just to hike at Lapham Peak specifically. I am so sad at the idea of part of the park being opened to bow hunting. I am very confident that if my mom were still with us she would be deeply saddened as well. Bow hunting or gun hunting to me makes a small difference - it's still hunting. It still leaves visitors with a sense of uneasiness. I understand there is a deer population topic to consider but one of the most beautiful things about Lapham Peak is visiting at dusk and seeing the deer and how peaceful they are. Which we know would become much more of a rare experience if hunting is opened up. I have often chosen Lapham Peak as my destination for hiking knowing that other areas in the Kettle Moraine allow hunting. There are so many parks and areas in Southeast WI that allow hunting and it has been a blessing to have Lapham Peak not be one of those locations. I understand that hunting could be a new way to bring in revenue for the parks system but we need to find another way so that nature lovers who need a safe, peaceful place to spend time have that option. I would be willing to pay more for a state park sticker for a hunting free option. I don't know how many people feel the same but I would pay \$50 per year for a sticker if it helps supplement park revenue enough to keep hunting out. While I respect everyone's difference in beliefs, I personally am against hunting. Living in	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

	WI during hunting season is difficult and I honestly think hunters have enough options both public and private locations. I will be devastated if I have to withdraw my support and frequent visits to Lapham Peak as it will end the generational impact the beautiful park has had to my family for 4 generations.	
228	I would like to register my objection to bow hunting in Lapham Peak. I live next to the park and can see the Ice Age Trail. It is heavily used especially during the fall color change. I feel hunting would endanger trail users. If you allow it could you add additional signage to the trail area warning hikers and hunters. Also ban hunting in October.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
229	I am writing to oppose the proposed change to allow bow hunting at Lapham peak. While there are plenty of deer at Lapham peak, it is also filled with hikers, runners, bikers and skiers during the fall and winter. Lapham peak is the closest park in the Kettle Moraine to most parts of Milwaukee and surrounding areas and it seems ill advised to allow hunting in such a popular park. There are other places to hunt and closing parts of the park for some of the season is not fair to those who use it heavily. Personally, I go there every week, sometimes multiple times a week, all year round and use both the east and west side trails frequently.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
230	In regards to NR45 I think everything should stay the same. We have a great relationship as far as snowmobile trails are concerned and want it to keep running smoothly. Thanks, New Fane Kettle Riders snowmobile club.	Comment is noted and has been entered into the record.
231	I strongly oppose opening up any portion of Lapham Peak for bow hunting. The park is too busy with hikers, skiers and other events for this type of hunting use. It would very likely have disastrous results. I come from a family of hunters, so I understand the need and the desire for hunting... but Lapham Peak is NOT a good choice. please reconsider.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
232	No comments at this time.	
233	It would seem you are over regulating the human body with regards to the anti nudity law you are attempting to enact. It had been decided in many states and furthermore countries that even topless bathing is ok because women are equal to men. Many feel you are overreaching and going backwards on this matter and I hope you will reconsider. Many love being unencumbered by clothing while camping in Wisconsin and they will definitely choose to spend their money elsewhere.	The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.
234	Hi, I am not a fan of hunting at Lapham Peak. It is a VERY busy park with many connecting trails within range of a stray bolt from a crossbow. If it is deemed necessary to thin the deer herd, I would hope it could be done on a very limited time frame - 3 days in the middle of the week? And well posted of the event. Currently, Lapham is one of the few State properties in the area to go without fear of a stray shot from a hunter. Other local trails in the Southern Kettle Moraine have bow hunters and small game hunters. I am on regular alert and wear blaze from September through January and do cross paths with various hunters during my frequent hikes. So far all have been safe, but it is always a bit of relief going to Lapham and letting my guard down. Thanks for all you do and listening to my concerns.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
235	I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45 during this public-comment period, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock

		climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
236	I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45 during this public-comment period, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
237	I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45 during this public-comment period, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
238	I'm a frequent visitor to Lapham to hike and to ski all the trails there. I have serious concerns for the safety of all hikers and skiers if the reach of arrows where hunting is allowed can reach any of the many trails in that park. Please stop this proposal.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
239	I think it would be great to allow bow hunting at Lapham Peak. A hobby/sport that families need more of. Of course safety precautions would be made.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
240	Thank you for taking input on bow hunting at Lapham Peak State Park. I live near the park and I'm actively involved with several user groups, and often visit the park several times a week. My great grandfather owned part of the land that is now within the park, so I'm very familiar with it. I strongly support the reduction of the deer herd and my own property in Delafield is in the City's nuisance deer permit program; there is a blind	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will

	<p>and stand just behind our home (though what I really need is an Apex predator.) As you are hopefully aware the City already offers public bow hunting adjacent the Park at Ethan Allen and the municipal yard. I have strong reservations about permitting bow hunting in the park for two reasons. The first deals with safety and the onus put upon non-hunting users. Is it the expectation that park visitors will wear hunting orange during the entire bow season? It is not reasonable to expect runners and skiers to gear up with blaze orange at the state's signature venue. The performance clothing required for these sports is not even available in that particular color. We host a top ranked youth ski program with nearly 200 students. They run and ski on these trails in their team uniforms several days per week and advising them to do so in hunting vests is an undue burden. We also have skiers visiting the park from Illinois, Madison, Green Bay, etc., many of whom will clearly not be aware of the situation until they arrive. They're going to ski anyway of course. West of Hwy C, in the horse/hike/mountain bike prairie, there are often dozens, and on some weekends hundreds, of users at any given time during these months. I think you are perhaps greatly underestimating the potential for conflict - and definitely underestimating those users' preparedness regarding safety clothing. Secondly, as one of the state's preeminent Nordic ski venues the effort and expense put into grooming the trails is extensive, and the effort put into educating hikers about avoiding trail damage is ongoing. It seems highly likely that hunters would, through ignorance as much as disregard, use the groomed trails to access hunting areas. It's human nature. No one is going to bushwack with their gear when there's a trail available. Most pedestrians have no idea how easily the ski trails are damaged or how much work goes into grooming them. I believe, generally, that hunters are safety-minded and hunting is safe. That does not change the fact that sharing the space with hunters can be anxiety-provoking. Whatever their chosen activity, users come to the state parks to relax. If a runner, skier, hiker, biker or snowshoer is required to be constantly vigilant about a potential interaction with a hunter who is scanning for movement on the trail, the relaxing nature of the outing is clearly degraded. I embrace the shared-use concept, but with 600,000 annual user visits to this highly developed ex-urban property, Lapham is just not suited to hunting. Let's find another solution.</p>	<p>pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
241	<p>I would like to register my opposition to opening lap and Peake to bow hunting. I believe that would create an unsafe environment, and that other options for controlling the deer population should be explored.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
242	<p>I'm a user of the Lapham Peak trails, and I am adamantly opposed to the proposed hunting areas within Lapham Peak. It doesn't matter if it's "archery" equipment only; hunting should never be allowed on trails that cross paths with skiers or hikers! Please reconsider this proposal and keep the policy prohibiting hunting on the Lapham Peak-Kettle Moraine State Forest grounds.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
243	<p>Please do not open Lapham Peak state park to bow hunting. It's bad enough that other parks allow hunting, as the hunters do not respect the hikers. I have seen it plenty over the years. There are plenty other hunting spots available. The main draw to Lapham is that hunting is not allowed currently. And if there was an agreement that hunting would not be allowed it should be honored.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
244	<p>I just learned about the proposal to open Lapham Peak to bow hunting during turkey and deer season. While I'm not opposed to hunting, I think this particular area is not a good choice, and would result in a lot of conflict between hikers, skiers, and hunters. I have hiked, run, and snowshoed at Lapham Peak many times, the last time just a few weeks ago, and that is one of the busiest hiking areas I visit regularly, second only to Devil's Lake. I purposefully hike Lapham during hunting season for the very reason that I know it is *not* open to hunting, and there are many beautiful trails. I also reviewed the proposed hunting map, and it's very confusing. There are small carve-outs where hunting wouldn't be allowed, and large swaths where it would be allowed. It's already so difficult to tell as a hiker where we can hike and stay out of the way of hunters, and this would just make it more difficult. In short, I am writing to express my disappointment that opening such a busy area to hunting is the first (only?) proposed solution to a surge in the deer population. I urge you to reconsider.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
245	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45 during this public-comment period, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation</p>

	<p>prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. I would also like to point out that removing or banning climb can affect an areas economic activity because of the facts that rock climbers are will to spend money on things like campsites/ hotels and things like food and water wether that would be at a local restaurant or even a grocery store. Also I have yet to meet, see, or hear of any climbers that are more than will to destroy an ecosystem just for fun and everyone of the climbers that I have met have been will to volunteer for community cleanups and are willing to do the basics of leave no trace. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equi table land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>(NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
246	<p>This is not a good idea and will ultimately affect the many trail runners that utilize that area. This is one of the few safe areas during hunting and ask that you would preserve that.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
247	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45 during this public-comment period, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
248	<p>As a climber, University of Wisconsin student, and climate conscious individual I would like to implore you to remove or revise NR 45.13(1)(e), effectively banning climbing in most State Natural Areas. I, along with the rest of the climbing community, believe this ban to be unwarranted given the climate conscious attitude of the climbing community. Me and the rest of the community would greatly appreciate the ability to climb this incredible rock in State Natural Areas and would try our level best to maintain these areas to the point where our impact would go essentially unnoticed.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>

249	<p>I am an 18 year old Wisconsin climber. I really enjoy the sport and would love the opportunity to climb at more places in the future. So, I am requesting the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
250	<p>I'm an avid hiker and Lapham Peak is one of my go-to's being hilly, peaceful, and only 20 minutes from home. It's the one Park I feel safe during hunting season because hunting has not been allowed there. I oppose bow hunting at this park. Instead, how about hunting deer and turkeys a few days a month but make it known to people using the park? Maybe offer orange vests to people when they enter the park and return them when they leave?</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
251	<p>It is my understanding that you are the responsible party entrusted to maintain a diverse use of public lands. Your position is to use public comment and researched public opinions, with polls, to make your decisions. This is so your actions reflect the interests of the people and users of public lands. Have you taken note of the respectable polls contracted by The Naturist Society Foundation (TNSF) and Naturist Education Committee (NEC) on this matter of changing the traditional role of nudity on public lands? These polls show a very real and strong public majority that approves of designated use of areas in nudity. They also reflect an attitude accepting and even participatory nudity amongst a very large section of the American population. In my personal inquiries of 30 active nude hikers online, it is obvious that those who might object to simple nudity in natural surroundings are a significantly small population, less than 5%. People tend to perceive majority opinions by the opinions of peers that they associate with. For example, an alcoholic who hangs out with drinkers in bars would assume that most everyone drinks, yet the actual numbers reflect that only 10% of the population drinks 90% of the liquor. Those who hike nude in my sample unanimously have found through experience that only a very few in one hundred hikers object to nude hikers. As a mental health professional, I have researched the studies of the effects of nudity on children. There is just no evidence, no scientific inquiry that supports any harm to a child viewing another member of his/her own species without coverings. What I surprisingly found, actually suggests that it may be beneficial. If a parent raises a child to fear, then that child will unjustifiably be fearful. If you look at the polling research, you will conclude that there is support for clothing options. If you proceed to the change in nudity policy, you are imposing minority moral values upon the rest of us. This would be undemocratic and in my mind un-American.</p>	<p>The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.</p>
252	<p>I am in favor of thinning the herd. Deer run across the road 9 times out of 10 when I drive down Cushing Park Road and last week a herd (6 deer) crossed right in front of me on C after leaving Lapham Peak. However, I am not in favor of opening Lapham Peak to hunting the entire bow hunting season given we and so many other people use it to trail run and hike during this season, and to cross country ski should there be a snow storm during this period. Although rare, it would be a real deterrent to ski the outer trails knowing a stray arrow could take me out. I would like to see designated periods (days in the week, or alternating weeks) when hunting is allowed, and a rule to preclude hunting when there is sufficient snow to ski the trails. For the man made snow portions, I would like to see hunting precluded anywhere close to the those trails.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
253	<p>What a great opportunity for the WDNR to show that it cares about the minority group of hunters in Wisconsin, Bowhunters...especially those residing in urban areas who normally have to travel hours for quality hunting opportunity's.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

254	I would like to comment on the proposed bow hunting in Lapham Peak. I am opposed to this idea. There are so many people utilizing Lapham peak and there will be even more on the ice age trail for the mammoth challenge during that time. Lapham peak is a goto spot for many hikers that are uncomfortable hiking in hunting areas.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
255	I'll start by saying I am absolutely in favor of controlling the animal populations with hunting! I would like to propose this idea even though it's a long shot. I am president of the Kanati company (Kanati club). We have worked with the dnr for years with our learn to bow hunt turkey program every spring. Hosted at Whale tales archery in dousman. We recently officially filed as a nonprofit. Our focus is still the same, make people aware of everything the outdoors has to offer in many ways. I saw this proposal of maintaining herd health with archery hunting at lapham peak and thought right away how awesome of an opportunity it would be to be able to partner up with our group and utilize our team of passionate mentors/ outdoorsman and women. It would provide excellent opportunities for us to mentor new hunters in the pursuit of deer and turkeys! Furthermore, with our group of mentors hunting and being there while introducing new hunters. It may provide some peace of mind to non hunters that there are not just any random people out there. It could be a group of selected individuals somewhat in control. Giving people a little bit of peace of mind that there is a structured group out there that is all communicating and working with one another. Helping keep the animal numbers in check while keeping it safe still in the park for non hunting visitors. I understand this is a long shot but I would love to chat more about the possibility if interested. I will attach my personal number and the Kanati email address.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
256	I think this is a great idea and long overdue. There are plenty of examples throughout the area which illustrate that this is both safe and effective. I support this idea completely.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
257	I fully support archery and crossbow hunting in Lapham Peak as outlined in the rough draft map. It seems safe and effective	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
258	I am in support of archery hunting being legalized at Lapham Peak park. Thanks	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
259	As an avid hunter and hunter safety instructor, You & I know there is no legitimate reason to restrict Lapham Peak from archery season. (Other than anti-hunting hysteria). The current users of the park will rarely even notice archery hunters. Many state lands combine dog walkers, cross country skiers, birders and hikers and hunters with few issues and an impeccable safety record. Opening the the area to those of us that pay the lions share of the wildlife funding is not only fair, but it would bring even more attention and use to the area.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
260	I learned today that there may be a possibility of the DNR allowing bow and crossbow hunting within Lapham Peak State Park. This came as a surprise to me as I am an adjacent neighbor to one of the proposed hunting areas and have lived here for over 39 years, even before Dr. Hausman and his wife donated their 550 acres of land to the park. I recall the deed restriction of having no hunting on the land donated however in the spirit of the donation I believe Doctor and Mrs. Hausman expected the no hunting would apply to the entirety of the park. Yes, I knew them. I reviewed the draft map of the potential hunting areas, areas with deed restrictions, areas of closure around campgrounds, the observation and communication towers, maintenance buildings, ranger residences and private lands. In my analysis I must question what the DNR is safely trying to accomplish? How is the DNR going to manage and keep hunters within boundaries meant to protect buildings, residences, deed restricted areas and places where park goers have had a safe haven for decades? Does the DNR have the staff to patrol what appears to be a patchwork of hunting areas overshadowed by a higher percentage patchwork of non hunting areas? When I purchased my home in 1984 the park was closed after an individual fell to his death from the observation tower. Over the nearly 40 years I have seen many great improvements made to the park, some by private groups donating their time to help make Lapham Peak a real gem. Many of the amenities including snowmaking equipment,	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.



	special programs and buildings were by the efforts of volunteers raising money and doing some heavy lifting. The park and staff have always been great neighbors. Through all of the cooperative efforts Wisconsin has a shining star, Lapham Peak State Park. I have watched a success story evolve with the amphitheater, trails, lodges, butterfly garden, Halloween events and paved handicapped accessible trails that draw 600,000 visitors annually, averaging 50,000 per month, or nearly 1700 per day. This is the park that Dr. and Marie Hausman envisioned and it would make them proud. Given the number of visitors, the irregular areas proposed for hunting, the ongoing dawn to dusk management of keeping hunters within the boundaries and the potential risk of having an unfortunate hunting accident, in my view, hunting does not fit with in Lapham Peak. The park has evolved over time beyond the new proposed use through the help of many hands to be much more than most State Parks and it would be best to leave well enough alone. If it works, don't fix it. You have a success story here.	
261	As much as I like bow hunting, I'm not in favor of bow hunting in Lapham Peak. I read the proposal and was surprised this would be considered, especially in some of the areas marked. This is highly trafficked by children and families and bow hunting would not be a good fit for Lapham Peak.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
262	Comments: 1. Why doesn't: "NR 11.24 State fish hatchery closed area. Each of the following areas is established as a closed area that no person may hunt or trap or have in their possession or under their control a firearm unless the firearm is unloaded and enclosed within a carrying case:" have an allowance for legal CCW? Which is obviously different than hunting. Furthermore, why can't the gun just be unloaded rather than cased?	This provision establishes by rule the boundaries of fish hatchery closed areas. Regulations on the possession of firearms are restated in this rule so that the reader is aware of them. However, the language related to firearms also occurs in s. 29.089, Wis. Stats. The statute does allow possession of a concealed handgun by people who are properly licensed and requires that other firearms be unloaded and enclosed within a carrying case.
263	I don't have any comments but I do have questions that I hope you address. 1. Will you need a special permit to hunt there and if so will there be a lottery system or other mechanism to get this special permit? Will volunteers be able to have some sort of priority? will there be a special sign up period for a permit? 2. If you shoot a deer, what will you have to do with the gut pile? 3. Since the park closes at 9:00 PM, will there be some ability to search for a wounded deer after that time or do you have to come back during regular hours. I know you won't be able to hunt on regular trails, but can you trail a wounded deer on regular hiking trails? 4. Can you set up a hunting tent or blind?	HELP I AM NOT SURE HOW TO RESPOND TO THIS ONE
264	Why does the Wisconsin DNR want to surrender to MAGA-fundamentalist republicans? They are too scared to impeach Justice Janet Protasiewicz. The gerrymandered districts will be thrown out. DeSantis is losing. When Israel defeats Hamas. in a few weeks Biden will regain his lead in the polls. Trump loses! The anti-nudity rules would have a lot of unintended consequences. Just like the anti-drag laws. I'm a senior who lives in Minneapolis and don't go out at night. I feel safe at our beach. MN and WI are so similar. We're a trans refuge state. We could be a nudist refuge state and take the tourists WI doesn't want. There will be civil disobedience and court challenges in Wisconsin if you do this, I'm sure. Wisconsin isn't a southern MAGA state I'm a mainstream Democrat who doesn't like anti-American, anti-Israel progressives. Keep your laws off our bodies!	The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.
265	As a frequent user of Lapham Peak, I am very opposed to opening Lapham up for bow hunting. I understand the problems that deer overpopulation pose, but would much rather see a structured deer abatement program like we have here in Brookfield instituted. Having trained snipers in to cull the herd during certain times seems much safer and more humane. Thank you for considering other options.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
266	Please don't allow hunting if any kind at Lapham.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
267	I wanted to express my thoughts on the proposal of having bow hunting near Lapham Peak. Lapham peak during hunting season is a refuge. For people and there families who hike and run the trails. And just to enjoy being out in nature and not having to worry about bow or gun hunting being too close. Would really hope that the realization of keeping Lapham peak safe from hunters is high on the table. There are so many places for hunting. At this point it seems like hunting numbers are down, so it's very unusual to me that this is being brought up now. During this time of year I'm at Lapham all the time training. I also bring my dogs during the weekend. This is the only place that I feel safe to continue training on trails. Please consider keeping this beautiful place hunting free.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

268	I wanted to reach out to express my support of expanding bowhunting to regions of the Lapham Peak State Forest. Hunting public lands has become incredibly popular in the past few years. Our public lands have become more crowded, and this has reduced the ability for people to enjoy the outdoors without paying for high dollar leases or owning private property. Expanding public lands in Wisconsin will help reduce hunting's monetary barrier to entry and get more people involved in the outdoors! Please go forth with expanding public land bowhunting to Lapham Peak.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
269	I'm 72 years old and an avid outdoor person my entire life. I lived within 10 minutes of Lapham Peak for 60 years. We then moved to Iron Ridge/45 minutes away but continue to go to Lapham Peak at least twice a week. The park is located in a very populated area/Delafield. I run in Colorama, cross country ski regularly and do races. I absolutely cannot imagine opening up this park to bow hunters. With the hills, traffic of ice age use, hikers, etc.; it's a recipe for disaster. As you recall in Scuppernon State Park; a bow hunter shot a horse with a rider on it during bow season. Really? How crazy was that. Many bow hunters hear a little noise, get excited and release the bow. Plus Freight Fest is a very popular week long activity and this is right during the rut. Deer are confused and hunters frequently take fast and long shots at the running deer. By the way, I have been a bow hunter for 25 years along with my family.....three adult kids and husband. Everyone of them think it's a troublesome move. Nobody would consider this option. Then add younger hunting age limits/youth hunting, the cross bow that shoots like a rifle? This is not the area for bow season. An option can be like Nashotah Park, when they had too many deer; park officials held a lottery and advertised a 5 day hunt to eliminate some of the deer. Everything was posted and seemed logical. You may want to consider checking with Waukesha County to hear their success rate. I am definitely against this possibility. PLEASE CONSIDER AREAS OF LESS POPULATED ACREAGE.....MCMILLER, WHITEWATER OR EAGLE AREA. If you have any questions, feel free to get in touch with me.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
270	I believe there are enough hunting lands in the state of Wisconsin that allow hunters to have ample access. With Lapham being the small tract of trail accessible land to the public that it is, I see hunting on it as a potential problem. I do not wish to see Lapham Peak available to hunters.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
271	To Whom It May Concern: I live in Delafield. My family uses Lapham Peak State Park year-round, primarily in the winter months. We can often be found on the ski trails and riding our fat tire bikes through the snow on the mountain bike trails. We have had State Park and Trail Passes for as long as we have lived in Delafield. I understand that there is a proposal to open the park to bow hunting and I am opposed to this. In reviewing the map, the mountain bike area is not protected from hunters. When I am riding on the mountain bike trails I encounter many other people also using the trails. I encounter hikers; some with unleashed dogs (which is not an issue for me), and some who are plugged into their noise-canceling headphones that are completely unaware of what is happening around them. Every now and then, I see people on horseback (I know they are there as well based on the footprints in the dirt/snow and poo), but when I do, it is a treat and a reminder of how lucky I am to live in Delafield. Something I rarely see on the mountain bike side of the road – deer. What happens to the arrows lying on the ground from missed shots? Are they going to sit there for dogs to slice their paws on? Or me to fall on (falling is common for me when riding in the snow) or slice a tire? Last year I was hiking out at the Lowe Lake Unit when a horse was hit with a stray arrow and had to be euthanized. This is not something I want to see on the trails that I love. If I saw hunters on the mountain bike trails, I would ring my bell in hopes of alerting the deer that I never see. Also, what happens if someone were to kill a deer on the trails? Do we all have to look at a bloody kill spot and drag through the snow? If a four-wheeler is required, the tires from that vehicle are enough to destroy the trail for cycles. If the overpopulation of deer is a problem, stop approving all the new subdivisions and taking their habitat. If deer are a problem, hire professionals to cull the herd and close the park for a day. Attached is a photo of us at Lapham on Jan. 1, the trails are used by cyclists through the winter!! Thank you	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
272	Hi just sending a message regarding the proposal to allow bow hunting at Lapham peak. I am a volunteer with the blaze babes through the Waukesha/ Milwaukee chapter of the ice age trail. I live in Wauwatosa and it is so nice to have a place like Lapham where one can hike not far from an urban area. This section of the ice age trail is one of the few areas that has not allowed hunting and that has been reassuring for me. I would just like to express my desire to keep this area a place where hunting is not allowed in any form to assure year round safe hiking for our community. Thanks for your consideration.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
273	I understand you are considering allowing bow hunting in Lapham Peak for the upcoming years from Sept - January. This is very disheartening as the park hosts many public events and is a great family place for hiking and skiing. We frequent this park since it is so close to our home in Delafield. There are other parks in the area that already allow hunting (Nashotah Park and Kettle Moraine) so why do you need to disturb the atmosphere of this one too? It doesn't seem safe! Please reconsider or at least shorten the timeframe of the hunting to a one or two week period	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

	of time.	
274	It should be opened to bow and crossbow	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
275	Lapham Peak is such a busy trail system, and the amount of land proposed open for hunting of such minimal impact to the deer population. This proposal makes little to no sense. The benefit does not outweigh the downside. I do not support adding bowhunting to the Lapham peak unit.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
276	As someone that purchases an annual sticker each year and frequents the park, my concern would be that people or other animals would get shot by an arrow. Also alot of hunters won't adhere to certain areas. It will be a free for all and I am truly upset that the DNR would even consider this because of how many people frequent the park. Way too many people are there on the weekends, trying to enjoy nature and take hikes. We do NOT need to worry about getting injured from irresponsible hunters. This is NOT a good idea. And if it is allowed I will not be purchasing any more annual state park stickers, nor would anyone else. I am spreading the word on this subject.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
277	To whom it may concern- regarding bow hunting in the kettle moraine state forest. I support Wardens to cull the deer herd during the parks closed hours - NOT hunters. Thank you	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
278	If I had a vote it would be NO to deer hunting on park property.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
279	I am against the proposal to allow limited areas of Lapham peak for bow hunting of Deer. The areas you are planning to allow are heavily used by hikers and runners in the fall and also cross country skiers if there is snow. I believe it would be unwise to allow hunting in the park, it has always been a safe haven for the people who use the park to not have to worry about hunters. There are better ways to thin the deer herd then letting hunters into the park.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
280	I myself am a bow and gun hunter for both deer and turkey. I am also a frequent visitor of Lapham peak and when I saw that hunting may be open at the park, I wasn't super excited about it. Part of the reason I choose to exercise and walk dogs at the park is because of the wildlife. I can see how hunting may be allowed, but I am curious as to if there will only be select dates for all seasons hunting is open? Knowing there are hunters in the woods I would not be able to do as I do and honestly I would worry I would be messing up someone's hunt. Now as that is up to the hunter knowing people may be moving through... I would appreciate as a hunter myself and a visitor, that specific dates only be open to hunting the land, and those dates be posted clear so us patrons are aware. Having it open an entire season seems a little much and I can imagine the area would be flooded if people are just welcome to come in. Do those hunting there as well need a park pass? Or would it be another reason for people to come in and not pay a fee and say - oh I was hunting. Thank you for opening up and welcoming comments. I can see how this has pluses and minuses.	Thank you for taking the time to write. As the proposal currently stands, Lapham Peak could be open for all bow deer and turkey seasons. Hunters are required to pay the admission fee.
281	Please be aware I support the proposal to allow an archery deer hunt in Lapham Peak State Park.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for

		managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
282	Im in full support of opening as much of lapham peak as possible to bowhunting. For more than 20 years I lived on the edge of Laham peak (Meadows of Delafield Sub Divison) there are far too many deer and their numbers need to be reduced.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
283	I oppose this idea 100% I have been hiking in the South Kettle South of Eagle where some bow hunting is allowed. The hunters are often hidden, yes, a good way to get a deer. I am always shocked by it. It is jarring. After doing that twice and encountering bow hunters, I do not go to state parks that allow hunting during hunting season. There must be other ways to control the deer herd. The last thing Lapham Peak needs is hunters. I don't care if it is not a gun and only a bow. Hunters and hikers do not mix.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
284	I am not opposed to allowing hunting of the Park decrease traffic accidents decrease sickness provide sport and food for hunters	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
285	I very much so support this. I live in Wales and frequent the park and see numerous deer and turkey and definitely think that population needs to be controlled. There are certainly is numerous areas where hunters could safely hunt away from the crowds and the trails. I sincerely hope this happens.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
286	I am opposed to allow hunting in the Lapham Peak unit. The boundaries of the patchwork of permitted hunting areas will be nearly impossible to enforce in the popular "park" with over 50,000 visitors per month. There are plenty of public hunting areas in the much larger Southern Unit (I have hunted there myself). The Lapham Peak deer herd can be culled using Rangers during non-peak times. The risk of a hunting accident does not justify the reward of more hunting land in this situation. Please consider withdrawing the proposal for hunting in Lapham Peak.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
287	Open it up!!!! Wisconsin public lands are the reason i can go hunting, among thousands of other Wisconsin hunters! More public means better herd control!!	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
288	I am writing regarding the proposal to allow bow hunting in State Parks, most specifically at Lapham Peak State Park, which is used by my family almost every day of the year. We live 5 minutes away, love to hike the trails and my children are both on the Peak Nordic cross country ski team-several times over state champions. My concern is with the proposed areas allowed for hunting on the map provided to the public. Some of them are overlapping ski trails that are heavily used during the proposed hunting period. I support allowing bow hunting in the park, but please make sure the allowed areas are far away from recreational use trails.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
289	I live in Oconomowoc WI I have been hiking at Lapham Peak for over 30 years and am now taking my grandchildren there to hike as well. It is a jewel of a park and one of the only places left where no hunting is allowed. It is a safe and sacred place for 1000's of non hunters. Please keep Lapham Peak safe and free from any kind of hunting.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
290	This is a great idea and will help reduce the number of accidents caused by wildlife on I94 and other surrounding highways.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will

		pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
291	<p>Dear Sirs, The WDNR Mission Statement includes the following objectives (emphasis mine): To provide a healthy, sustainable environment and a full range of outdoor opportunities, To ensure the right of all people to use and enjoy these resources in their work and leisure, To work with people, to understand each other's views and to carry out the public will. I respectfully request you ask yourselves if you are fulfilling your own stated mission with respect to the proposed rule changes to Section 37 - NR 45.04 (3) (am) Nudity? Please consider these points: (1) A full range of outdoor opportunities would include the use of lands, paid for by tax dollars, and used by tax-paying naturists in areas set aside for that purpose. (2) All people would include naturists, both residents of the state of Wisconsin and visitors to your state, who bring you financially beneficial tourism dollars. (3) Understanding each other's views includes fully informing yourselves about naturism and those who enjoy its benefits. (4) Carrying out the public will should be heavily influenced by responses gathered at public hearings (both in-person and virtual). Your department held a virtual hearing recently during which the majority of public comments opposed these changes. Remember, you are representative of those people - not their rulers. Furthermore, I offer you these verifiable facts regarding the benefits of naturism and naturists: Naturist tourism brings tangible economic benefits to Wisconsin and its local communities. As a similar, but concrete, example, the economic benefits of naturist tourism dollars to Florida (my home state) is \$7.4 billion at last count. Mazo Beach, part of Dane County's Mazomanie Bottom State Natural Area, has existed as a clothing-optional beach for many years with no appreciable negative impact to the general public or users of that beach. In fact, I would argue the benefits of naturism are so numerous as to be a net positive to those users (above average sensitivity to environmental concerns, promotion of body-positivity, tangible improvement to self-esteem, health benefits (stronger bones, stronger immune system, natural Vitamin D absorption), respect for all people regardless of body type, race, disability, and opinions about nudism). As one of 50 members of our Union, Wisconsin's government (including your agency) assents to the line written in our Declaration of Independence from England, to wit: Our Creator grants every human the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The proposed rule changes are in direct opposition to that idea. They are unnecessarily and arbitrarily restrictive to the liberty and the pursuit of happiness of naturists, specifically. Do not be swayed by the sophomoric argument that the "rights of the majority overrule the rights of the minority." That thinking is antithetical to the U.S. Constitution and everything we all stand for as proponents of civil rights. In summary, the proposed rule changes are not in keeping with your agency's own mission statement, risk ignoring the civil rights and liberties of the minority (naturists) in order to (supposedly?) appease the majority (non-naturists), and are, de facto, destructive to the rights and liberties of a significant portion of Wisconsin's citizens to which you have a sworn duty to uphold as representative (not rulers) of the people you serve. I implore you, before proceeding with this rule change, FULLY inform yourselves. I highly recommend the people and resources of the Naturist Education Foundation in your very own state. Call (920) 415-2900. They will provide you with a wealth of information about the benefits of naturism and the people who enjoy naturism. Thank you for carefully and thoughtfully considering my factual arguments against changing Section 37 of your rules.</p>	The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.
292	<p>I am against allowing bow hunting in Lapham Peak during the normal archery season. The reason is that Lapham Peak State Park is incredibly busy with people all the time (hiking, running, school groups, skiing, snowshoeing, biking, etc.). So, much more so than most other state parks/areas and this would just be too dangerous. I do however understand the overpopulation of deer is also a problem so I would think that doing something like local suburbs do could be a solution. I lived in Brookfield for 20 years and I know that several times they did have to cull deer, I don't remember if it was by bow or gun, but it was on a couple of very specific days and done by a small group. So perhaps that is a way to control the deer but not have the risk to the high number of users of Lapham Peak during 4 months of the year.</p>	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
293	<p>I just wanted to comment that I think this is an amazing, great idea! It will help with population control and hopefully make less deer be in the road causing accidents.</p>	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
294	<p>I am a local outdoorsman who has hunted all over Wisconsin and after reading the article mentioning the possibility of opening deer hunting to Lapham peak, I am here to say that I would be for this change. I have hunted several different state managed land in Wisconsin such Devils lake state park and Point beach state forest. Both parks are open to public recreation and I have never seen a documented incident of an danger between bow hunters and people frequenting the area for other recreational activities. Based on these experiences, I'm confident Lapham peak would be able support hunting in specified areas of the park. Opening Lapham peak would be greatly appreciated by local outdoorsman looking</p>	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

	for a chance to bag a deer close to home. And what better place than Lapham peak! Hope you get positive feedback from all your responses and hope to see this change in the near future! Below you can find my contact information. Thanks!	
295	Please do not allow hunting at Lapham peak. I hike there often and it is one of only a few places where you can hike safely. Hunting would change that. It is a very family friendly place and it needs to stay no hunting.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
296	I want to say I support the opportunity to allow bowhunting at Lapham Peak 100%.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
297	I support hunting in this unit. Thank you.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
298	Please allow Hunting at Lapham Peak.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
299	Out of safety and respect for residents who visit the Lapham Peak state park for its peaceful recreational trails year-round, I am sending this request to ask that hunting of any form does not become permitted on any parts of the park property. Hunting of any kind introduces a safety risk to those who enjoy the park for a number of recreational activities. Making the assumption that all who plan to hunt on park grounds will abide by only hunting in the designated areas is a bad assumption. Every year in Wisconsin, there are reports of trespassing by those unauthorized to hunt on properties. I personally witness unauthorized hunting on the Lapham Peak property on Thanksgiving Day 2019. Myself and a friend were returning to our vehicles in the homestead hollow parking lot after a mid-morning hike. We heard gun shots and saw a hunter only about 100 feet off the tree line on the westside of the parking lot. This incident further demonstrates that rules and regulations are simply suggestions in the eyes of those who may not care to understand them or never intend to follow them. If hunting is permitted in any area of the park property, it creates room for interpretation on what is allowed or not allowed. Additionally, creating confusion on which areas may be designated for hunting versus other activities, making it more of a safety risk for all visitors. If visitors feel unsafe, support of the park will decline. In closing, I strongly encourage the DNR to reconsider the current hunting proposal. Please leave this beautiful park safe for everyone to enjoy and do not move forward with permitting hunting of any kind on the Lapham Peak state park property.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
300	I vote no for hunting or culling deer at Lampham peak.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
301	I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation

	<p>are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>(NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
302	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
303	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
304	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>

	during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.	available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
305	I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
306	I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
307	Hello, I am a concerned homeowner near the park. I love to go to the park often. I am not in favor of the general public hunting in this popular park. I would be in favor of sharp shooters thinning the deer and turkey population.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
308	My husband and I frequently use the Lapham Peak area for hiking and Summer Stage. I find the "proposed" bow hunting map unsettling. The amenities the area offers to family outdoor enjoyment would be impacted negatively. We personally avoid all State land use during hunting season. I was born and raised in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan and come from a long line of avid hunters. This proposal will limit the enjoyment of numerous residents of the area. The area was created for family enjoyment for the immediate community and beyond. Hunting has its place and is beneficial for species control but not at the cost of safety for those enjoying our beautiful Wisconsin outdoors.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.



309	<p>I write to urge the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to reconsider its proposed changes to administrative code NR 45, particularly regarding NR 45.13(1)(e). This provision effectively bans rock climbing in most state natural areas, a restriction I believe is unjustified and lacks any concrete evidence of harm. The rock climbing community has a long-standing commitment to conservation. Climbers actively engage in various stewardship initiatives alongside the DNR, ensuring the preservation of the natural areas they enjoy. This dedication to environmental responsibility undermines the rationale behind the proposed ban. Without compelling evidence of adverse environmental impact, it's unreasonable to single out rock climbing for special restrictions beyond those applicable to other recreational activities. Therefore, I strongly urge the DNR to withdraw NR 45.13(1)(e) entirely. Alternatively, consider revising the code to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which addresses off-trail hiking. This approach would ensure that restrictions are based on demonstrable environmental harm, ensuring fairness and consistency across outdoor recreational activities. I urge you to carefully consider my arguments during this public comment period. I firmly believe that allowing responsible rock climbing in state natural areas aligns with the DNR's commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin. Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
310	<p>Hello there, I am a avid outdoorsman and hunter. I think it would be a great idea to allow bowhunting inside the park. I can tell from when I drive that there are to many deer in that area due to all the roadkill I see on I-94 east and west by Delafield. It would give us hunters a chance to harvest meat for our families while simultaneously help the herd get down to a more manageable number that the dnr is looking for. Thank you for your time. God bless,</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
311	<p>Great idea ... support it 100% win win situation great for deer herd ..great for auto safety great for the local bow hunters... t thank you for your work</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
312	<p>I would want there to continue to be no hunting at lapham peak. That is the only no hunting state park that I know of in the area.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
313	<p>I am writing concerning the issue of deer being bow hunted/culled in Lapham Peak State Park. It is quite obvious that this is something that the public does not want to happen. The notice came out in the paper just today in which it gave an email address which did not work. Most people get and read their paper in the evening after work, so they might easily miss the article and as Sunday, the 10, is the due date to address this issue, gives only 2 days to react. Most people that would address this issue as my husband and myself have done, would not even be aware of it. We had to call the DNR to get the correct email address. How many people even would know to do that? Plus being just two weeks before Christmas, which is a very busy time of year for most people. We listen to the news every night and have not heard anything about this change in the usage of our favorite State Park, Lapham Peak. It is obvious this is being pushed thru at this time when most people will not know what is being done to our lovely park, Lapham Peak until it is too late. We have read that the number of hunters is down from previous years, so obviously we don't need more woods or more deer for hunters to hunt. Plus the fact that most of the deer in Lapham Peak Park are mostly tame. They will stand a few feet away and allow people to take pictures of them as long as the person does not move quickly and scare them. As Tax payers and people who also purchase Sate Park Stickers, changes of this volume should be put on a referendum to get everyone's input. Right now, I believe there is a notice that the park closes at a certain time and I'm quite sure that is when the bow hunting is proposed to take place. This is a park and people bring their children and their dogs to enjoy a peaceful walk on the trails in the park. No one wants to see bow hunters in their park, preparing to "cull" the herd. And no one wants a child or dog or even adult shot by an overly anxious bow hunter getting in a little before the "hunt" practice in the park. My husband and myself are very much against this change!! Our state parks belong to us! We want them to stay as parks where adults, their children, their dogs and the deer are free to be safe and enjoy a little bit of what a park should be! Safe and woodsy for both us and our deer!</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

314	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
315	<p>[I live in] Delafield with my wife, three kids. I would like to suggest that allowing hunting at Lapham Peak would completely ruin the draw of the park in the first place. At any time of year I am able to bring my children there to enjoy safe hiking while always greatly enjoying the wildlife. It is full of people bringing their dogs as well, and school field trips with young children. It is AMAZING to have access to a park year round without any worry for hunters etc.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
316	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
317	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock</p>

		climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
318	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
319	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
320	<p>I see that the Caledonia Conservancy land is also Knowles-Nelson Stewardship land. I am wondering if the DNR has prohibited hunting as an NBOA on these properties?</p>	<p>At this time, the DNR has not prohibited hunting on these properties.</p>
321	<p>Please do not allow hunting of any kind at Lapham Peak. As a runner, hiker, skier, and mountain biker, I use the park quite frequently. I have experienced running through areas where hunting is allowed and it creates a fear that takes some of the joy out of the activity. I have some blaze orange clothing to wear, but many do not. My kids do not. They also use the park and trying to navigate where hunting is allowed vs. where it is not would be very confusing for them. Accidents happen while hunting. The deer population issue should not take priority over anyone's life or their enjoyment of our parks. Let nature take care of itself. If the deer herd gets too large, food sources will run short and they will move on, or die naturally. Please, lets not have arrows flying through the air in our parks.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
322	<p>I would not be in favor of any type of hunting at our beautiful state park. Our family has been enjoying all seasons of hiking, skiing, birding, and relaxing at Lapham Peak State Park for almost 30 years. We do not want to see hunters or their kills or be afraid of hunters being in the park. Please do not allow hunting to take place in Lapham Peak State park.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for</p>

		managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
323	It has come to my attention that the Wisconsin DNR wants to open the Lapham Peak Park to bow hunting. I understand that the intent is to lower the deer population. As someone who visits Lapham Peak Park 3 times a week I strongly disagree with this proposal. The park is very popular; any type of hunting will affect visitor's safety and comfort. Allowing any bow hunter who is not a trained marksman presents danger to visitors of the park. The deer population is not restricted to the park. Any deer eliminated in the park will be replaced by an animal from the surrounding area. Again I feel that allowing hunting in Lapham Peak Park is a very bad idea.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
324	I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
325		The comments indicate concern that changing the approval process for rock collecting from a permit to written permission from the property manager will make it easier for this activity to happen, and thus, better facilitate the removal of these resources. In the experience of department staff, on department lands, the public does not participate in rock collecting on a wide scale. The change in language represents the reality that DNR has not had a permit for this activity over the time in which the previous code was active; DNR property managers have allowed for this under written permission on a case by case basis. The department does not monitor rock collecting at a statewide scale and written permission is the best way to manage this activity at the property level. The comments also indicate concern about what appears to be a proposal to remove a number of property types from what was a prohibition of collecting of these resources. However the department feels that most of those property types that have been removed can facilitate this activity. Regardless of property type, individual property managers will evaluate collecting requests for potential impacts. Regarding State Natural Areas (SNA), a revision was needed to acknowledge that while collecting is generally prohibited, it can happen if part of a research project and is subject to our SNA research permitting process. It now states: "NR 45.04 (b) 3. No person may collect rocks, minerals or fossil materials on state natural areas without first obtaining a state natural area scientific collector permit." This section had to be moved into a subsequent section because it is a subdivision creation rather than an amendment for the public review process, but it will still end up in the same place once

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the rules revisions package regarding NR 1, 11, 45, 51, 115, and 116. I testified in person with an oral statement provided at the Tuesday, December 5, Zoom meeting hearing that took place at 4:30 pm. I am offering written comments here as follow-up, and perhaps clarification, to the positions I presented at the hearing. I appreciate the WDNR's efforts to take public comment on this subject matter both in person and in writing. My comments will be centered on 5 issues regarding revisions to NR 45 only. Revision 1 I wish to comment on: Regarding rocks, minerals, and fossil collecting on state lands, NR 45.04 General Rules **currently** states: On state property, rocks, minerals or fossil materials may be collected for noncommercial purposes, such as educational uses and personal collections, by hand or using a hand held rock hammer or similar device in **accordance with the terms of a written permit issued by the manager of the property** on which the collecting is done. A collector may not remove more than 5 pounds of rock, mineral or fossil material per day from any property with a maximum total of 50 pounds per year. The permit may further limit the allowable methods and amounts of material collected. The **proposed** revision (Section 27) reorganizes the provisions relating to rocks, fossils and minerals into a new collecting subsection and clarifies that they **may be collected with written permission of the property manager rather than a permit**, which provides more flexibility to property managers and prospective collectors. In addition the revision **strikes** the **bold-typed** wording in the next paragraph from current rules and regulations: *Notwithstanding subd. 1.*, No person may collect rocks, minerals, or fossil materials on **state natural areas, state wild rivers, state parks**, state trails, Havenwoods state forest **preserve, state recreation areas, Point Beach and Kettle Moraine state forests**, and any specific site which is designated as a non-collection site by the department. The preceding paragraph, with its proposed, deleted **bold-typed** wording, opens numerous state properties to more convenient collection of rocks, minerals, and fossils on state lands. **Here are my thoughts on these revisions regarding rock, mineral, and fossil collecting on state lands.** Like other features of our state, public lands, rocks, minerals, and fossils are natural resources worthy of protection from over-exploitation by individuals that threatens the greater public interest in preserving these natural assets for generations to come. Rocks, minerals, and fossils can all be considered non-renewable and once removed from public lands, their place on the natural landscape is lost forever. It appears **written permission** will still be required in order to remove rocks, minerals, and fossils, but if a **permit** requirement is more restrictive and provides more scrutiny as to whether or not permission is granted, I favor retaining the permit requirement to prevent the removal of these items from state lands. It also appears that the new rules revision will **remove** state natural areas, state wild rivers, state parks, state recreation areas, and two southern state forests from their designation as **non collection sites** and reclassifies these areas as **collection sites with written permission**...if this is the case I strongly oppose that revision in the status for these lands. Revision 2 I wish to comment on With the **removal** of trail cameras from listing as a personal property under NR 45.04 General Rules, 3) Personal Conduct, (m) Structures, the state is attempting to codify a policy of allowing the use of trail cameras on state lands that has been in place and in action for over a decade, under the guise of NRB approval. **Current** law's wording regarding personal property on state lands reads: (1) In this paragraph, "personal property" includes stakes, markers, or any other object which is placed with the intent of marking the location of a trap site except when the season established in s. NR 10.01 for that species is open and a lawfully set trap is placed with the stake or marker. (2) Except as authorized by the department, **no person may** construct, place, occupy or use structures or **store personal property** on lands subject to this chapter. This paragraph does not apply to tents or canopies which are less than 100 square feet in area or other temporary structures which are used for recreational purposes and removed by 11:00 p.m. of the day they are placed on the property. As current law stands, **personal property** would include trail cameras. The **proposed** revised wording to allow trail cameras on state lands reads: SECTION 44 **reorganizes the personal property provision to allow for trail cameras to be left on department property.** SECTION 45 **establishes that trail cameras are not considered personal property for purposes of the prohibition on storing personal property on department land.** SECTION 47 **establishes the policy for overnight use of trail cameras on department lands**, specifying that cameras must be properly marked with the operator's contact information, that camera placement and use cannot damage vegetation or department property and that cameras cannot be placed in such a way to monitor other property users in certain areas designated for public use. SECTION 47. NR 45.04 (3) (w) is created to read: NR 45.04 (3) (w) Trail cameras. **A person may place and leave trail cameras unattended overnight** on department lands when all of the following conditions are met: (1) Trail cameras are permanently and legibly marked in the English language with the name and address or department customer identification number of the operator in a manner that is clearly visible on the outside of the camera without needing to move or adjust the camera. (2) Placement, use, or installation of the trail camera does not damage vegetation or other department property. (1) The camera's location and entire available field of view is only areas where hunting is allowed and is outside of designated use areas including designated trails, beaches, campgrounds, buildings, roads, water access points, and parking areas. **Here are my thoughts on these revisions to exempt trail cameras from designation as personal property and the limits placed on the storing of personal property on state lands.** It appears that state policy has allowed trail cameras on state lands where hunting is permitted for about a decade, and this revision merely codifies that policy by removing trail cameras from consideration as personal property on state lands, since personal property can not currently be "stored" on state lands. I oppose this

incorporated into administrative code. This should address the confusion. Concern is also indicated about the removal of bones and specifically antler sheds. While it is clear that small mammals will chew on antlers and bones, it is not clear if antlers are abundant enough (above other types of bony materials and mineral-rich foods) to have a significant effect on rodent populations, and the department has not identified research that has actually examined this issue. Further, it is also not clear if antler collecting, as popular as it is, has a significant impact on the number of sheds remaining on the landscape. Given this, along with the enforcement difficulties associated with this activity, the potential issues are not believed to be significant enough to warrant regulating this activity at this time; changes to the proposed rules allowing this activity are not suggested. The comments also note concern over the removal of the prohibition of pets in observation towers. However, that provision is only moved to another section of the code, so that prohibitions on where pets are allowed are now in one location: the prohibition on pets in observation towers will remain, just in a different location. Finally, opposition to allowing trail cameras on department lands is noted.

	<p>revision because I generally oppose the use of trail cameras as a tool to assist in the hunting of game species. Trail cameras, especially in their most recent form, run counter to fair chase philosophies, like so many modern technologies that have changed how we hunt and fish. Their rapid growth in popularity has outpaced any attempts to regulate their use and design, though some states like Arizona and Nevada have banned their use during hunting seasons and at least 5 more states regulate the wireless remote forms of these cameras. I oppose Wisconsin rubber stamping their use on state lands, and oppose exempting trail cameras from personal property status under the current NR 45 restrictions on storing personal properties on state lands. Trail cameras are personal property that should be restricted on state lands as is currently dictated by existing state law. Revision 3 I wish to comment on The state is proposing that the prohibition of pets (dogs, cats, etc.) in observation towers on state lands be removed from law. <b>Currently</b>, NR 45.06 Animals. (3m) reads: No person may allow the person's dog, cat or other animal on an observation tower. The <b>proposed</b> revision, in SECTION 68, <b>eliminates the prohibition of pets in observation towers</b> (moved to SECTION 66). <b>Here are my thoughts on this revision that would allow pets in observation towers on state lands.</b> I oppose the <b>delisting</b> of "observation towers" on state lands from their current status as facilities off limits to pets. Like buildings, restrooms, etc., observation towers are limited, confined spaces where the potential for "pet to pet" or "pet to person" conflicts is high and the elevated platforms and stairways pose increased risks for injuries should such confrontations occur. Current state law requires pet leashes be no more than 8 feet on state properties. An 8 foot leash allows a pet to wander an area of about 200 square feet (20ft x 10 ft, if you need to picture that). Even a 6 foot leash allows for a pet to wander 113 square feet (a little over a 10ft X 10ft). Though I am not privy to the dimensions of every tower that exists on state lands, the math here would seem to tell us that a leashed pet's "range to roam" on a stairwell or platform invites unsafe conflict. Revision 4 I wish to comment on Regarding the collecting of clean skulls, antlers, and bones on state lands, I was unable to find specific mention of the collection of these natural items <b>currently</b> in NR 45.04 General Rules. Under the state's <b>proposed</b> revision, <b>SECTION 34</b> reorganizes the provision on collection of stems for trapping purposes, establishes that both willow and aspen stems may be collected, and restricts the purpose of the collection to trap stakes and bait sticks, which are the two predominate uses. This section also allows collection of stems for these purposes without written permission from the property manager, as this type of collection is very limited in scope. This section also requires a person who wants to collect seeds from herbaceous or woody plants to obtain a seed collecting permit from the department, as restructured from the note which was repealed (SECTION 25). <b>This section also allows a person to collect the clean skulls, antlers and bones of wild animals from department lands, as long as an open hunting season has been established for that species and the species is not otherwise covered by state and federal laws protecting them from collection and possession, such as endangered and threatened species and federally protected migratory birds. Here are my thoughts on this revision that would allow the collecting of clean skulls, antlers, and bones on state lands.</b> It appears there is no current written, legal policy regarding the collection of sheds and other animal bones on state lands, at least none that I uncovered. I couldn't find anything specifically mentioned in the current NR 45, but I may be wrong. I am not necessarily opposed to the collection of bones from the landscape in general, at least I wasn't at one time when I taught science courses and occasionally collected specimens for use in the classroom. But like trail cameras, the collection of bones, primarily antler sheds, has exploded in popularity to the point that at least 2 states, probably more, limit and regulate the practice. Concerns with the stress placed on wintering wildlife as shed hunters comb the landscape regularly in areas of high wildlife use, coupled with the impacts of the removal of this bony material so valuable as a mineral source to numerous small mammals, warrant we examine this human activity for its ecological impacts. Therefore, until further notice, I would like to see the state explore restrictions or regulations to such collecting on state lands and would support prohibiting such collecting. Revision 5 I wish to comment on My concluding comments consider the revision in SECTION 143, which adds Kohler-Andrae state park and Point Beach state forest to the <b>existing provisions</b> for protecting the dunes at Whitefish Dunes state park. I applaud and support this move that extends provisions for sand dune protection to additional state properties and increased state-owned acreage. Thank you once again for the opportunity to comment on this rules and revision package for NR. 1, 11, 45, 51, 115, and 116.</p>	
326	<p>I'm writing on behalf of my husband, two children, and myself to voice support for the proposed plan to allow hunting at Lapham Peak State Park. Hunting is an important WI tradition and controlling the deer population in this area is a huge need. CWD is prevalent in the area and we can help manage it by hunting.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
327		<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding</p>

	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
328	<p>I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the proposed amendments to chapters NR 1, 11, 45, 51, 115, and 116 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code, particularly the prohibition of public nudity on state-managed lands. As an engaged citizen who values personal freedoms, body positivity, and the cultural heritage of Wisconsin, I believe it is essential to address the potential impact of these rules. Historically, naturist spaces like Mazo Beach have played a crucial role in promoting body positivity, acceptance, and freedom. These areas have provided a platform for individuals to connect with nature, foster a sense of community, and embrace their bodies in a non-judgmental environment. The closure of Mazo Beach in 2016 and the proposed amendments, signal a departure from the values of inclusivity and cultural diversity that Wisconsin cherishes. As an individual who resides outside the state but frequently spends tourism dollars within Wisconsin, I must express that these proposed amendments would reduce my inclination to visit. The allure of Wisconsin lies not only in its natural beauty but also in its openness to diverse recreational activities. Restricting such activities may impact the state's attractiveness to visitors like myself who seek a welcoming and diverse environment. These rules have the potential to infringe upon personal freedoms and recreational choices that Wisconsinites hold dear. The state has a rich tradition of respecting individual liberties and embracing a diverse range of recreational activities. The proposed changes conflict with the principles that make Wisconsin unique, undermining the notion of personal responsibility and trust in our citizens to engage in responsible recreational practices. It is crucial to recognize that naturist activities are often characterized by a sense of responsibility, respect, and adherence to established norms. Such activities foster a sense of community and camaraderie among individuals who share common interests, contributing positively to the cultural fabric of Wisconsin. During the recent virtual hearing, a majority of public comments opposed the proposed nudity ban, particularly Section 37. This indicates a lack of public support for these rule changes. As engaged citizens voice their concerns, it is imperative to consider the diverse perspectives and values that contribute to Wisconsin and its tourism industry. I urge the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources to reconsider these proposed amendments and to engage in a more inclusive dialogue with the public. By taking into account the historical significance of naturist spaces, the impact on personal freedoms, and the responsible nature of naturist activities, we can arrive at policies that reflect the values of the state and preserve the diversity of recreational options available to its residents and visitors. Thank you for your attention to this matter. I hope that the department will consider the concerns expressed by the public and work towards a solution that balances the preservation of the state's cultural heritage with the evolving needs and values of our community.</p>	<p>The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.</p>
329	<p>This property should be open to hunting. Over population is a huge issue in this area. Being surrounded by private land, these animals will have very little success surviving a harsh winter.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
330		<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional</p>

	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
331	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
332	<p>I am concerned about hunting in Lapham peak. I not against hunting, my husband and 3 sons are all hunters. We live in Delafield and my son's house abuts with the park right in the area that would allow hunting. We have several concerns. (1) The park is often used by hikers, cross country skiers and those on snow shoes. (2) A compound bow is deadly at 50 yards, crossbow can be deadly at 100 yards. (3) Hunters may be going through our neighborhood to track the wounded deer. (4) Hunters may choose to park in our neighborhood and use our neighborhood trails to access the park. (5) The hunting season is 1/4 of the year. That is a very long season to be concerned about hunters in the woods and safety of our dogs and children playing in their own back yards. If hunting is allowed, please consider a short season like they did at Nashota Park. Please reconsider the hunting plans for Lapham Peak.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
333	<p>Who in their right mind thinks this is a good idea? Do you see how many people and pets are at Lapham on any given day, at any given time? There is plenty of land in the lake country area for hunting, there is absolutely no need for this to be allowed in a state park!</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
334	<p>My family lives in Delafield which has direct access to Lapham. We have enjoyed many years of using the beautiful trails in Lapham without the worry of hunter's possible errant arrows or bullets. I am requesting that you continue to NOT allow hunters in Lapham. I viewed the map of the areas that hunting would be allowed and see that much of the ice age trails would be available. This is an area where hikers are allowed when there is snow on the ground so as not to damage the CC ski trails! Opening this up to hunters poses a dangerous condition for hikers and their leashed pets! While there are areas that would be restricted, the map is very confusing to navigate for both groups (hunters and hikers) - where hunting is allowed, where it's not. And without the map, most people don't know where the boundaries are between deeded land, the proximity of private residences to Lapham, etc. I understand that, in general, there is an overpopulation of deer however I am requesting you do not open Lapham to bow hunters and find an alternate means to decrease the heard due to the possible injury this could cause to hikers which include many children who should be allowed to explore the park without fear! I appreciate you taking my opinion into consideration and hope you</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>



	reevaluate your position!!	
335	I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
336	I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
337	I hike at Lapham Peak 4 times a week on both sides of HWY C. If you allow hunting, I don't see how I can continue to hike safely. So, I absolutely, positively object to hunting of any kind in Lapham Peak Park. Please do not do this horrible act. Sincerely, P.S. Why don't you have the professional Rangers cull the deer herd?	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
338	This is a reply to the proposed resolution to open hunting at Lapham peak state park. Why only bow hunting? Why not rifle as well. We all know that the deer herd in the area is way out of control. Near by business are suffering tremendous dollar losses due to the deer feeding habits as are home owners landscapes. All of these cost substantial dollar amounts to replace and are not covered by insurance. Sharp shooter have been used in the recent past to control the herd. The use of firearms is the only effective means of control. Please state why bow hunting alone is the only thought on this problem	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
339	Hi, I just wanted to express my concern about the DNR proposal to allow bow hunting in the Lapham Peak. While it appears that the DNR has a few safe places for normal park visitors to hike, etc., it doesn't feel safe for the visitors. We all have learned of horrible mistakes that hunters have made with devastating results. Some hunters get overly excited by the hunt and are desperate to get a deer by any means. That's when the	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will

	<p>results become disastrous. Hi, I just wanted to express my concern about the DNR proposal to allow bow hunting in the Lapham Peak. While it appears that the DNR has a few safe places for normal park visitors to hike, etc., it doesn't feel safe for the visitors. We all have learned of horrible mistakes that hunters have made with devastating results. Some hunters get overly excited by the hunt and are desperate to get a deer by any means. That's when the results become disastrous.</p> <p>One of the reasons for the DNR's proposal is that there is an over population of deer. Whitnall/Root River parks had a similar problem a few years ago, and hired trained sharpshooters to hunt deer at night. Many signs were posted and it seems that the deer problem was eliminated. My husband and I love Lapham Peak and enjoy being able to hike in many of the park's trails. We feel safe and peaceful there. Remember that there are a lot of children that hike in the park, along with dogs. It would be very distressing if any of the kids or pets were accidentally shot with a bow. Please reconsider your proposal and don't allow bow hunting in Lapham Peak. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
340	<p>I fully support allowing hunting in the park.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
341	<p>I live next to the park. I am opposed to opening up the park for bow hunting due to significant safety concerns. As an immediate neighbor to the park, I see the large number of individuals walking through the park on a daily basis. To suggest everyone should wear a bright vest or coat is simply not practical. If there is a way to allow hunting only after the park is closed would be a possible option but who is going to monitor this if the park is closed? People walk into the park all the time, not just through the main entrance. The after closing option would have to be restricted to individuals specifically designated and licensed. Delafield tried this a few years ago but was found to be cost prohibited. I guess another possible option would be to designate a couple of days when the park would be closed for the specific and only reason of hunting the deer.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
342	<p>I am writing to comment on the proposed bow hunting at Lapham Peak unit. If the DNR has determined that the deer population is too large then I support controlling the population. In general I do not support bow hunting at Lapham and I do not support the duration proposed. If it must be done I think that it should be reduced to the minimum required to achieve the goal. If possible 2-3 days. I am at the park to recreate 1-2 times a week most of the year. I volunteer to make snow among other activities and in the fall and winter I am at the park 5-7 days a week to ski. The deer are so tame I can't imagine that you won't achieve the goal in a day or two. I also know that mountain biking was at one time allowed East of Hwy C. I believe part of the reason this is no longer allowed is because of the large number of hikers and wanting to maintain a safe and enjoyable environment. I would feel unsafe running or bringing my kids to the park during this time. This park (unit) has been a safe place to recreate during hunting season. It would be a shame to lose this.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
343	<p>Legislative members of DLNR Thank you for your consideration of the following concerns. Over the years I have spent time in Wisconsin in the enjoyment of the public and private lands in Wisconsin. Some in nude activity, some clothed. Many in the more remote parts of public land of northern part of the state. I currently am in medical practice in Hawaii and have text books and personal experience of using the natural elements of sun, light, fresh air, sound, and being in natural areas naked for healing. Such conditions as tuberculosis, better control of diabetes, autoimmune disorders, and mental illness, as well as maintaining general health and wellness can be managed with complete exposure of the body to natural elements. While some would be able to avail this treatment and self-healing in private locations, others would not have the access to private areas due to cost, time, or limited location. Public land access for being without clothing is important for families, and individuals for health and well being. A legal question could also be developed. Would a limitation or restrictions for a specific group (those desiring to be nude in a location where-by legal standards it could be possible to be nude) be construed as a possible constitutional violation and open to legal challenge. Please do not indiscriminately criminalize the normal natural opportunity for the unclothed human body to obtain health and well-being in natural public lands! Please do not make laws criminalizing being naked on public lands! Thank you for your time.</p>	<p>The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.</p>
344	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding</p>

	<p>a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
345	<p>This is a great idea! I hope it passes! (Note: this email was attached to a forwarded email about bow hunting at Lapham Peak.)</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
346	<p>Hi, I am a resident of Oconomowoc and holder of two state park passes. I am writing to request that hunting not be allowed at Lapham Peak State Park. It is difficult to find recreational lands in the fall that are not multi-use for hunting and hiking, etc. Lapham Peak State Park currently provides a safe area for both hunters and outdoor rec users. In that there is no hunting allowed in a dense and heavily used area and therefore hunters cannot accidentally harm or kill someone. I specifically use Lapham Peak in the fall and winter because there is no hunting. The potential area marked for hunting on the south side of the tower is a segment of the ice age trail that has heavy winter use and would be dangerous for both hunters and rec users. This is too dangerous and takes away usage from hikers like myself. I already give up state forest, ice age trail segments, etc due to hunting in the fall. I am ok with that- but where can I hike during hunting season that doesn't put myself at risk? I've paid for this usage and now it is being put at risk.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
347	<p>Please accept this message in favor of proposed changes to Administrative Code NR 45 that seek to protect access for rock climbing within State Natural Areas. Members of the climbing community serve as strong advocates and stewards of conservation and the protection of natural lands. The current prohibition encoded in NR 45.13(1)(e) imposes an unwarranted prohibition against climbing, which is not supported by evidence that climbing has an adverse impact on the protection of these areas. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
348	<p>Please accept my vote of support to allow bow hunting of white tail deer and turkey within Lapham Peak. Past due, but better late than never. Count my vote as YES, allow bow hunting.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

349	Dear DNR, I am writing to state my opposition to allowing bow hunting at Lapham Peak State Park. I walk with my dog in the park 3-4 times a week, and each time we find many families, older couples, and individual hikers on the trails. It would be incredibly unsafe for all of us who enjoy the park to allow hunting of any sort within park boundaries. It would also seem that hunters have plenty of other land available to hunt deer. Please do not allow bow hunting at Lapham Peak State Park.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
350	I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
351	I would definitely like to see lapham peak opened to bow hunting.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
352	I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
353	The photos below taken at 1:45 PM on December 7, 2023, depict the parking lot at Homestead Hollow at the trailhead of the plantation trail at Lapham. The parking lot appears 90% full and the area around it is filled by young families with a gathering of children who appeared to be of kindergarten age. The area proposed for bow hunting, appears accessible from the plantation trail. How are dead deer going to be removed from the park? Will Young children see deer being dragged from the woods and loaded onto pick up trucks? How does killing turkeys improve things for deer? Many current and past donors for improvements in the park may have assumed that it will not be a hunting ground. For many of us, permitting hunting will be a very big change, not one for the better.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

354	Please, please, please!! Maintain NO HUNTING throughout Lapham Peak. It's the one safe and relaxing place I hike and ride my horse during the many hunting seasons in Wisconsin. Hunters have PLENTY of other places to do their "sport." Can't the rest of us have a sanctuary in this stressful world? Mental health is a big issue these days. Lapham Peak is an enhancement to mental health. Please don't turn it into another killing field. We have enough of those. There must be other ways to control the deer population. Contraception an option?	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
355	I am commenting on NR45 in regards to snowmobile trails in the Northern Kettle Moraine State Forest and request that they remain unchanged. This great asset to snowmobiling has been in place since the 60's and has served the community in many ways including bringing in snowmobilers from other areas to the NKM State Forest and surrounding businesses. The trails are maintained and groomed for winter use by our snowmobile club as well as others. We work under a strict contract that has worked well as a partnership between the clubs and the NKM State Forest management.	Comment is noted and has been entered into the record.
356	I reside in Waukesha. I saw in the Freeman that the DNR wants to open Bow hunting at Lapham Peak. I am very opposed to this venture. I use the park weekly to walk and hike with my dog, all year long. I specifically use Lapham as there is no hunting there and I don't have to worry about someone shooting me or my dog. We enjoy coming across deer as well, as well as other wildlife like the turkeys. The park is well managed, clean, convenient, close to home, and is well maintained. I don't want to be hiking in the park with my dog if any person can be in there at the same time with their bow. I would be very fearful for my safety. I understand that most hunters are safe, but that is the problem, most, but not all.... Please don't allow hunting for the general public at any time (including deer season).	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
357	I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
358	I am in favor of allowing bow hunting on parts of Lapham Peak.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
359		The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

	<p>Hello. I am a resident of Waukesha County. Specifically, I in Waukesha8. I am writing to express my support to allow the rule change to allow Archery hunting in Lapham State Park. I express this support with first-hand knowledge of the burgeoning deer herd in the Delafield area, as I currently serve as the volunteer coordinator of the Town of Delafield Deer Management Program and I am the Waukesha Community Liaison for the Waukesha County CDAC. I have participated in this program for the last five years, and even though we have harvested in excess of 20 deer for each of those five years, we barely make a dent in the deer herd in and around Lapham Park. I will say, that while I am in favor of hunting the Park, I can offer some cautionary insights if you allow this to move forward. First, while in our Town of Delafield Program, we try extremely hard to make things as "Idiot-proof" as possible, people are still people and they do some dumb stuff. If there is any way to place some type of "Restrictions" on participants who will hunt the Park, I would strongly encourage it Restrictions I would recommend; Mandatory in-person training to hunt the Park Limited lottery or other means to pre-screen participants, so that the general public that is against hunting doesn't have more ammunition based on bad behavior from a few bad actors in the hunt You could also do a "Pre-registration" of participants, so you know who will be hunting. Second, because I am certain you will be getting push-back from the ill-informed, Safety-freaked, dog-walking crowd, you could require a proficiency test to make sure people who hunt the Park are skilled enough to make clean, quick kills so wounded animals do not cause trouble for other users of the Park. Third, I would REQUIRE that hunters REMOVE ALL GUTS/ENTRAILS from the property upon harvest. Again, based on the dog-walking crowd, I can't imagine that they would enjoy coming upon gut piles on the property, especially because no hunting has happened there before. Lastly and probably most importantly, only allow hunting in the Park in areas that are away from dog-walking, cross country skiing, and hiking trails to avoid user conflicts. NOTE: This will also allow for better success for the hunters because people won't be walking through while they are hunting, thus causing animals to flee the area As I stated previously, I fully support the rule change to allow Archery hunting for deer and turkeys at Lapham Park and I am hopeful that this rule change moves forward. Additionally, I would welcome an opportunity to discuss this further with anyone that would like my opinions.</p>	
360	<p>Concerning the DNR's proposed deer hunt; I am totally against this idea for the following reasons: (1) A deer (in the majority of cases) will run well over 100 yards when struck. Assuming it is a perfect kill shot. (2) A deer will run much further when hit with a non-lethal shot. (3) In both cases there will be a blood trail, which will cross hiking trails at some point. (4) The gut and blood pile will draw other animals including Coyotes. (5) NONE of this is what the 600,000 visitors to the park each year would want to experience, especially on a fall or winter outing. DNR wardens or a professional hunter could remove whatever quota you have set in a matter of nights. I am knowledgeable of professional hunters that are used in our county and how effective they are. I have been and still am an avid deer hunter and outdoorsman. I spend a lot of time hiking Lapham's trails (year round) with family and or my Black Lab. I realize the DNR has the obligation to offer whatever they can to the licensed deer hunters of Wisconsin. However, if common sense is used, this is not the location and is a very disappointing plan suggested by our DNR!</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
361	<p>As a long time neighbor and volunteer of Lapham Peak state forest I support the DNR's position to begin culling the deer herd in the park via a hunt. It should be determined by the DNR as to whether it should be carried out by DNR employees or by issuing permits to the public. Special attention should be given to the opinions of local DNR employees Colton Kelly, Jay Abts and Brian Fitzpatrick. They have intimate knowledge of the park as well as many years of personal deer hunting.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
362	<p>I live in Milwaukee, WI which is fairly close to lapham peak and I agree with you guys for opening some of the park for archery only. However, I think you guys should do a lottery style for a select amount of hunters because of how limited the open to public hunting with archery only land acreage is.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
363	<p>Hello, I am writing to you about the proposed hunting in Lapham Peak. This link <a href="https://laphampeakfriends.org/hunting/">https://laphampeakfriends.org/hunting/</a> states that the deer are overpopulated in the park and starving. I am not sure how turkey's go into the mix with starving deer, but I am writing to you to express my opinion that I am against this idea. This park is used by so many people for hiking and hunting is not suitable with the amount of people that could wander into harm's way. Please note that I am against hunting in Lapham Peak in Delafield, Wisconsin</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
364	<p>I understand that the DNR is proposing that Lapham Peak be opened to bow hunting during the normal archery season for deer and turkeys. Currently, no hunting of any type is allowed at Lapham Peak. I am sending you this note to let you know that I am opposed to this proposal. Lapham Peak is a busy park, enjoyed by countless individuals and families participating in various activities. I would hate to think that the people enjoying the park would be negatively impacted by open bow season. I understand that the reason the DNR is proposing this action is to prevent starvation and overpopulation. I feel sorry for these animals. We continue to develop land and push them out of their habitats. Then we want</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

	them gone from our parks too. If you are certain that such action is necessary because of starvation and overpopulation, won't you please limit these killing activities to certain time periods, and close the park at those times, so no one is hurt? This is done at Whitnall park in Milwaukee, and though not ideal, at least people are not put in harms way.	
365	I fully support the opening of archery hunting at Lapham Peak. I support the DNR's effort to open more lands to archery hunters, especially in this area. I frequent Lapham Peak in the summertime and believe it would be a great use to the public to expand hunting opportunities in the fall.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
366	Please do not allow bow deer hunting at Lapham Peak State Park. There are so many people that use the trails, including myself and that appears to be a danger that none of us would like to be subjected to. Unbelievable to think that as we hike and ski through our favorite trails that we would be risking injury or worse. Very scary. There is a deer problem in this part of the state. I would think you could come up with other ways to take care of this problem. I have deer in my yard in Hartland, but that doesn't mean hunting should be allowed here. Please use common sense and consider the populous when attempting to solve problems. Thank you.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
367	To the DNR Board, I first would like to give you a thumbs up on this opportunity for all hunters and citizens in Wisconsin. The more responsibility given to the outdoorsman and women will only create a stronger bond between wildlife, conservation, repopulation and a greater understanding of our fragile environment. I am in agreement with the opening of Lapham Peak's west territory for bow hunting; with 2 requests. (1) All deer or turkey shot in this special zone need to report within 12 hours. (2) All gut piles will be bagged and taken out of the woods to a proper disposal container. Thank you for your time.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
368	Please do not open up Lapham Peak to bow hunting. There is enough land available elsewhere in the state already for this. Please keep it a safe space for hiking where stray arrows are not a concern.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
369	I am currently the City of Delafield Chairman of our Deer Committee and strongly encourage bow and archery hunting at Lapham Peak.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
370	I live directly across from the park on Lapham Ln. "I Do Not Want To See Hunting AT THIS AWESOME PARK". Please do not make this park into something it was not meant to be....It's a wonderful park just as it is. I'm proud of the way it's kept up by the rangers.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
371	We are opposed to bow hunting at Lapham Peak Park.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
372	I am opposed to the allowance of bow hunting within the bounties of Lapham Peak state park for many reasons. The biggest reason is for the safety of hikers and pets. I own property adjacent to the park and the proposed area that is identified for bow hunting, and regularly walk from my house to the park with my dogs, who look remarkably similar to a small deer. Hunting accidents happen all of the time and the loss of just one pet, or god forbid, one human, is not worth the risk. Allowing hunters access to the park would also likely mean cars and trucks parking on Lapham Peak Rd, which is already a narrow road. I also worry that hunters will wander onto my property mistakenly. I should not have to feel unsafe on my own property. I would suggest an alternate solution to the deer population problem, which is allow additional bow hunting tags in the existing hunting areas for doe only.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

373	On behalf of the Consumer Technology Association (“CTA”), attached are comments opposing the proposed amendment to NR 45.04(1)(c) that would add uncrewed aircraft systems (“UAS” or “drones”) into the list of flying related activities that are restricted in state parks and recreational areas. As discussed below, the proposal is overbroad and preempted to the extent it prohibits drone operations over state parks and recreation areas. See attachment, "CTA Comments NR 45.04(1)(c) (120823)"	The department has reviewed the CTA comments and taken them under advisement but does not plan to make any changes to the proposed language at this time.
374	I am hopeful you don't open Lapham Peak to hunting. The number of places people can safely hike during hunting season is very small. This would take away one of the few options. Thank you for your consideration.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
375	Hello. If I heard my neighbor correctly, are you seriously going to enact this? I find this totally absurd & dangerous with all the traffic there. I sure will not walk nor ride across the road til this is addressed. ..Cushing Park Rd.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
376	I have been an avid Lapham Peak Park user for the past 31 years. Our property line is against Lapham Peaks property. The excessive over population of deer in Lapham Peak is out of control. There is rarely a day that I drive down Hwy C that I don't see a dead deer on the side of the road caused by a car/deer crash. The deer eat the pumpkins off my front step and ALL our landscaping. I am adamantly in favor of bow hunting in the park to reduce the deer population. It is in the best interest of the deer, other wildlife and those of us who have to travel down Hwy C on a daily basis. I'm happy to cooperate and assist with this project in any way possible. This decision should not be up to those of us who use the park, this decision should be in the hands of the DNR who are trained to do what is best for the park property and the animals that it supports.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
377	I vote yes in agreement to open Latham Peak to bow hunting.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
378	I am happy to have a chance to respond to the proposed solution to the problem of too many deer at Lapham Peak. As one of the busiest parks in the state, the idea of allowing bow hunting seems like a very bad idea, and one that could cause great harm to the users of the park. I strongly oppose hunting at Lapham Peak when people are hiking, biking or skiing in the park. Could an alternate solution of closing down the park for a couple of days and inviting hunters into the park be possible?	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
379	Please support opening this property up to bowhunting. Wisconsin bowhunters have proven over decades they can responsibly share public ground with other citizens without conflict. It would be great to have a bowhunting only public ground option available here.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
380	I am happy to have a chance to respond to the proposed solution to the problem of too many deer at Lapham Peak. As one of the busiest parks in the state, the idea of allowing bow hunting seems like a very bad idea, and one that could cause great harm to the users of the park. I strongly oppose hunting at Lapham Peak when people are hiking, biking or skiing in the park. Could an alternate solution of closing down the park for a couple of days and inviting hunters into the park be possible?	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
381	I do believe the Deer should be hunted. It would be nice to have a limited time (3 weekends a year) or something like that, so runners/skiers and hunters are not crossing each other. I am a runner/skier and I do not want the frustration of the hunter when I run by and mess up their hunt. I am from Iowa and they instead make the hunting in the parks available for Handicapped hunters. I think that would be great as it would allow easy access for the handicapped hunter (could bring them to the site in an ATV) and an easy kill for them as the deer are used to humans. My father-in-law teaches hunter safety in Iowa and volunteers for the handicapped hunts. He helps the hunter get to the site, helps direct them so it is a great experience for the hunter and a humane kill of the deer.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.



382	<p>This is a comment to the proposed rule change allowing archery and cross bow hunting at Lapham Peak. I strongly oppose the proposed rule change to allow archery and cross bow hunting in Lapham Peak. I am a sticker holder and use the Park regularly to hike, ski and snowshoe as well as view the fall foliage. Allowing archery and cross bow hunting would interfere with my freedom to exercise, recreate and enjoy the outdoors in a relaxing manner without worrying whether I will be shot by an arrow. Leaves on trees mask distance, direction and path, greatly increasing the probability of mishap. If hunting is allowed during these fall and winter months, people would be forced to buy orange hunting clothing and hope they will not be hit by an arrow. This increases stress and reduces recreational enjoyment. More likely, instead, many people who regularly use Lapham Peak will just not go there during the five designated hunting months especially those with disabilities and the elderly who use the accessible trail. Archery and cross bow hunting in this unique area poses a severe risk to public safety, especially since the number of people who hike, ski and snowshoe at Lapham Peak will be greatly increased when Lapham Lodge is opened. There are many other locations in Wisconsin that permit archery and cross bow hunting of deer and turkey that do not infringe on the rights of those who are already using Lapham Peak and seek to continue enjoying the outdoors without fear of injury or death from an arrow while hiking, skiing or snowshoeing. I am against the archery and cross bow hunting proposal. Thank you. Delafield, Wisconsin</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
383	<p>I have a home directly adjacent to the proposed public hunting area that I believe to be a 40 acre square in the NE corner of the park. I am in opposition to the proposed changes for many reasons. Some of those reasons are: Reduction of safety while walking my dogs and horses (I am a frequent user of the park), My wife and children are frequent users of the park as well and have all expressed safety concerns, I already have frequent trespassers from the park and I fear this is likely to increase, I believe there are better ways to control the size of the deer herd without making such a huge and permanent change to the park. Please don't do this!</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
384	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
385	<p>I wish to make public comment on the proposed change in the administrative code that will open the Lapham Peak Unit of the Kettle Moraine State Forest to bow hunting for deer and turkey. I use Lapham Park for recreation more than any other park in Southeast Wisconsin. MANY people do. The proposal to open it to bow hunting will present an unprecedented risk to the public. There are MANY places open to hunters. Do not open a recreation area used by so many people of all ages all through the year. If there is an overpopulation problem seek other means than by putting the public at risk.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
386	<p>As a hunter of more than 25 years, please, PLEASE leave Lapham Peak closed from hunting. Are there too many deer in Delafield? Yes, without question. Would I personally hunt at Lapham given the opportunity? Absolutely. That does NOT make it a good idea. Talk to your staff, and they will tell you that Lapham is one of the most utilized State Park's in the system, and this includes hikers, runners, and skiers of all ages, at all times of the year. As a hunter, I already find myself spending too much time defending what I value to people that don't understand the value of hunting. Putting hunters into Lapham Peak only will serve to create greater hostility and conflict between hunters and non-hunters. We don't need that, and it will NOT help us to increase our hunting license sales. Do I support opening additional state lands to hunters? As a general position, absolutely. Do I support doing it in areas that will only create hostility and anger in local communities? No, not even remotely. As hunters, we have a responsibility to not only behave ethically in terms of how we conduct ourselves in the field, but also in terms of how we represent ourselves to those who do not share our passion.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

387	Please consider this email as full Support for a deer hunt access for bow hunters and crossbow hunters to the Lapham Peak Park system. Please consider a lottery system to limit the number of active hunters at one time, otherwise this will become a real challenge to maintain any sort of quality hunting experience. I fear that Harassers will be very active in the area Thank you Formerly a Nashotah resident	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
388	I am Waukesha County resident (please see address below). I am vehemently opposed to any hunting at Lapham Peak. Lapham Peak is the one safe park for hikers, runners, and the community to go out into nature during hunting season without the worry of being harmed. We deserve a space that is safe. In addition, there are multiple safety concerns with allowing hunting at what is one of the most frequented parks in the area. The amount of people that utilize Lapham Peak for activities such as runs, skiing, group hikes, bird watching, etc. all year round makes this proposal incredibly unsafe for the community. The proposed areas for hunting are too close to the trails and neighboring houses. Please do not allow this proposal to go further. The hunting community has dozens of trails and parks in the area they can utilize during the year without concern. We in the community deserve at least one park that we can feel safe from harm and not worry about an accident to ourselves, families, and pets. This proposal is in my opinion, irresponsible and completely disregards the safety of those that utilize Lapham Peak.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
389	I'm writing to urge you not to open Lapham Peak to hunting. For those of us who don't hunt, but enjoy hiking, photography, birding, etc there aren't many places we can go in fall that don't allow hunting. Fall is the best season to be out enjoying the outdoors. We have deer seasons that basically run from September until January, which is totally unfair to those of us who enjoy the outdoors in fall. I live in rural Dodge County, we have hunting all around us to the point where it isn't safe to walk our dogs, so we go to Lapham to exercise them. It's ridiculous that now this area too is being considered for hunting. The percentage of Wisconsinites who hunt is much lower than those who don't, and personally, I'm tired of the hunting population being catered too. Please do not allow this to happen.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
390	Not in favor of opening to hunting, too many reasons to list.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
391	Dear DNR, bow hunting or any type of hunting should not be allowed in this park. There are enough areas where killers can go & be psycho. Your agency is in great need of reform. Hunting is dying get with the program & change or the public will change you.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
392	I appreciate everything the DNR does to preserve our environment AND the safety of those who hike our many trails. Please do not allow any hunting in Lapham or the nearby trails.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
393	I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will

		engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
394	I am fully in support of bow hunting possibly being allowed in Lapham Peak. Bow hunting is statistically extremely safe and I have had personal experience bow hunting public parks that were also open to hikers, skiers, etc. and interacted with several of them while hunting and it was almost always a positive experience. I know how disease can set in areas of overpopulated deer and as unfortunate as it is, reducing overpopulated areas is necessary and bow hunting lets more people access an area they might not normally have decided to visit/enjoy. Thank you for his consideration and if any volunteer assistance is needed, I am completely open to that as well. I am a former law enforcement, and hunter education instructor, and lifelong hunter. I live in Elkhorn, but work in Waukesha and have numerous friends around Lapham Peak and would love to be able to hunt near work/friends. Thank you and feel free to contact me for questions and/or volunteering to help get this going.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
395	I don't mind being in a state park during a hunting season, especially bow hunting, but Lapham Peak is used by a lot of people unfamiliar with the dates of hunting seasons and the precautions that should be taken. I hike a lot so always have bright orange hats and vests in my car but most people don't think of that. I especially worry about children in the park during any hunting season. So, in the case of Lapham Peak, I don't like the idea of allowing bow hunting.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
396	However, Lapham is quite small and heavily used. I doubt there is enough of an area that would qualify for hunting use that would actually accomplish a useful reduction of the deer population. Not to mention, deer aren't stupid and will quickly figure out where is safe and where is not safe. My neighborhood tried hiring sharpshooters but it didn't make any difference in foraging pressure. We've seen no reduction in deer. I am very skeptical this idea of allowing hunting at Lapham would accomplish anything. Also, it will impact my family's quality of life. Currently, during the VERY long fall hunting season there aren't many "wild" places where hikers and bikers, who are taxpayers and voters too, can participate in their chosen hobby without fear of some unskilled hunter taking them out or having to remember to wear blaze orange. I've had multiple instances where my hike turned into a fearful situation, like hiking the Monches segment of the Ice Age Trail only to panic when I heard nearby automatic rifle fire or when I walked under a hunter in a stand right off the trail. People never obey rules; it's just a fact of life. In the fall, my family and I tend to stop hiking the parts of the Ice Age Trail and rec land that allow hunting and focus on using Lapham since Fall is the best time to hike and partake in nature. Hunters have the vast majority of rec land for their use; do they need to take our only safe haven too, especially since it won't actually address the problem of deer overpopulation? I don't think it's a good idea.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
397	I was disheartened to recently read that there is proposed legislature in Wisconsin to make nudity illegal. It seems the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources would be the last place for that kind of mindset (forcing what is natural to instead utilize potentially unnatural elements to be able to enjoy it). While I don't currently reside in Wisconsin, I have grown up in the midwest and have visited or traveled through Wisconsin multiple times. I have wrestled with whether or not I should comment on this, and what I should share that might lead to a favorable outcome. I know growing up in a multi-generational christian* family, that nudity was a confusing thing in my early years - when was it OK to be naked, when was it not OK, and why was it not OK? [*christian defined here as a individual having a personal relationship with Jesus Christ and regularly engaging with the word of God - the Bible - not an individual that might occasionally attend a church or grew up in a house with others that might attend church.] As I've gotten older (in my early 50s now) I've heard comments from time to time of nudist camps, skinny dipping, etc. all of which seemed rather intriguing, but yet "wrong". Following my divorce (and lots of ugly accusations around sex and nudity) I started exploring more about what all this nakedness stuff might be. I've read several contemporary christian sites that make claims that the Bible opposes nudity, with a few scriptures referenced that painted a somewhat negative view of nudity. However, there are other scriptures that also reference nudity, but not in an opposing fashion (rather, just matter-of-fact fashion) and those passages are rarely ever brought up in the commentaries regarding the Bible and nudity. After my initial deep dive into this subject on a biblical perspective, I've now read comments from language experts that claim the one scripture passage most often referenced as the strongest (yet weak) evidence opposing nudity is actually being misinterpreted from the original Hebrew and Greek scriptures to claim something other than what was actually being presented. Finally, I've also heard and read testimony of many others (of both biological or genetic sexes) that have found once they started exploring naturism (nudity), the psychological struggles they have had regarding themselves or how they viewed others subsided. [I just realized that I haven't ever read a testimony of someone that found themselves further harmed due to nudity - something I can't say regarding testimonies I have heard or read for those that have engaged in the LGBTQ++ lifestyles that are so promoted in vogue currently.] I personally have found that there is nothing more enjoyable than to be able to enjoy nature as God created me. In more public or popular naturist settings, I have found less desire to "gawk" at others	The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.

	<p>because I immediately see <u>them</u>, not whatever they are wearing and then being left wondering what they actually look like. I have met and enjoyed fellowship with other like minded christians that also enjoy being able to enjoy life as God created us (reference to Genesis Chapter 1) . I have witnessed comments from “naturists” that I would say don’t correspond with a naturist lifestyle, but I’ve also witnessed equivalent or worse comments from (textile) people (some that think nudity is purely sexual - which is far from reality). Clothing in and of itself (I am sure) have not prevented sexually inappropriate behaviors from taking place in areas (or situations) where such behavior shouldn’t be happening. I’ve heard rumors that the whole intention of this proposal is a misguided thought that banning nudity would somehow eliminate inappropriate behaviors. In a similar fashion, most people miss that there was a blood sacrifice in Gen 3:21 for the sins of Adam and Eve to then produce the garments that clothed them (possibly a loving gesture for them to hide the shame they now felt?), similar to the blood sacrifice of Jesus on the cross for the sins of mankind to enable forgiveness to all to be able to have a personal relationship with Christ upon acceptance of His sacrifice. Note that neither of those actions (clothing or sacrifices) have eliminated inappropriate behaviors. I hope there is further thought into the potential implications and unintended consequences of these proposed rule changes as I can only guess at what the intended desired outcome is. I can say that my research and personal experiences thus far have yet to answer why it might not OK to be naked - outside of man-made regulations prohibiting it - and I believe that eliminating those regulations prohibiting it might allow for a mentally healthier population (and potentially a reduction in sexuality related crimes).</p>	
398	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
399	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>

400	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
401	<p>Do not allow any hunting any time, any where, in Lapham peak. This is the one refuge that exists for hikers without hunters! There are more than enough places for hunters to hunt. Let me take a hike in peace without somebody pointing an arrow at me from a tree stand</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
402	<p>Absolutely not!!!! That would mean we could not safely hike for several months! State parks are for hiking, walking, enjoying nature - NOT HUNTING!!!</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
403	<p>I would like to show my support for DNR to approve bow hunting in Lapham Peak Park for these reasons: I have come close to hitting a deer with my car many times and feel there is an overabundance of deer in the area. Hunters are required to take a safety class in order to obtain their license and I feel bowhunters are very safety conscious. Lastly, the Park should be shared amongst people who may have different interests. I walk my dog there almost every day and would feel safe with bowhunters.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
404	<p>I disagree with the rules allowing deer pushing. I don't think that pushing deer should be allowed. It's not very ethical. Pushing deer doesn't give them a chance!! Ethical way would be sitting and hoping a deer goes by you. Pushing doesn't give the deer any chance. Also, pushing is not safe as the people pushing don't know where other hunters are in the woods. Thanks</p>	<p>Deer pushing (also known as "driving") is not contemplated in this rule package. This comment will be shared with the wildlife program who would be most likely to address this topic via rulemaking or otherwise.</p>
405	<p>I have lived in Town of Ottawa for 33 years and have visited Lapham Peak State Park dozens of times in all seasons. I am completely against allowing any hunting in this park. This has always been a place to hike, walk my dog, and visit the Butterfly garden with my granddaughter without any danger of bullets or arrows around us. We need a place like this to escape hunters because the Waukesha county parks and Kettle Moraine state forest allow bow hunting and gun. Your stated reason to allow hunting is a sham. That is, the deer population has grown too large and they are starving. I have never seen a starving deer anywhere in this park. In addition, the land was given by original owners to the state but with no hunting/trapping allowed. This is breaking the spirit of that deed's rules. If absolutely needed, send in sharpshooters to cull the herd and not have wounded deer running the trails. Do NOT allow hunting in Lapham. Let it stay safe for all human and animals as was intended. The DNR has this responsibility!</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
406	<p>I have resided in Muskego almost 30 years with my husband Richard. We daily utilize the Muskego Park and walk the woods, which is about 3 miles. I take pictures of the deer tracks, almost had a fawn run into us this summer, saw two buck brothers bound in front of us last year, and have seen buck scrapes and rubs in fall seasons. I'm sure others in Latham Peak live for their daily nature walk too. All my family and friends are gone, so seeing the deer is a great reason to be alive. Also, we've seen waterfowl (I'm a member of Ducks Unlimited and the WI Waterfowl Group), rabbits, and carried turtles back to the pond that were in the roadway. Why kill the deer for God's sake? Very sad for me. Unless there is evidence</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

	that they starve in winter, which I highly doubt, as evidenced by the browse and birdseed from feeders available and the high quantity of acorns this Fall produced. I was sliding all over the fallen acorns. I also want you to know that there are people that walk dogs off trail and at all hours at the parks. You don't want a citizen or pet casualty! Also, this year I told the park staff about homeless men I've seen leave early with backpacks and bags of stuff. Definitely homeless people. Again, could be mistaken for a large animal. I told the staff in Spring a woman saw some man hiding by a tree which unnerved her. I come from a hunting family, my husband is a wonderful hunter. Just now, I made venison hamburgers. This issue for me is all that I have mentioned. Please do not exterminate these animals. I pray the DNR goes in a different direction. The deer at Lapham aren't harming anyone. The park is heavily used. Why kill the deer if they aren't causing trouble? I don't get it.	
407	Please do not allow bow hunting, or any hunting in Lapham Peak Park! We love to hike there with our grandchildren and would be much too worried to go if there might be hunters in the park.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
408	We are losing our natural safe areas to hunting. There is plenty of other places that people can hunt.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
409	Hello - I want to express my opposition to any hunting season to be held at the park. We use the park extensively year-round and I have major concerns about safety if opened to hunters. Please keep the park free from hunting of any kind.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
410	My family has always enjoyed the peaceful total nature experience of the park. Not all hunters are safe or respectful, unfortunately. I would rather not have to worry about it when all I want is a peaceful environment to de-stress. And the fact that hikers and skiers would have to purchase different clothing to be safe from hunters is asking a lot. There's plenty of other public hunting available elsewhere. Keep our parks the way nature intended, for humans and wildlife as well. Thank you for allowing commentary.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
411	Please do not allow hunting We live in Greenfield and love driving to enjoy this serene park. If you allow hunting you will destroy the amazing escape we all desire	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
412	I am commenting in support of the title proposal (Section 140 of the proposed rule changes) to allow hunting in Lapham Peak. I am in favor of this change to allow additional hunting opportunities.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
413	I am in favor of increasing the opportunities to hunt in the public state parks so support an idea to have limited archery season in the park.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
414	Never forget that in 7 days of monitoring a nude beach you gave 13 citations for literal public intercourse, and that was an improvement from the year before: <a href="https://www.butting.com/articles/wisconsin-nude-beach-stats-exemplify-seriousness-of-sex-crime-charges/">https://www.butting.com/articles/wisconsin-nude-beach-stats-exemplify-seriousness-of-sex-crime-charges/</a> I believe people should be allowed to do things that don't hurt others, but anyone who claims this is entirely nonsexual are either lying or misled. The people who desire these places have already demonstrated their desires with almost 2 citations per day average and no child should be subjected to such an open	The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.

	<p>door to perversion. We've already documented the awfulness that comes to kids put in those situations, even if they aren't directly abused. Until they can get their sex addicts under control, it's an unfortunate reality for these people that they need to have their freedoms so squashed that the must... wear clothes?? I don't see how anyone could care about showing their nuts so much that they're willing to open the door to child abuse but that's the world we live in today. Every nudist I've ever interacted with has gone out of their way to be disgusting towards me, it's no wonder why only 20% of nudists are women. When asked about why they want to do it, the most common responses I got on the largest online nudism platform were about the thrill of exhibitionism and multiple stories about being caught by beautiful women. It's obvious to me that for a majority of people involved it's nothing more than a kink, and no children should ever be involved in that. Since it would be wrong to make outside a child-free zone, the best option I can see is just... make people wear something. It's not that hard to cope with that they shouldn't care so much. Thanks for listening, I'm sorry those people made it such a freakout.</p>	
415	<p>For the better part of human history except for perhaps the last hundred fifty years. Non-sexual nudity was both common and necessary in every day life. Wisconsin has historic been aligned to a positive approach to non-sexual at Maxi Beach, providing the opportunity for those seeking body acceptance and the expression of one's individual rights to do so freely. The proposed rule change, aligns more closely with an oppressive and controlling state than one which values freedom fought for, defended and protected since the founding of our nation and the state of wisdom. I do not support inappropriate or sexualized nudity broadly expressed and unavoidable by others. However, there is no socially beneficial purpose to generally restrict non-sexual socially nude practice in secluded and designated spaces among consenting individuals. If one is offended in these limited places over one's eyes or choose another among location from the vast expanse of textile only places.</p>	<p>The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.</p>
416	<p>I am a Wisconsin resident residing in Sheboygan. I am in support of allowing hunting at Lapham Peak as I believe it can greatly reduce accidents and deer incidents on the interstate closest to Lapham peak. I am a hiker, but not a hunter yet. I believe we all should coexist and respect the great outdoors. Hunters should be allowed to hunt there as well if it helps the population.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
417	<p>I live in Brookfield WI 53005. I do not think bow hunting on the park grounds is good idea. I explore the park weekly with my dog. I feel like I wouldn't feel safe if there are hunters on the property. I have been going to Lapham Peak for 20+ years. I had many meaningful conversations with my children while hiking those trails. My middle son decided he wanted to get his degree in environmental science at UW-Whitewater because of all the hiking we did at Lapham Peak. What I'm trying to say is that I probably will find a safer place to hike if hunting is permitted there. Are there other solutions to your dilemma?</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
418	<p>I am aware that there are high numbers of deer at Lapham Peak and that is problematic for the forest. I don't need to tell you how heavily this park is used. Surely, there is a better way to solve this problem without putting thousands of people at risk. This is a really bad idea!</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
419	<p>I am against this. Just rode horseback with a group of 9 there in November. Beautiful park. Saw two hunters with dogs and they were bird hunting, didn't think that was allowed. Heard gun shots. That is frightening to horses. Also- bow hunting can cause severe injury to people, dogs and horses that use the park. There was an instance in a Wisconsin park where a bow Hunter shot and injured a horse while being ridden on the trails. The horse had to be put down!! Not all hunters are ethical hunters with skills. Please do not allow hunting of any kind in this park.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
420	<p>My address is Delafield WI 53018. In my opinion as a hunter, the WIS DNR should find a better solution than 3 months of bow hunting deer in a much utilized State Park. My suggestion would be to employ sharp shooters over a week to cull the deer with the park closed. The venison then could be donated to food banks. I agree with the cull, as I live in the area, and don't enjoy the deer damage of my property.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
421	<p>I come from a hunting family, and as I do believe we have a problem with our deer population numbers. I do not believe making Lapham Peak public land for bow hunting unless you would be closing the park to trail users. This is purely a safety concern for park users and I would hate to see someone injured by a hunter with poor judgment.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

422	<p>I am firmly against bow hunting in Lapham Peak State Park. The park is used by hundreds of people as an area in the midst of metropolitan expansion in which they can hike and bike in a natural, safe environment with their families and pets every month of the year. Having hunting in the park would destroy that and endanger their lives. Furthermore, the park preserves the oak savannah ecology that once dominated this part of the state. Having hunters tromping through the grass prairie would destroy the native prairie plants and upset the delicate balance of the prairie ecology. There are innumerable other areas for hunters to satisfy their archaic, visceral desire to kill innocent beings. Why do they need to add Lapham Peak Park to their bloody list? If the argument is that the deer herd needs to be reduced, there are humane ways of doing so without having to kill the animals. The Humane Society of the US has proven through years of research studies that injections of PZP (porcine zona pellucida), an immunocontraception vaccine can prevent female deer from getting pregnant and reduce the deer population by 40 to 60 percent. The application of a little science and a little effort on the part of the DNR could easily resolve any problem of deer over-population. Hunting in Lapham Peak State Park is not safe and is not necessary!</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
423	<p>Do not allow any hunting any time, any where, in Lapham peak. This is the one refuge that exists for hikers with out hunters! There are more than enough places for hunters to hunt. Let me take a hike in peace without somebody pointing an arrow at me from a tree stand.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
424	<p>Hello Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources - Allowing hunting with deadly weapons in public parks and natural areas by a small minority of citizens who use deadly weapons to kill for entertainment unfortunately excludes a majority of Wisconsin citizens. Having to wear an orange vest just highlights the very real danger of bad judgement and deadly projectiles that can easily travel beyond the sight of the shooter. Many people don't know when hunting seasons start and end and shouldn't have to. They end up going to parks and natural areas where hunting sometimes occurs. That's not shared use. In order to be fair to a majority of citizens, a majority of Wisconsin public parks and natural areas should not allow any hunting year round. I am a Wisconsin Master Naturalist who helps organize and lead free family friendly public nature outings every week year round. People love them but I frequently hear concerns about fear of taking nature walks if hunters might be nearby. I have personally been shot at more than once when hunters aimed at something between us and didn't see me. Families and kids on a nature outing I led a week ago were very concerned about gunshots in an area half a mile away where hunting was permitted. Someone with a deadly weapon potentially using bad judgement and projectiles travelling beyond their sight creates a very real life and death fear for people trying to enjoy time in nature, even on well travelled trails, regardless of statistics about the relatively small frequency of 'accidents'. People gamble to win with lower odds. It's what they feel that matters. The actual and reasonable fear on the part of many citizens of risks of being around hunters denies a large majority of nature lovers the opportunity for year round enjoyment who would otherwise be doing a variety of other eco-friendly, non-killing, non-consumptive highly popular nature recreation activities enjoyed by all ages like birding and hiking. Allowing hunting effectively prevents many people from visiting their own public parks and natural areas. No one should have to put their lives at risk of someone's bad judgement who is using a deadly weapon to kill for sport, no matter how rare the accidents. The non-hunting majority of the Wisconsin public needs to have MOST of our shared public parks and natural areas to have NO hunting, to keep them accessible for nature recreation year round to truly realize the public value of our parks. I therefore oppose the proposed rule change that would allow bow hunting anywhere in Lapham Peak State Park for all of the following reasons: The Friends of Lapham Peak State Park group oppose this proposed change that would allow hunting in the park. The random patchwork of land that the DNR is recommending being open to archery is not realistic for even the most ethical hunter to stay within. Hunters most certainly will be tracking and retrieving wounded animals all over the entire State Park and neighboring private properties. This creates conflict, confusion, and reason for concern. The small staff of the park currently would not be able to reasonably enforce or address the safety concerns of visitors. The DNR would need to add additional staff and Conservation Wardens. The areas suggested for hunting (Homestead Hollow, Tower, &amp; the Westside Prairie) are too close to incredibly popular hiking trails used by families and dog owners as well as cross-country ski trails during the busiest time of year. This goes against all logic for safety. The horse trails on the Prairie Path pose a particularly dangerous risk for trail riders. Just in 2020, a horse in the Southern Kettle Moraine State Forest was shot by a bowhunter while under saddle on the trail with a group of several riders. This regulation is wide open for "archery for all animals" for the entire archery season that runs from September to February. This far too long of a time that would impact the visitor experience for all recreational users for almost half the year. Especially, after significant efforts and investments have been made to make the Lapham Peak a winter destination for all of Southern WI with the snow making and the future Lapham Lodge. Thank you for consideration.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>



425	I am a land owner of 6 acres that boarder the park and do not want hunters near, or on my land to endanger my family.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
426	With the upcoming proposal for changes or retraction to NR 45.13(1)(e) that prohibits rock climbing, I'd like to submit my brief thoughts and comments in support of a revision or retraction to this restriction. Climbing can and does align with conservation of delicate environments, and as an important recreational activity for a large part of Wisconsin it should be thoughtfully accommodated within or laws. The work of the Wisconsin climbers association, as well as national groups such as the access fund have worked together with parks to assist with maintenance projects, erosion management, and general protection to the areas that the climbing community use here in Wisconsin. The restriction of all climbing is not part of a path toward responsible use of these areas. I firmly feel that we can and should assess our impacts and ensure we protect our natural areas for generations to come, but the blanket restriction in place is, frankly put, simple avoidance of the thought and care the climbing community deserves and a misunderstanding of how climbers interact with our natural resources. In summation, I am advocating for the proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e). Give the climbing community the opportunity to be stewards of the environment, and help protect these amazing recreational lands.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
427	I was born and raised in Dousman and have been hunting deer since 1983, almost all of which was in Waukehsa County (with a gun up to 2000 as well as a bow). I have seen first-hand the deer population explode as well as the number of hunters and safe (for all) hunting opportunities whither away. In college at UWSP, I studied wildlife, and as part of that course, we learned a lot about deer, from a scientific perspective, not just a hunter's perspective. I am a current State Parks sticker holder as well, and use Lapham peak a few times a year for hiking. It is a great park. In addition, I also have taken part in the city/town sponsored bow hunting programs by the City and Town of Delafield. In the last three years, I have taken 1 deer through their programs. We know that deer today have adapted to live in very small areas, amongst people, especially on larger lots with small woodlots or significant tree lines. The proliferation of the invasive exotic buckthorn exacerbates this problem exponentially because for deer that live near humans, it is 'out of sight, out of mind'. They do not respond to human odor the same way deer do in the open country or north woods. It is worth noting that much of the Town of Delafield and bow hunting program takes place on the former Ethan Allen Boys School property, directly adjacent to much of Lapham Peak. This program has been successful, and to my knowledge has a strong safety track record. The high deer population takes its toll on gardens, the environment, and on our personal safety. In October this year, my sister struck a deer in Delafield, at full freeway speed, on I94 and totaled her car. This was about 1/4 mile from Cushing Park road. Again, right near Lapham Peak. It has been my experience, and I am sure that of others that Lapham Peak serves as a deep pool of deer, which move out into other parts of the area. Really a source community (similar to Chenequa). In addition, the Park accommodates heavy population densities, exacerbating the problems with automobile accidents, Chronic Wasting Disease, and even Covid-19. I feel that the best solution to reducing the deer herd in the greater Town of Delafield and more specifically Lapham Peak SP has two components. First, a state/town/city-sponsored hunting program, modeled on the programs of the City and Town of Delafield. This would put people in the park physically harvesting deer, but also putting pressure on the deer to vacate via the overall hunting activity. Second (and perhaps for those who do not hunt but want to do their part to reduce the herd) is a program to wipe out buckthorn. Since the semi-urban deer like we have rely less on their noses to signal safe/danger than their eyeballs, it is necessary to remove the line-of-sight barrier that buckthorn poses. What once were beautiful woods you could see deep into are now extremely thick scrublands. Deer can hide in just about plain sight a short distance away. I am happy to discuss any of this further if you like. Thank you for your time and consideration.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
428	More public hunting land is what we need to keep the youth interested and involved in hunting! Keep up the good work Wisconsin DNR!	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

429	I am an avid trail rider . I ride both the Northern and Southern trails and Loew Lake. All these trails allow hunting which I'm not opposed to but I do tend to forgo riding these trails during hunting season as do many riders. Allowing hunting at Lapham would eliminate the chance of "worry free" riding . Please do not add Lapham Peak to the list.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
430	I am concerned about allowing bow hunting at Lapham peak. It is a very heavily used park for cross country skiing. The parking lots are very full on the weekends with lots of use. I realize some areas will be restricted but the trails cover the park.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
431	I am a frequent hiker at Lapham. Your hunting map Intersects my most frequented trails. Is there a way you can shorten the time for a hunt, mark it very clearly for the specific days, or not do it at all.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
432	I wholeheartedly oppose bow hunting of deer and turkeys at Lapham Peak State Park. The park is extremely busy with hikers, skiers, families, etc and hunting would compromise their safety. While I appreciate the challenge of controlling the animal population, I believe that public safety is more important. Plus, if you open to hunting, you won't get as many people coming to the park, and therefore less revenue.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
433	I oppose the proposed rule change that would allow bow hunting anywhere in Lapham Peak State Park that I frequent often!!!! - the strong friends of Lapham Peak State Park oppose this proposed change - it's a random patchwork of land being recommended that is not practical for hunters leading to likely conflict & confusion and UNSAFE situations for the MANY hikers, families, nature lovers, dogs - the park small staff would not be enough for any enforcement and to ensure a safe visitor experience.....means much more expense and staff?? - the proposed hunting areas are way too close to busy XC ski, hiking, dog walking trails; it's a crazy proposal (driven by special interest hunting groups??) - the horse trails on the west side of the park are another dangerous risk to riders and their animals; remember the horse killed in the southern unit by a bowhunter in 2020 which also could have been a rider!! - this 'archery for all animals' is way too long of a season and impacts the desired winter recreation XC ski demand from a broad visitor base; make snow and build a new lodge so that more recreational users can be put at risk?? I hope this crazy proposal is eliminated quickly. Thank you, P.S. I just bought my state pass which I have had for decades....I hope not a mistake with some mis-guided DNR policy being considered.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
434	I strongly support the DNR's proposal to open portions of Lapham Peak to archery hunting for deer and turkeys. Our state has a rich history of hunting and conservation, and opening this public land to the additional use of hunting would honor that history. I understand there are members of the public who may be concerned about safety. To them I would point out that archery hunting is incredibly safe, with almost no hunting accidents reported within the state over the past 5 years. But if the DNR feels the need to compromise on this issue, safety could be increased by (1) requiring that all shots be taken from an elevated position (i.e. no hunting from the ground) and (2) only allowing vertical bows (i.e. no crossbows). The benefits of this plan outweigh the costs. The risk to safety is minimal. The benefits include increased public enjoyment of the land, increased economic activity to local businesses, and increased revenue for the state (in the form of more archery tags sold). But perhaps most importantly, this move would further the goal of conservation. Waukesha County reported the most deer-automobile accidents in the state this year. And Lapham Peak has such a high concentration of deer that diseases such as CWD must be of concern. The most responsible and cost-effective way to conserve this resource is to allow public archery hunting.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
435	We write to oppose the opening of certain lands to bow hunting at Lapham Peak State Park. We live one-mile south of the park along Highway C and although there are many deer along Highway C that live in the State Park and we understand the deer-car collision problems, our biggest concern if bow hunting is allowed is the unfound arrows with open razorblade tips that are left under the leaves and in the shallow dirt after passing through the deer or after missing a deer. There are hiking and ski trails in all of the areas that hunting would be allowed. With 600,000 thousand visitors in the park every year, someone or a pet is sure to step on one of these arrow tips which will lay waiting for decades. Too much potential danger. We are also concerned that a wounded deer will often travel 100+ yards before lying down. If one crosses into the deed restricted hunting areas that comprise most of Lapham Peak as well as neighboring private lands, which is very likely given the small size and	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

	location of the proposed open hunting areas, the hunter cannot pursue and the animal will be left to rot. This would be waste of an animal and not a good scene or smell for hikers and skiers. Please do not open Lapham Peak to hunting. Thank you.	
436	Please do not open the park for hunting. It is the only "safe" place to hike during hunting season.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
437	I use Lapham Peak on a regular basis. I hike there in the summer and fall and XC ski in the winter. I have enjoyed hiking all of the trails including the mountain biking/horse trails, Iceage trails and every ski trail throughout the park. Hundreds of people per day on average use the park for hiking/running/skiing. I have looked at the proposed map of hunting locations on the property. It looks like they are in areas that have trails winding through them. I can't imagine allowing bow hunting in any of those areas. My neighbor has allowed bow hunting on their property. I understand the need for hunting and thinning our deer population. My neighbor had to stop the bow hunters because there was an issue with several arrows going stray and almost hitting a house and deer getting hit but ended up hobbling into adjacent land that hunting couldn't be done on. It seems like a very bad idea to allow hunting in an area that is used so heavily by hikers. Why not bring in sharp shooters to thin the heard if there is an overpopulation? That could be done at controlled times and very precisely. Please do NOT allow hunting at Lapham Peak	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
438	I'm responding to a notice just received from a fellow horse owner and rider. The bridle trails protected from hunting in the Lapham Peak area are special and loved. I am 81 years old and this protected area allows me to continue to be on trails that are safe for my old horse and me! Please continue to protect this area from hunters.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
439	In an effort to Recruit, Retain and Reinstate, the DNR repeatedly shoots itself in the foot. A recent report shows that non-consumptive sports and recreation in Wisconsin is bringing in the big money to the state, while interest in hunting is on the wane. The hunting demographic is aging out and people nowadays want to enjoy the outdoors in other ways. That is the present and future. As someone who hikes all the Waukesha County Parks, state and county, trying to figure out where and when hunting is allowed is quite confusing and off putting. With Lapham Peak being such a heavily used park in a populated county, conflicts and accidents are only a matter of when, not if. I follow the WDNR Facebook page where hunters are your own worst enemy. They will never be appeased, as is evidenced in their steady stream of sarcasm laced comments all "aimed" at DNR policy and rule making. They turn every post, no matter how benign, into a sounding board for their complete disdain for the agency. The real supporters of the agency, if you would only notice, are the advocates, who truly care about Wisconsin's environment and wildlife. Opening Lapham Peak State Park to hunting is a very bad idea that will dissuade the hikers, skiers and horseback riders who enjoy it as the gem and place of respite that it was meant to be.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
440	As someone who uses lapham Peak on a regular basis, opening it up to hunters is not a good idea. With all the park has to offer and the new pavilion that is being built, increases in usage is a given and adding hunting is just asking for an accident to happen. On top of the issues with families, skiers and runners, the deer within the park are used to seeing and being by humans. You can run right by them and they don't give move an inch. Seems unfair and unsportsmanlike to kill an animal that doesn't even know they are being hunted. Overall, adding hunting into lapham Peak is a horrible idea and I hope that the conversation ends here. At least give families a place to go without having to worry about hunters.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
441	I am in favor of hunting West of County C in Lapham State Park. But after looking at the West side of C it would have to be on something like a permit basis. To hunt the East Side it would have to be limited to archery or cross bows only again on a permit basis and very specific time slots due to the higher use by the public.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
442	I am writing to implore you not to allow bow hunting for deer and turkey at Laphman Peak State Park in the Kettle Moraine Forest. As with over 600,000, I hike the area almost on a weekly basis. Allowing hunting would make it a dangerous for those of us who enjoy the park. It should also be noted that the Park is used on a regular bases for field trips for 4th graders learning about Wisconsin topography, some of whom have never had the opportunity to visit a forest setting. Above is just a few reasons why you should not allow bow hunting at Laphman Peak State Park. Thank you for your consideration.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

443	<p>This letter is to add to the list of extremely concerned park users of Lapham Peak regarding a long hunting within the very tight trail network. Logistically, there is almost no opportunity to actually take a shot, 100 yards in any direction is on a trail or private property. This is not the wilderness. People will be hit with arrows, there is zero question. Trails cross and intersect in every direction. Bring in sharpshooters to cull the herd if that's necessary. Much safer and keeps this wonderful park available to users other than hunters. Which is what would happen, because there is no where to take a legal shot in the area proposed, its all within feet of trails and private property. But shots would be taken, people will be hurt and killed, and the park and its revenue gone. Please do not allow this. Use the sharpshooter approach. You barely have ranger resources to begin with, this would be an out of control nightmare at a very popular park.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
444	<p>I am a frequent user of Lapham Peak. I hike and ski at the park. I'm also an avid bow hunter. I think it's a good idea to allow Bowhunting in permitted areas. I would add that I think there should be a drawing for permits for an additional cost to get a tag for the area. I would then use those funds to fund other park projects. Otherwise, I believe that the amount of bow hunters out there would make things dangerous and it would be sloppy. An occasional harvested deer would not be a problem, but having a bunch of wounded deer in the park and families having to deal with the nature of that situation on their Sunday morning hikes would be very unfortunate. That kind of thing may still happen with limited tags, but I think the frequency would be far less.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
445	<p>I strongly oppose the hunting proposal for Lapham Peak. I fully understand we have a deer problem. Please consider other options for deer control. Lapham Peak Park is Largest and most widely used park in the Milwaukee Metro area providing a safe haven during hunting season. Lapham Peak Park has always been the go place where people feel safe to bring their families. There has to be a better option. Close the park to allow trained shooters to go in and get the job done. If needed two or three times a year. I think the Arboretum still follows this. Arboretum "deer management program" employ sharpshooters at night — away from trails — to thin the deer herd to protect vegetation. The prairie side of the Park: Owners allow dogs to run free. (almost impossible for DNR to monitor) Yesterday I looked off in the distance and saw what I thought were two deer frolicking through the high grass. Found out they were two very large golden retrievers. With a young child running behind. WE need trained hunters hired specifically for this purpose. Not just any hunter who signs up. The public doesn't know if a visible hunter in the tree is mentally stable. Just dead wrong to put our public in this fearful situation. Especially with all the mass shootings. Please preserve one of the only large public parks providing a safe haven from the fear of being shot during hunting season. Other options below. Below from the Humane Society How can we control deer populations humanely? Wildlife fertility control offers a humane way to manage deer populations. Researchers have developed methods of deer "birth control" — ways to keep deer from reproducing. The Humane Society of the United States has focused on one of them: PZP (porcine zona pellucida), an immunocontraception vaccine that can keep adult female deer from becoming pregnant and has reduced deer populations by as much as half. Surgical sterilization or ovariectomy is another option for humanely controlling deer population growth. Although it is expensive, it need only be done one time. Removing the ovaries or a large enough percentage of an area's does has been shown to reduce deer populations by as much as 45%. Immunocontraception: PZP PZP works by causing an immune reaction in does that blocks sperm fertilizing eggs. Unlike some fertility control vaccines and methods that cause undesirable behavior changes, PZP simply prevents fertilization. Most importantly, because PZP is a natural protein, like all other proteins found in animals, it is safe to use and will not harm animals. PZP can be delivered to adult female deer by hand or remotely using darts shot from a dart gun. Recent improvements in the PZP vaccine now prevent deer from having fawns for up to three years with just one treatment. This significantly reduces the time needed to dart animals and so the costs of treating deer. Since the 1990s, the HSUS has conducted several successful PZP immunocontraception research projects on deer. Here are the four biggest: Fire Island National Seashore (FINS) was the HSUS's original deer study site. The primary goals there were to see whether more than 200 deer could be darted each year and to the effectiveness of PZP on what had been a growing deer population. The deer were easily darted and the immunocontraceptive alone was shown to reduce a deer population over time. The HSUS also used PZP over a period of 20 years to treat the deer on the fenced campus of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) in Gaithersburg, Md. The number of deer collisions dramatically decreased, the remaining deer became healthier and the deer population growth rate fell, despite the fact that urbanization and development around the facility caused constant migration of new deer onto the campus. Over a five-year period of darting deer on Fripp Island, S.C., with PZP, the deer population decreased by nearly 60%. In addition, the remaining deer were healthier. Residents were pleased and the number of human deer conflicts fell. An eight-year study in the New York City suburb of Hastings on Hudson, N.Y., showed that PZP could reduce a deer population in an area that was not bounded by water or by a fence by as much as 50%. The terrain in Hastings on Hudson was challenging, with close together homes and rocky hills, but researchers managed to dart more than 60 percent of the does. The treated does stayed in their territories and kept new, untreated does from moving in. The study showed that two shots given over a period of two and half years can prevent fertilization for up to five years.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

446	<p>Please say YES! I live adjacent to the Park and I can tell you that the deer and the turkey are destructive to property and become increasingly hungry as the winter progresses. We spend considerable amounts to protect our trees and plantings from annihilation. I have obtained DNR nuisance permits to remove a few turkeys who like to poop on dry surfaces (walks, driveways and patios). We have to play hops cotch to get to our cars. My grandchildren are not free to be in our yard due to the aggressive nature of the herd of turkeys and their disease ridden poop. They peck at their images on windows, doors (ruining screens) cars (scratching paint) They knock over birdbaths and jump on anything that collect water. While I understand they were here first, I also understand there is plenty of room and food in the park to support a reasonable population of both deer and turkey. Culling the herds is essential and considerate for their well being as well. I have witnessed both turkey and deer fight for the few seeds that fall from my bird feeder. There are years that come February you can count the deer's ribs. We have cooperated with the City's deer culling program for years by allowing a tree stand on our property for authorized bow-hunting. It has never caused a problem or incident. Hunters are responsible people and know the rules. Unfortunately, it is not enough as bow hunting is difficult and the needed proximity of the hunted is a deterrent to a effective harvest. Please we strongly urge you to expand the area to be both effective in producing a sustainable herd and lessening their suffering as a whole in our WI winters. Thank up for your consideration.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
447	<p>Please do not open up Lapham Peak for bow hunting. This park is used by many non-hunters. It would impact their safety. It is not worth taking the chance of anyone being injured. Please drop this consideration. If you have any questions about this request you may contact me via the information provided below.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
448	<p>I am writing to state my opposition to the proposed changes to NR 45.13 (18) which would allow the DNR to designate areas where hunting deer and turkeys can occur within the Lapham Peak Unit – Kettle Moraine state forest. Lapham Peak is a highly utilized suburban park and the addition of hunting within the park for the entire bow season does not seem in keeping with common sense public safety. In addition, opening up the park during the entire bow season seems excessive –and also coincides with increased people traffic for fall hiking, Friends of Lapham Peak fund-raising events and winter skiing. I do propose that If the deer population gets excessive in a given year, the Department could consider closing the park on specific days and times for the herd to be culled. Years ago, I seem to remember Havenwoods State Forest using sharp shooters. Bottom line – from September to January I don't want to hike, ski and just be in the woods alongside hunters. I don't want to have to wear blaze orange or put pets and children in blaze orange in order to be seen by hunters. There are not enough "safe" feeling places in the world anymore –please keep Lapham Peak feeling safe for visitors.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
449	<p>We are residents of Waukesha County and both use Lapham Peak for walking, hiking, and, for myself, cross country skiing. We annually purchase the yearly sticker, and I purchase the ski trail pass. We are donors, and even have planned for a gift after our passing. WE OPPOSE OPENING ANY AREA WITHIN THE STATE PARK FOR THE GENERAL POPULATION OF HUNTERS.. IN OR OUT OF STATE. TO CULL THE HERD, WE HIGHLY PREFER THAT YOU USE WARDENS WHO WILL RESPECT THE LAND, WILL BE ON DUTY, WILL CLEAN UP REMAINS AND WILL BE LESS LIKELY TO BE ALCOHOL IMPAIRED (PLEASE BE PRACTICAL HERE!). IT IS ALSO a MUCH SAFER SOLUTION FOR SOME OF THE SAME REASONS!! Negotiating and marking "hunnable" and "non-hunnable" areas will be a nightmare.. who knows, somebody may have family members out for the first time to experience the family tradition!! I support general hunting, and culling the herd.. BUT NOT IN LAPHAM PEAK Philosophically, the area is intended to be as natural as possible and open to the public for most of the year.. with only professionals supervising its upkeep, ESP WHEN IT COMES TO RIFLES WITH SIGHTS !!</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
450	<p>I would be against expanding bow hunting into Lapham Peak. With all the public hunting grounds and park designations already in place for bow and gun hunting I see no reason to create another. Regardless of whether there are designated and restricted areas within the proposed area, the safety concerns to people and pets e,g, hikers, skiers, dogs should be considered, not to mention just the feeling security for the aforementioned (it's nice to be able to use the park without having to be continually aware of either stray shots or encroaching on a hunter). Please consider the users and supporters of this park year around and let them have at least one sanctuary without worry or concern.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
451	<p>I am writing to state my opposition to the proposed changes to NR 45.13 (18) which would allow the DNR to designate areas where hunting deer and turkeys can occur within the Lapham Peak Unit – Kettle Moraine state forest. Lapham Peak is a highly utilized suburban park and the addition of hunting within the park for the entire bow season does not seem in keeping with common sense public safety. In addition, opening up the park during the entire bow season seems excessive –and also coincides with increased people traffic for fall hiking, Friends of Lapham Peak fund-raising events and winter skiing. I do propose that if the deer population gets excessive in a given year, the Department could consider closing the park on specific days and times for the herd to be culled. Years ago, I seem to remember Havenwoods State Forest using sharp shooters. Bottom line – from September to January I don't want to hike, ski and just be in the woods alongside hunters. I don't want to have to wear blaze orange</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

	<p>or put pets and children in blaze orange in order to be seen by hunters. There are not enough “safe” feeling places in the world anymore – please keep Lapham Peak feeling safe for visitors.</p>	
452	<p>I am a hunter as well as a Waukesha county citizen. My family has enjoyed hiking in Lapham State Park numerous times. I recently became aware that the DNR is entertaining a plan to allow deer hunting in Lapham Peak park in certain areas of the park. My thoughts and comments are: 1. As a crossbow hunter, I would take advantage of hunting opportunities in the park. I currently participate in the Delafield deer management program. I think it is a successful program that provides local hunters with recreational opportunities as well as assisting in deer herd management. 2. I believe myself to be a good hunter and conservationist. As a hunter, there is nothing more important to me than protecting and preserving the natural resources that I enjoy immensely. I am quite certain that all of my hunter friends and acquaintances share the same sentiment. As a participant in the Delafield deer management program, I am very particular about following the rules set forth by the City of Delafield knowing other members of the public enjoy the areas as well. 3. With that said, I believe that careful thought should be applied to such a plan. I understand that hunting will only be allowed in certain areas of the park. I think it might be wise to provide guidance as to where a deer should be properly shot and how it should be dragged out. I am thinking that they should be cut out at a minimum. A certain distance from hiking trails and probably should not be dragged out on hiking trails. I'm not sure how that would work, but I think some hikers would not like to see a hunter drag out a dead deer. I don't know the park well enough to provide further guidance, but perhaps someone more familiar with the park layout might be able to provide some ideas. I think that using hunters to help with deer management is a great idea. It's just that certain rules and limitations probably need to be in effect when hunting occurs near areas that are enjoyed by non-hunters. I would be happy to discuss my thoughts about this potential program or the Delafield program that I have participated in with anyone who would like to have more information from a hunter's perspective. My contact information is below.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
453	<p>Hello, I am a resident of Waukesha County, specifically the Lake Country area. I am writing to show my support for the rule change to allow archery hunting for deer and turkeys in Lapham Peak State Park. It is quite obvious that our area has an abundance of deer and in some cases, they are a nuisance. Being a participant for the last 5 years and now a volunteer coordinator for the last 2 years for the Town of Delafield Deer Management program I do have cautionary insights to share. First off, as we attempt to control the deer population in the town of Delafield, we are limited to a small amount of actual area we are able to hunt/harvest deer. Right now, we have permission to have stands on the Ethan Allen Boys School Property and a few other very small tracts of private land. As we get some calls for other small properties in which residents complain there are too many deer and are a nuisance, we need to get permission from other properties surrounding these. It is not always easy because as hunters seem to portray a negative image to a lot of people. To some, it is the blood and gore they do not want to see, some are concerned about safety, and others have just had bad experiences with “hunters” in the past. Below are my insights.... -Mandatory Safety Training. Just because someone has passed the state mandated hunter safety courses in the past does not mean they follow the rules at all times. The park has a very high population at any given time of people participating in other recreational activities. An extra above and beyond training module or power point presentation pointing out possible park specific safety hazards should be implemented. -Number of hunters/Identification. Lapham Peak would be a premier place to hunt and will generate interest from a lot of hunters, in the past you needed to wear a back tag while hunting in the state of Wisconsin, while I am opposed to this for the general hunting population I feel in a situation like this it expresses a sense of accountability because the hunters on the property would be able to be identified by any non-hunter participating in other activities or other hunters if there may be any rule violation. This would also mean that there would need to be a documented list of hunters that would be approved to hunt on the property. I believe that limiting the number of hunters that are allowed to participate on the property is also crucial. An application process should be implemented so you know who is using the property for these activities. Limiting the number of hunters that are using the property will also limit the number of hunter/non hunter interactions. In the Town of Delafield program hunters book hunts on an appointment registration website. There is a limited number of “stands” on each property and we know who and when is hunting on any of the properties at any given time. This way when there are problems/complaints or violations it is easy to identify who the individual was, and we can deal with the situation. -Removal of gut piles/entrails. After harvesting a deer there is waste that is not the most precious thing to see in the field. Non-hunters using the park for other activities are not going to want to see or smell the guts/entrails of the deer or have their dogs eating anything they shouldn't. This is a requirement for our properties we have Town of Delafield sanctioned stands on for our program. This removes a lot of the blood/gore people are going to see. This seems to be a major complaint along with people's concerns with their safety on some the Facebook posts about allowing hunting on the property that I have seen posted. -Proficiency test. The image of seeing wounded deer or a deer with an arrow stuck in it walking around the park is also a main concern of the opponents of hunting at Lapham Peak. I know in other states,</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

	<p>proficiency tests are required for hunters seeking to get special permissions or tags for certain areas for the opportunity to hunt. I feel this should be implemented as well. Something as simple as requiring a hunter to school a 3-inch group from 20-yards with their crossbow or vertical bow would be sufficient, I believe this is what was required to get special "Conservation tags" in Illinois. If you failed, you did not get a tag. -Designated Hunting Areas. I have seen a map with the proposed hunting areas circulating on social media also, I feel this is also crucial to keep hunter/non-hunter interactions at a minimum. Posting these maps at the entrances at the park and possibly posting signs along trails that are close to the designated hunting areas would also help. Designated hunting areas should try to be isolated from high concentrations of trails/recreational areas. As stated, I am absolutely in favor of allowing hunting in Lapham Peak State Park and am looking forward for the opportunity to do so if the rule change moves forward. Additionally, I would enjoy the opportunity to further discuss and share more insights/opinions to help move this further along. I would also be willing to volunteer my time to help coordinate and implement any special rules or processes to make it happen. I have attached our "Rules" document for the Town of Delafield Deer Management Program if you are interested to review. Please feel free to reach out to me directly or you can also email us at delafielddeermanagement@gmail.com</p>	
454	<p>I really oppose opening public land for hunting purposes. I oppose hunting period, except for the poor. Please see that this bill is defeated.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
455	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed amending of Scope Statement SS 074-21, SECTION 140. NR 45.13 (18), opening Lapham Peak State Park to hunting deer and turkey with archery equipment. My residence shares a property line with Lapham Peak State Park. The map of proposed hunting areas in the park would allow hunting up to my property line. I am not looking forward to hunters trespassing on my property, or the arrows, and dead animals that will be left behind. I am concerned for the safety of my family and dogs while walking my property. I have had hunters tracking deer through my property before, they came from the park when there was no hunting allowed in the park. I know this will be occurring more frequently if the proposed changes are approved. I visit Lapham Peak State Park several times a week. I am one of the 600,000 visitors to the park every year. I bike for my two Huskies on the mountain bike trails and walk the trails with them. The safety from potential hazards to visitors to the park will be greatly diminished if this proposal is approved.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
456	<p>You are asking for trouble! There should be absolutely NO hunting allowed within the trail system or within the designated area of Lapham Peak. It is too close to the residential areas and subdivisions of Delafield. Proximity to the highway is too close.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
457	<p>I'm opposed to opening up archery hunting at Lapham Peak. It's not necessary to hunt everywhere. The random patchwork of land that the DNR is recommending being open to archery is not realistic for even the most ethical hunter to stay within. Hunters most certainly will be tracking and retrieving wounded animals all over the entire State Park and neighboring private properties. Park staffing to monitor and enforce is almost non-existent. And the recommended location for this type of hunting is too close to hiking trails used by families and dog owners. This is a huge safety issue. In 2020, a horse in the Southern Kettle Moraine State Forest was shot by a bowhunter while under saddle. This is far too long of a time that would impact the visitor experience for all recreational users for almost half the year. Especially, after significant efforts and investments have been made to make the Lapham Peak a winter destination for all of Southern WI with the snow-making and the future Lapham Lodge.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
458	<p>I am totally against opening Lapham Peak to any type of hunting. It is one of the few places you can hike without worrying about being in the same area with hunters. There are loads of other public lands in the southern Kettle Moraine area where folks can hunt. Please leave Latham hunter free.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
459	<p>I oppose the proposed rule change that would allow bow hunting anywhere in Lapham Peak State Park for all of the following reasons: The Friends of Lapham Peak State Park group opposes this proposed change that would allow hunting in the park. The random patchwork of land that the DNR is recommending being open to archery is not realistic for even the most ethical hunter to stay within. Hunters most certainly will be tracking and retrieving wounded animals all over the entire State Park and neighboring private properties. This creates conflict, confusion, and reason for concern. The small staff of the park currently would not be able to reasonably enforce or address the safety concerns of visitors. The DNR would need to add additional staff and Conservation Wardens. The areas suggested for hunting (Homestead Hollow, Tower, &amp; the Westside</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

	<p>Prairie) are too close to incredibly popular hiking trails used by families and dog owners as well as cross-country ski trails during the busiest time of year. This goes against all logic for safety. The horse trails on the Prairie Path pose a particularly dangerous risk for trail riders. Just in 2020, a horse in the Southern Kettle Moraine State Forest was shot by a bowhunter while under saddle on the trail with a group of several riders. This regulation is wide open for “archery for all animals” for the entire archery season that runs from September to February. This is far too long of a time that would impact the visitor experience for all recreational users for almost half the year. Especially, after significant efforts and investments have been made to make the Lapham Peak a winter destination for all of Southern WI with the snow-making and the future Lapham Lodge.</p>	
460	<p>I am very sorry and disappointed to hear the State of Wisconsin is considering allowing hunting in Lapham Peak State Park. When the Hausmann family donated this land the State agreed to a caveat that hunting would NEVER be allowed in the park. Yet here we are having our elected political leaders breaking this promise. I am against this in every way – not only because of what the State agreed to but also because my wife and I use the park regularly and feel it would no longer be safe with hunters in the Park while trails are open! I can’t understand what our elected officials are thinking. The former Wisconsin School for Boys is adjacent to the park – hunting there will decrease the same herd that frequents the park. Why endanger the public when you have a better option right there!?</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
461	<p>We oppose the proposed rule change that would allow bow hunting anywhere in Lapham Peak State Park. There are numerous reasons, and we hope you seriously consider each one and realize this is not in the best interests of most of the people who enjoy the park. 1. The Friends of Lapham Peak State Park group oppose this proposed change that would allow hunting in the park. 2. The land that the DNR is recommending being open to archery is not realistic for even the most ethical hunter to stay within. Hunters most certainly will be tracking and retrieving wounded animals all over the entire State Park and neighboring private properties. This creates conflict, confusion, and reason for concern. 3. The areas suggested for hunting (Homestead Hollow, Tower, &amp; the Westside Prairie) are too close to incredibly popular hiking trails used by families and dog owners as well as cross-country ski trails during the busiest time of year. This goes against all logic for safety. 4. The horse trails on the Prairie Path pose a particularly dangerous risk for trail riders. Just in 2020, a horse in the Southern Kettle Moraine State Forest was shot by a bowhunter while under saddle on the trail with a group of several riders. 5. This regulation is wide open for “archery for all animals” for the entire archery season that runs from September to February. Significant efforts and investments have been made to make the Lapham Peak a winter destination for all of Southern WI with the snow making and the future Lapham Lodge. Hunting at Lapham Peak is most certainly not in the interest of the majority of park users who are skiers, hikers, horseback riders. Please don’t allow this change. Thank you for consideration</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
462	<p>I've purchasing Wisconsin State Park passes for several years, using Lapham Peak Park weekly or more. I walk with my dog, using all the trails through the years. I do not want to fear my dog or me being accidentally struck by a hunters arrow. I do not visit the park in the southern Kettle Moraine Park when hunters are allowed there. I do not interrupt my visits at Lapham Peak. I consider this an unsafe idea. Please do not allow hunting at Lapham Peak State Park.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
463	<p>I am writing to ask the DNR to reconsider allowing bow hunting at Lapham Peak. Like thousands of others each year, my family love to hike at Lapham to enjoy the peace, the beauty of the area and creatures living in it. We feel safe doing so and it is our very favorite place to hike and the reason we get a state pass. Allowing bow hunting would take away from the perception of safety and enjoyment of wildlife when hiking at Lapham Peak. The idea of hiking and enjoying beautiful creatures while at the same time knowing they are being hunted is such a dichotomy that hiking at Lapham would never be the same. Thank you for considering my viewpoint.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
464	<p>I am writing to state my opposition to the proposed changes to NR 45.13 (18) which would allow the DNR to designate areas where hunting deer and turkeys can occur within the Lapham Peak Unit – Kettle Moraine State Forest. Here are my reasons why I oppose the change: Lapham Peak is a highly used suburban park, only 30 miles from Milwaukee, an hour drive from Madison, and 1.5 miles from Chicago area. Many people come from Madison and Chicago to cross country ski because of the reliable snow due to the snowmaking loop. Many more come to hike in the fall because the park does not allow hunting. I would propose that IF the deer population gets excessive in a given year, the DNR could consider closing the park on given days to cull the deer herd. With the restricted areas throughout the park, it would be difficult for hunters to know the correct hunting zones and difficult for park staff to reinforce no hunting areas. Lapham Peak has many school groups in fall, many families with children as well as all ages who hike and view the colors. As a teacher, there are as many as 1-4 buses on a given day. The Hausmann Nature Center is open, as well as many fundraising runs from various groups are held at the park. People do not want to wear blaze orange and not feel safe. In conclusion, September to January is a long time for visitors to hike alongside hunters and wear blaze orange in this highly urbanized park. Keep the park a safe area, there are few places in the world where people feel safe.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>



465	I don't believe hunting should be allowed in this area. 1 Conflict between hunters and hiking, walking or other activities of non hunting people. 2 Because there is no fence or barrier around the park the deer are able to roam outside of park. That being said the argument to starvation is nullified. Let them roam as nature intended. I personally love this large area for recreation and obviously a very large amount of others also do . 3 If hunters are allowed and a deer is harvested, if not killed straight off it may wonder into an area that others are hiking, skiing walking maybe young people and will be exposed to the suffering of a wounded animal. Another is if the field dress is done onsite what about the spoils left and the other scavengers that brings, a startling site for younger children. Sincerely	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
466	I am opposed to any hunting at Lapham Peak. Let there be a spot in the forest that is safe for horses, dog, children and adults. We don't need the door opened to hunting here too.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
467	I oppose the proposed rule change that would allow bow hunting anywhere in Lapham Peak State Park. There are numerous reasons, and we hope you seriously consider each one and realize this is not in the best interests of most of the people who enjoy the park. 1. The Friends of Lapham Peak State Park group oppose this proposed change that would allow hunting in the park. 2. The land that the DNR is recommending being open to archery is not realistic for even the most ethical hunter to stay within. Hunters most certainly will be tracking and retrieving wounded animals all over the entire State Park and neighboring private properties. This creates conflict, confusion, and reason for concern. 3. The areas suggested for hunting (Homestead Hollow, Tower, & the Westside Prairie) are too close to incredibly popular hiking trails used by families and dog owners as well as cross-country ski trails during the busiest time of year. This goes against all logic for safety. 4. The horse trails on the Prairie Path pose a particularly dangerous risk for trail riders. Just in 2020, a horse in the Southern Kettle Moraine State Forest was shot by a bowhunter while under saddle on the trail with a group of several riders. 5. This regulation is wide open for "archery for all animals" for the entire archery season that runs from September to February. Significant efforts and investments have been made to make the Lapham Peak a winter destination for all of Southern WI with the snow making and the future Lapham Lodge. Hunting at Lapham Peak is most certainly not in the interest of the majority of park users who are skiers, hikers, horseback riders. Please don't allow this change. Thank you for consideration	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
468	I am a resident of Delafield, living less than .5 miles from Lapham Peak. I would strongly urge you to deny the right of hunting in the park. The wildlife at the park is what makes it so special, and I would be devastated to lose that. This should be a safe haven for wildlife, a place for them to be safe from humans. Please do not approve this hunting at the park. As I and most of the residents of Delafield are strongly against it.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
469	I strongly oppose the rule change for hunting at Lapham Peak in the Kettle Moraine State Forest at Delafield, Wisconsin. Having been a frequent walker and occasional camper at Lapham Peak for more than forty years, I enjoy the tranquility and occasional sightings of all the game which are available to see at Lapham.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
470	I would like to see turkey and deer hunting continue to be prohibited in Lapham Peak park. There are some very nice equestrian trails that riders use, especially in fall and not having hunting in that area is less of a risk for horses. I ride multiple trails in WI in fall which have hunting on them and it is always concerning. I wear hunter orange, but am still not confident that hunters won't shoot in my direction. Keeping Lapham Peak at no hunting would be great!	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
471	I am writing to tell you I oppose any hunting in Lapham Peak state park. I recreate in this park often and I can see this being a safety issue. I use the park during the summer to hike and bike and in winter to snowshoe. I also bring my kids to this park. The boundary for hunting is confusing and not clear. I can see accidents waiting to happen. Please keep this park as a haven for wildlife and non recreational users. Thank you!!	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
472	I have never submitted a comment about anything DNR related in the past. THIS is so important!! Please DO NOT allow hunting of any kind in Lapham Peak SP!!! There are so many other places for hunters to hunt!! Most hunters are not proficient at hunting, resulting in many misses. Especially bow hunters! LP SP is too close to residential areas in addition to families hiking on the trails. A couple of years ago there was a horse	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will

	deliberately shot with an arrow in the SKMSF-On the horse trails. The horse had to be euthanized!! All because the hunter was angry that the horse riders would supposedly scare off deer. That hunter's arrow Very Easily could have hit the rider or any of the other riders and horses who were all riding together!!! NOTHING was ever done about it! The coward hunter took off into the woods and was never caught. He got off scott-free! We go to LPSP because we (adults, children, dogs and horses) are safe from harm from hunters!!! Let the wardens address the excess deer population during hours when the park is closed. It will be much more efficient and keeps other park users safe. The animals can be properly disposed of and meat donated to homeless shelters. Please resist taking the easy way out, of opening up more hunting!!! LPSP needs to be a hunting-free zone!!!	pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
473	I vote NO. There is already enough hunting land, why allow it at Lapham?	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
474	I writing to urge you to please leave Lapham Peak as a sacred and safe space for people to enjoy hiking and activities in peace, quiet and safety for everyone. I live on the kettle and already those trails are off limits for us to hike with our dogs. Please do not take away this beautiful spot for hikers to enjoy. There a multitude of places for hunters to do their thing.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
475	I was born and raised in Dousman and have been hunting deer since 1983, almost all of which was in Waukehsa County (with a gun up to 2000 as well as a bow). I have seen first-hand the deer population explode as well as the number of hunters and safe (for all) hunting opportunities whither away. In college at UWSP, I studied wildlife, and as part of that course, we learned a lot about deer, from a scientific perspective, not just a hunter's perspective. I am a current State Parks sticker holder as well, and use Lapham peak a few times a year for hiking. It is a great park. In addition, I also have taken part in the city/town sponsored bow hunting programs by the City and Town of Delafield. In the last three years, I have taken 1 deer through their programs. We know that deer today have adapted to live in very small areas, amongst people, especially on larger lots with small woodlots or significant tree lines. The proliferation of the invasive exotic buckthorn exacerbates this problem exponentially because for deer that live near humans, it is 'out of sight, out of mind'. They do not respond to human odor the same way deer do in the open country or north woods. It is worth noting that much of the Town of Delafield and bow hunting program takes place on the former Ethan Allen Boys School property, directly adjacent to much of Lapham Peak. This program has been successful, and to my knowledge has a strong safety track record. The high deer population takes its toll on gardens, the environment, and on our personal safety. In October this year, my sister struck a deer in Delafield, at full freeway speed, on I94 and totaled her car. This was about 1/4 mile from Cushing Park road. Again, right near Lapham Peak. It has been my experience, and I am sure that of others that Lapham Peak serves as a deep pool of deer, which move out into other parts of the area. Really a source community (similar to Chenequa). In addition, the Park accommodates heavy population densities, exacerbating the problems with automobile accidents, Chronic Wasting Disease, and even Covid-19. I feel that the best solution to reducing the deer herd in the greater Town of Delafield and more specifically Lapham Peak SP has two components. First, a state/town/city-sponsored hunting program, modeled on the programs of the City and Town of Delafield. This would put people in the park physically harvesting deer, but also putting pressure on the deer to vacate via the overall hunting activity. Second (and perhaps for those who do not hunt but want to do their part to reduce the herd) is a program to wipe out buckthorn. Since the semi-urban deer like we have rely less on their noses to signal safe/danger than their eyeballs, it is necessary to remove the line-of-sight barrier that buckthorn poses. What once were beautiful woods you could see deep into are now extremely thick scrublands. Deer can hide in just about plain sight a short distance away. I am happy to discuss any of this further if you like. Thank you for your time and consideration.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
476	Please do not allow hunting in Lapham Peak State Park. Our family has had passes to the park for many years and we have enjoyed hiking at all times of the year and skiing and snow shoeing as well as picnicking and climbing the tower. We observe many people taking advantage of those opportunities, also. I understand that the deer herd needs to be culled, but do that when the park is closed. If necessary, close the park for a day or two and do what is needed to eliminate some of the deer. There are plenty of places for hunters to use. The park should be for everyone's use. Having hunters in the park will eliminate its use for others. Anyone with pets will certainly not want to take them into an area with hunters and frankly, I wouldn't want to be any where near it. I don't think that any of the state parks should be open for hunting. We have a family member who uses the more difficult trails as we used to. We've always appreciated that we could access the park and feel safe there .	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

477	I have concerns with allowing Bow Hunting in the Lapham Peak area. This area is heavily used by hikers, both children and adults with their pets. This is no place for modern bow and razor sharp arrows in a public area. Mistakes WILL occur and I implore you to keep the current regulations to protect public safety. There are ample other locations to harvest deer.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
478	To allow hunting at Lapham Peak, for any reason, is a dangerous idea. There will be only one word to describe what will eventually happen if this misconceived idea takes effect- TRAGEDY. Please take this proposal off the table.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
479	I wanted to comment on the proposal to permit bow hunting at Lapham Peak State Park. I've been visiting Lapham for more than 30 years and am a daily user of the trail system in this part of the state. During hunting season, there are very few places I can hike -- or take my family when they visit. Even public places near hunting areas are potentially dangerous! understand that public parks should be available to all users, but Lapham Peak is one of the most visited parks and trail systems in the state -- especially during hunting season when there are few other options to enjoy the state park experience. During hunting season, the parking lots at Lapham are near capacity -- with hikers, runners, nature lovers and families enjoying the outdoors. Places for hunters to hunt are plentiful. Why can't there be one state park in this area where families can enjoy a day in the outdoors during hunting season without the concern of encountering an arrow or a bullet?	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
480	The current proposal to allow archery hunting within the Lapham Peak Unit as outlined by the DNR is too broad in terms acreage, length of time and constitutes a negative change of use to the current users. Lapham Peak is a heavily utilized public property that according to the Friends of Lapham Peak, approximately 600,000 people visit annually. This Friends of Lapham Peak visitor estimate may even be low based on my personal observations of many guest cars parked along Cushing Park Road, guest cars parked in adjacent subdivisions, and the many walk-in guests that live adjacent to Lapham Peak. On other properties, the Department does not permit hunting in intensive use areas such as parking lots, picnic areas, wildlife refuges, other posted special use areas or near buildings. This is also what is currently proposed at Lapham Peak. It is clear that the Department does not permit hunting in these areas because it is deemed unsafe. The proposed areas within the Lapham Peak where hunting deer and turkeys with archery equipment is vast and I believe includes trails that should be considered intensive use areas. The Department needs to more carefully identify intensive use areas including trails before considering allowing hunters and weapons. Allowing hunting within Lapham Peak is a change of use to the many current users of this property. In my opinion it is a negative impact to hikers, bikers, and horseback riders. From personal experience, the number of guests within in the western portions of the park (hiking, biking, inline skiing) increases in the fall precisely when hunting is proposed. The proposed four month open season is excessively long and negatively impacts the current users.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
481	I would like to strongly suggest not to allow hunting in Lapham Peak Park. At the very basic level it's a "Park". People of all types want to take in it's scenery, ski, run, hike and more. While efforts to limit where hunters can access, deer will fall where they want. That could be on a trail which to some people might be a bit traumatic. Deer are part of the nature in our area. In the park it's nice to see them while hiking. In the past controlled hunts have taken place to correct overpopulation. I'd feel better with a controlled hunt by the DNR on a specific date as an option. As a resident living next to the park and an individual who hunts on my property, I will do my part to help within the regulations that exist for hunting locally. Other residents on the road I live on also hunt on their own land next to the park and I can assure you each family has opportunities every year to fulfill tags. I'm concerned allowing hunting could bring about trespassing, making park attendee's uncomfortable, too many deer taken, and ultimately taking away from the beautiful natural park that Lapham Peak is. I recommend a controlled hunt as has been done in the past. Let's leave Lapham Beautiful and preserved as much as possible. Thank you for hearing my thoughts	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
482	I live in Waukesha. I'd like to say that the idea of allowing hunting at Lapham Peak Park is wrong for so many reasons. People visit the park because it's a safe place go to enjoy hiking, skiing, dog walking and picnicking. It's a meeting place for family outings and nature walks. We don't want to be looking out for errant arrows we won't even hear coming. I take my dog to this park 5 or 6 times a week and visit other dog walkers. Most of the time we go early in the morning just because it's so beautiful and quiet in the rising sun. It houses a great nature center and now you want sanctioned killing to take place. I feel that if the deer population gets to large that the park personal can deal with it after hours. Culling the herd should be left to the park management who know the herd and not some overeager dude with a bow and arrow kit that might shoot at a moving bush or tree limb.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

483	My family regularly enjoys the outdoors and enjoys visiting various state parks including Lapham Peak. I am APPALLED to hear that hunting will be allowed on state grounds as this poses an unnecessary danger to people who are safely trying to hike and enjoy the beautiful wilderness areas of our state. There are plenty of places for people to kill animals and it is disgusting and terrifying to hear that this might be allowed on protected state land. I truly hope you will reconsider your decision. The possibility of someone accidentally being hurt due to a misunderstanding is not worth whatever potential benefit (which I honestly do not understand what the benefit to killing animals in a protected state park would be in the first place) that exists from allowing hunting.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
484	I think having bow hunters pay for a permit to trim the herd of deer in Lapham Peak State park is a win win opportunity. Hunters pay the State for a permit, adding \$. While thinning the overpopulated herd to feed their families. It'll get the job done.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
485	Considering the overpopulation of deer in Waukesha County and the prevalence of CWD I believe a means to allow deer hunting at Lapham Peak should be pursued. The town of Delafield has a successful and well controlled deer hunt program. This could be used as a template for similar at Lapham Peak.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
486	I wanted to send my vote in to allow for hunting the lapham peak unit of the kettle moraine forest. I live in Wales.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
487	It has come to our attention that the WDNR is proposing bow hunting in certain parts of Lapham Peak State Forest. While I can appreciate and understand the possible need to cull the deer population, we do not agree with bow hunting in the park. To be completely safe, it would mean that the entire park is shut down for the entire bow hunting season -- yet it appears as though none of the areas would be restricted which means that hikers/families would be in the same areas as the hunters. We live on Cobblestone Court which is right where one of the proposed hunting areas would be. Our back yard backs up to the park so we walk our two dogs (yellow lab and golden retriever) in the park every day. Not only that, but they run into the forest on their own. To the non-discerning eye, they both could look like deer. Our neighbors have young children so hunting in this area concerns us because of that. Who would be allowed to hunt in the park? Anyone? Or would there be a process to vet the hunter? How would it be handled if a deer was trailed onto private property? If there is a need to cull the herd, we would like the state to investigate other options.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
488	I oppose the proposed rule change that would allow bow hunting anywhere in Lapham Peak State Park for all of the following reasons: The Friends of Lapham Peak State Park group oppose this proposed change that would allow hunting in the park. The random patchwork of land that the DNR is recommending being open to archery is not realistic for even the most ethical hunter to stay within. Hunters most certainly will be tracking and retrieving wounded animals all over the entire State Park and neighboring private properties. This creates conflict, confusion, and reason for concern. The small staff of the park currently would not be able to reasonably enforce or address the safety concerns of visitors. The DNR would need to add additional staff and Conservation Wardens. The areas suggested for hunting (Homestead Hollow, Tower, & the Westside Prairie) are too close to incredibly popular hiking trails used by families and dog owners as well as cross-country ski trails during the busiest time of year. This goes against all logic for safety. The horse trails on the Prairie Path pose a particularly dangerous risk for trail riders. Just in 2020, a horse in the Southern Kettle Moraine State Forest was shot by a bowhunter while under saddle on the trail with a group of several riders. This regulation is wide open for "archery for all animals" for the entire archery season that runs from September to February. This far too long of a time that would impact the visitor experience for all recreational users for almost half the year. Especially after significant efforts and investments have been made to make the Lapham Peak a winter destination for all of Southern WI with the snow making and the future Lapham Lodge. This is a dangerous proposition.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
489	I oppose the proposed rule change that would allow bow hunting in Lapham Peak State Park. Some reasons are documented below. My opposition is not because I am anti-hunting, just the opposite. I am super pro hunting. However, this issue is so controversial it has reached my attention on the western border of Wisconsin. As a hunting advocate I believe the DNR should not be undertaking actions that will push non-hunters off the State Parks. It is not in the best interests of hunters and the hunting heritage to do so. The backlash will only lead to more	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for

	<p>conflict. Instead, the DNR should be putting their effort into a program that gives bow hunters access to private lands for hunting. Such a program can be a win/win for the landowners and the bow hunters. Other states have extremely successful programs of this type. We need more unity, not more division, among all types of outdoor users in our state. The Friends of Lapham Peak State Park group oppose this proposed change that would allow hunting in the park. The random patchwork of land that the DNR is recommending being open to archery is not realistic for even the most ethical hunter to stay within. Hunters most certainly will be tracking and retrieving wounded animals all over the entire State Park and neighboring private properties. This creates conflict, confusion, and reason for concern. The small staff of the park currently would not be able to reasonably enforce or address the safety concerns of visitors. The DNR would need to add additional staff and Conservation Wardens. The areas suggested for hunting (Homestead Hollow, Tower, &amp; the Westside Prairie) are too close to incredibly popular hiking trails used by families and dog owners as well as cross-country ski trails during the busiest time of year. This goes against all logic for safety. The horse trails on the Prairie Path pose a particularly dangerous risk for trail riders. Just in 2020, a horse in the Southern Kettle Moraine State Forest was shot by a bowhunter while under saddle on the trail with a group of several riders. This regulation is wide open for “archery for all animals” for the entire archery season that runs from September to February. This far too long of a time that would impact the visitor experience for all recreational users for almost half the year. Especially, after significant efforts and investments have been made to make the Lapham Peak a winter destination for all of Southern WI with the snow making and the future Lapham Lodge. Thank you for consideration</p>	<p>managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
490	<p>I am grateful for the chance to respond to your proposal about opening Lapham Peak to bow hunting during the normal archery season for deer and turkeys. I think that this is a very bad(!) idea, and strongly object. I visit Lapham Peak nearly every day, maintain a section of the Ice Age Trail, and always see many many people of all ages and abilities in all areas of the park — hiking, skiing, running, biking, strolling, dog walking, bird watching, relaxing and more! As the DNR itself frequently notes, it is a VERY popular park and one of the busiest. With its heavy use (including by families with small children, large numbers of school groups, plus Think Outside Hikes organized by the Ice Age Trail Alliance, I can't imagine how this proposal makes sense. It is very disconcerting. I have nothing against hunting or hunters but want to keep this urban park accessible AS IS FOR NON-HUNTING ACTIVITIES. That said, I could see opening the park for a day or two (only!) to specifically invited hunters or DNR staff to help solve the problem. Something similar has been done at Nashotah Park just up the road, and had good success. My husband and I moved here from out of state, and actually chose our home based on its proximity to Lapham Peak! We are grateful for this gem and wish for it to remain the peaceful, safe respite — and source of non-hunting activities and recreation that it is. Please do not change the existing regulation.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
491	<p>Regarding the DNR proposal to allow bow and cross bow hunting at Lapham Peak Park: The following are concerns that we have concerning this issue: 1. Parks are for people’s enjoyment but also for an environment for animal habitat. Because so much open land is being used for housing, apartments, condos, and homes, the animals are losing their place to live. Coyotes do hunt deer and turkeys and there seem to be many in the park that would help illuminate the overpopulation. 2. Your plan show so many various areas to hunt that it seems the hunters would not be able to determine where they are able to hunt. 3. Our 5 acre property would adjoin the bow hunting area. Our home is very close to the area that may be approved for the hunting. While we did not restrict the deed, our family sold the land to the state DNR with good intentions that it would be used for animal habitat and would be used safely. We would be concerned with inaccurate arrows and or disrespectful hunters. Also the trailing of a deer that was only injured would not be allowed on our property. 4. Parking on Lapham Peak Road would cause congestion for those that live on the road. It might also be detrimental to residence property due to the fact that it is a rural road and there is not any shoulder for parking. 5. The land that gives access abuts our property as well and may bring in persons of disrespect or irresponsibility. We have been blessed with safety on our street and would not look forward to having irresponsible behavior that would need police presence. 6. According to the plan, hunting and hiking or skiing at same time does not seem like a safe idea even though the hikers and skiers would have to wear appropriate color. We are located at W325 N1167 Lapham Peak Road Delafield, Wisconsin Our Names are Bill and LoRayne Schmidt</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
492	<p>We are writing to express our concerns with the Draft Rule PR-03-20 which proposed to modify NR 45.13 to allow bow and crossbow hunting in the Lapham Peak Unit of the Kettle Moraine State Forest (Lapham Peak). We are very opposed to the current proposal to allow hunting for the whole season from September through early January. We are longtime direct neighbors of the park, and we have concerns over the lack of communication regarding the need for this change and any alternatives considered. There also has been no transparent and thorough data offered behind the need for this change or the solution offered. Without this information, it is hard to trust that DNR is making informed decisions. We also have concerns over procedural issues with this change. Lapham Peak is a unique state resource and deserves to be evaluated differently from other state parks and DNR-managed lands. Responsible stewardship of the park resources should include data analysis, alternatives evaluation, and strong communication with stakeholders. Our concerns are detailed as follows, and we would be happy to discuss these over the phone or in person to determine a more appropriate solution. Background We are a direct neighbor of the park, please see the attached map. Along with our two school-aged daughters, we have lived at S4W32685 Government Hill Road since 2012. Brian also grew up at this</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

location in the 1980s and 1990s. The property has been in the family since the 1950s. This provides distinct knowledge of the history and uses of the park.

**Purpose and Need for Allowing Hunting** We are wondering why this change is being proposed. We are troubled by the lack of data to demonstrate the estimated number of deer in the park and whether it exceeds what would be appropriate for a park this size. To serve as responsible stewards of the park land and the deer population, this would be important information to have. This helps to determine goals for how much to reduce the deer population and which solutions would be appropriate. Without that data, it is hard to say whether there is a problem to solve, and which alternative is best – the deer population could be reduced too little or too much.

**Current Proposed Change – why we oppose** Assuming that there is a deer problem, we have not seen communication regarding what alternatives were considered, the pros and cons, and analysis of effects on stakeholders. As a neighbor and regular user of the park, we have concerns over safety. Lapham Peak is a very unique park with a high number of potential conflicts between hunting and park users and amenities: Many trails including accessible paved trails, Several parking lots and shelters, Summerstage, Hausmann Nature Center, Deed restrictions prohibiting hunting on the land donated by the Hausmann family, Ice Age Trail, County Highway C bisecting the park, Adjacent private residences and subdivisions, Several pedestrian access points, Irregular park boundaries. All of these result in very few areas where hunting is a possibility, and they would be small in size. With only spot locations available for hunting, they would need to be signed and marked very clearly. If people don't know where they can and can't hunt, the potential for hunting accidents increases substantially. In addition, just like any law enforcement, if the regulations are not clearly depicted, it becomes very difficult to enforce them by the wardens. Lack of ability to enforce the regulations leads to them not being followed. Lapham Peak is also unique in how many people use the park year-round. Whether it's hikers, dog walkers, skiers, bird watchers, or families going for a nice fall walk, the park is busy year-round. I have not been able to find stats on the DNR website, but based on observations, the park is busy year-round, and perhaps busiest in the fall – when hunting is proposed to be allowed. There are two concerns with this. One is the safety concerns of allowing hunting during a busy period in the park. The other is that it can be more challenging for hunters to find deer when more people are in the area, since the deer tend to go elsewhere when more people are around. So, having data on the number of users per month would help to determine the appropriate approach. Last, the 4+ months proposed duration is simply too long – it results in more exposure for potential safety issues and could result in over-reduction of the deer population.

**Other Alternatives** Again, assuming that there is a deer problem, there are other ways it could be addressed. It would be important to evaluate different options, their pros and cons, and effects on stakeholders. The options should be evaluated in regard to their potential effectiveness (ability to achieve deer reduction goals), potential safety concerns, and potential conflicts based on times of peak vs. non-peak park usage. We believe there are other viable options to address a deer population problem, and we would be happy to discuss other options, if they are needed. Other states and governmental agencies have implemented such options such as closing a park for a short duration (e.g. 3 to 7 days), limiting the number of hunting permits in the park, tracking deer taken versus the deer reduction goal, etc. Using sharpshooters and donating the meat could be a viable option. A limited trial of one option could be done one year to see how it goes.

**Procedural Concerns** We have heard that WI DNR has already ordered the signs that would be needed to post when hunting allowed for bows and crossbows. This should be investigated. If this is in fact the case, this would be very troubling. Beginning to proceed with the change before the public hearing and input are taken into account would be a major breach of trust with the public.

**Other Concerns** There is a lack of clarity in the map proposed with this change. As shown in the attachment, the map is missing some connector trails and pedestrian access locations. Also as shown on the map, the Ice Age Trail has recently come under the National Park Service, which typically does not allow hunting. This would need to be updated and clarified. Other questions would revolve around what happens when a deer is shot with an arrow but leaves the park before it dies. Will it be clear to hunters that they cannot go onto adjacent private property to retrieve the deer? And if a deer dies on our property, will DNR pick it up, or will the Town of Delafield? Summary We understand the need for wildlife management and conservation in order to responsibly reserve all aspects of natural resources such as state parks. However, we feel there has been no communication of data analysis, alternatives evaluated, or analysis of potential effects on various stakeholders. All of these should be performed before a goal is developed and solutions implemented. Also, there are so many users and amenities/facilities within the park that it leaves very few areas to safely hunt, and it would require substantial efforts to clearly post all of the restrictions so they could be enforced. There also very few times when the park is not busy with users of all ages. Without data, alternatives, analysis, and strong communication, we have deep concerns over safety, the ability to appropriately manage the deer population, and the ability to enforce the regulations. We also have concerns over procedural issues with this proposal, if DNR has in fact already ordered the signs. As a longtime neighbor of the park, we want to see the park thrive for all users, flora, and fauna. We would be happy to discuss the need for deer herd reduction and various proposals to address it, in order to determine the appropriate solution. We strongly urge you to reconsider the current proposal to allow hunting in Lapham Peak.

493	<p>I oppose the proposed rule change that would allow bow hunting anywhere in Lapham Peak State Park for all of the following reasons: The Friends of Lapham Peak State Park group oppose this proposed change that would allow hunting in the park. The random patchwork of land that the DNR is recommending being open to archery is not realistic for even the most ethical hunter to stay within. Hunters most certainly will be tracking and retrieving wounded animals all over the entire State Park and neighboring private properties. This creates conflict, confusion, and reason for concern. The small staff of the park currently would not be able to reasonably enforce or address the safety concerns of visitors. The DNR would need to add additional staff and Conservation Wardens. The areas suggested for hunting (Homestead Hollow, Tower, &amp; the Westside Prairie) are too close to incredibly popular hiking trails used by families and dog owners as well as cross-country ski trails during the busiest time of year. This goes against all logic for safety. The horse trails on the Prairie Path pose a particularly dangerous risk for trail riders. Just in 2020, a horse in the Southern Kettle Moraine State Forest was shot by a bowhunter while under saddle on the trail with a group of several riders. This regulation is wide open for "archery for all animals" for the entire archery season that runs from September to February. This is far too long of a time that would impact the visitor experience for all recreational users for almost half the year. Especially, after significant efforts and investments have been made to make the Lapham Peak a winter destination for all of Southern WI with the snow making and the future Lapham Lodge.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
494	<p>We live in Delafield, Wisconsin, 53018. We also have interest in our family homestead which is located at Government Hill Rd. Our son and family currently live there. Our family have been residents next to the park since 1955. We have been donors to the Nature Center and currently still volunteer there. So we have significant interest in and a long term history with the park. We note that the park is heavily used and there have been many users from other states and countries at the Hausmann Nature Center. We therefore are very concerned about the potential hunting change to allow hunting in the park. Accordingly we have the following comments and questions regarding this subject which we hope you will take into consideration. 1. We were very disappointed that notification of this change was not provided to the local newspaper, property owners adjacent the park, and user groups. Several people have expressed disappointment that they were not able to be involved in the Public Hearing held December 5. We did not find out about this issue until we received a copy of the Friends Group website notice late in the evening on December 7. 2. We hike the path into the park from Government Hill Road almost every day of the year and have done so for many years. We have not noticed an increase in deer sightings over the years or deer damage either in the park or on our property. We are wondering if the DNR has counts or other information to justify the subject increase in the herd population. We also drive CTH C every day and have not noticed an increase in deer crossings, dead deer, or accidents. Is there a number that the population should be controlled to? 3. There is a cul de sac at the end of Government Hill Road adjacent to the park. Although it is signed for no parking, several vehicles park there on a regular basis and the occupants hike/run into the park. There also are several people that daily hike into the park, some with their dogs from the subdivision west of CTH C. There is a path from the Evergreen subdivision to the south that also connects near the cul de sac. It is not shown on the DNR map. There are other miscellaneous runners/groups from the area that use this access to the park. We assume that there will be adequate signage at the cul de sac to warn of the hunting. We need to note that there is significant vandalism/graffiti at the cul de sac location. It has been very difficult for DNR staff to maintain signs here as recently witnessed by the No Hunting sign that was missing for many months. This is a significant concern if signs are not always posted! 4. Because of the close access to cul de sac location, we are concerned that hunters will drag their kill here and gut it leaving a mess behind at this location. Certainly this is a problem for the dog walkers. Who will be responsible to clean this up? The Town takes care of the pavement but the cul de sac is DNR property. 5. Likewise, who will be responsible to remove deer that are shot and end up dying on private property? We have had two on our property and had to pay a contractor to dispose of the carcass. The Town does not provide the service. Will the DNR be responsible for this? 6. We have had hunters trespassing on our land with guns. We have had people on our land to track deer that have been wounded. We have found arrows on paths on our property. We have not had a particularly good experience with hunters. 7. The map provided by DNR was very vague. Streets were not identified, Some paths were not shown and private property lines were not identified. It would appear that the restricted areas could not be enforced unless distances are provided on a map or the areas are signed. For hunters not familiar with the park this could be a problem knowing if they are in a restricted area or not. 8. It is not clear if the hunting would be allowed throughout the bow/crossbow season, approximately from early September through December, or only the regular gun season. DNR staff we talked with have not been able to answer this question. 9. Why were buffers not provided along the property lines with private property? There are several locations where houses are located within about 100 feet of the property line with the park. Would the normal 100 yard hunting restriction from buildings apply? 10. DNR has indicated that starvation may become a problem. We note that there are now several areas in the park where buckthorn and all other brush have been removed. We have seen deer eating young buckthorn and other brush on our property. Is complete removal of these possible food sources a good practice? 11. The Ice Age Trail which traverses the park has recently been designated as a National Park. Hunting is not allowed in National Parks unless they are specifically listed. How does this impact this proposal? 13. If the size of the</p>	<p>Thanks for taking my call today. I hope you have much more clarity on the proposed archery season at KMSF-Lapham Peak Unit. As always, feel free to reach out to me with any future concerns that you may have regarding the property. Enjoy the rest of your weekend! The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

	<p>herd and starvation is a problem, then we would prefer a control method similar to what is used in Michigan. Multiple people we have talked with also preferred this approach. The park is totally closed to all users except hunters for a designated number of days such as a week. This is heavily publicized and signed. The number of deer to be taken is controlled. Wardens can be available to take care of any issues. Park staff can clean up as needed. Were any other control methods considered? Thank you for your consideration. For all of the above listed reasons we feel that mixed use in this heavily used park is an unwise idea. We look forward to having further discussions regarding this matter.</p>	
495	<p>As an avid outdoor enthusiast, I would like to extend my dismay at the idea of hunting at Lapham State Park. There are so few safe places that we can go and walk quietly in nature during hunting season. I not only feel unsafe hearing gunshots, I fear for my dogs as well. In 2016 I had two of my canine family members tragically murdered by a coyote hunter. As he got off with a mere slap on his wrist, I am aware that hunters have ALL the rights and privileges 365 days a year night and day. As an outdoor enthusiast, I happily pay for a park pass (despite not currently residing in Wisconsin due to said tragedy) when I am fortunate to travel through town. I also happily pay for my ski pass for man made snow--one of the few places that makes snow-- and then happily hike with my dogs on the accessible trails. I too am revenue for Wisconsin and I know there are so many like me! Please please take into consideration others like me that seek the peace that nature offers and others that suffer from PTSD due to gunshot. Please continue to allow us a safe place to hike during an increasingly unsafe season to be outside. It is our respite and our chance at recovery too. Hunters have access to all public land and so many State Parks already, Lapham Peak does NOT need to be added to the list. Thanks for the consideration and if you would like more information to validate my story/concerns I am happy to share,</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
496	<p>We can not allow The Lapham Peak state park to become a hunting ground. It currently is a place for none consumptive users to enjoy seeing wildlife and spending time in nature. Hunting brings imminent danger not only to the area but also to the non consumptive users who are trying to enjoy wildlife. Parks should be available for people to enjoy nature without being worried being about being shot or having hunters chasing and killing animals.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
497	<p>I would like to express my support for the proposed hunting rules changes at Lapham Peak Park. I believe this will help supplement the existing deer population control efforts by the Town of Delafield and City of Delafield. The DNR is currently allowing both the City and Township to utilize Nuisance Permits to allow hunters using conventional archery and crossbows to help with these control efforts. These efforts have produced results. However, the inclusion of Lapham Peak park into a similar state supported effort will allow a significantly larger geographic area to be utilized and potentially add hundreds of acres open to hunting. Obviously, deer don't recognize property boundaries. Allowing additional area's within the Park to be included in control efforts is welcome and will enhance the effectiveness of currently approved programs by the local governments surrounding the Park. I also support rules to ensure the safety of everyone currently using the Park. For example, the City and Town of Delafield only allow tree stands (ladder stands) to prevent arrows and crossbow bolts from traveling beyond the shooters intended target. Hunters should be required to successfully complete the Wisconsin DNR's hunters safety course. Measures like this are necessary. If you would like additional input, please contact me.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
498	<p>We can not allow The Lapham Peak state park to become a hunting ground. It currently is a place for none consumptive users to enjoy seeing wildlife and spending time in nature. Hunting brings imminent danger not only to the area but also to the non consumptive users who are trying to enjoy wildlife. Parks should be available for people to enjoy nature without being worried being about being shot or having hunters chasing and killing animals. I oppose the proposed rule change that would allow bow hunting anywhere in Lapham Peak State Park for all of the following reasons: The Friends of Lapham Peak State Park group opposes this proposed change that would allow hunting in the park. The random patchwork of land that the DNR is recommending being open to archery is not realistic for even the most ethical hunter to stay within. Hunters most certainly will be tracking and retrieving wounded animals all over the entire State Park and neighboring private properties. This creates conflict, confusion, and reason for concern. The small staff of the park currently would not be able to reasonably enforce or address the safety concerns of visitors. The DNR would need to add additional staff and Conservation Wardens. The areas suggested for hunting (Homestead Hollow, Tower, &amp; the Westside Prairie) are too close to incredibly popular hiking trails used by families and dog owners as well as cross-country ski trails during the busiest time of year. This goes against all logic for safety. The horse trails on the Prairie Path pose a particularly dangerous risk for trail riders. Just in 2020, a horse in the Southern Kettle Moraine State Forest was shot by a bowhunter while under saddle on the trail with a group of several riders. This regulation is wide open for "archery for all animals" for the entire archery season that runs from September to February. This is far too long of a time that would impact the visitor experience for all recreational users for almost half the year. Especially, after significant efforts and investments have been made to make the Lapham Peak a winter destination for all of Southern WI with the snow-making and the future Lapham Lodge.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>



499	I am writing to express my dismay and opposition as I've learned of the consideration to allow a long bow hunting season for the Lapham Peak State Park. Growing up in Waukesha County, I hiked the trails at Lapham Peak multiple times. It is a huge draw in the fall for the colors as well as cross country skiing throughout the winter. To allow bow hunting in an area that is trying to attract activities on foot or horseback is just not even good common sense - to have a wounded animal discovered along the way of these activities is not the experience we want for our users. Please reconsider this decision, nothing good can come of it.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
500	NRB Order Number PR-03-20, Section 140, NR 45.13 (18) Definitely the deer and turkey numbers need to be lowered in the Lapham Peak recreational area relating to diseases affecting them, but there is a bigger benefit. An archery hunting only season would be the safest solution to the overpopulation of whitetail deer and turkeys. This would help lower the number of deer and turkey collisions which affect insurance rates for all. With the influx of many more people living and working in the surrounding area of Lapham Peak in the last decade, culling the herd and flock would help curb the vehicle damage, not even mentioning the medical needs or heaven forbid mortality of victims in the vehicles. Plus first responder calls would also go down. In all it would generate more revenue with licensing for the DNR and these hunters would be visiting area businesses adding to commerce. It's a win, win proposal.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
501	I am sending this comment as an active hiker who uses Lapham Peak several times a year along with my wife. I am also an avid bow hunter participating in the Delafield deer management program. I hunt the Ethan Allen property. So, I can see both sides for this land use proposal for Lapham Peak. Continuing to find ways to live in harmony with nature is perhaps what this change suggests. The current plan may not start out perfect but could be developed to provide a viable solution to the overpopulation of White Tail Deer within the Lapham Peak State Forest. For certain White Tail deer are the best at adapting to their habitat change. With available food, water and cover rest assured they will not leave. I would respectfully suggest that a plan be put together after public input. A trial hunting period could be set up with some guide lines monitored as to be able to evaluate a potential new harvest opportunity which could be a tool in creating more of a balance between deer, habitat and all who enjoy this area. The Delafield deer management program has been very successful in working towards creating a balance between land habitat and wildlife. That program provides an opportunity. An opportunity that those of us that participate appreciate having.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
502	This email is in response to the proposed NRB Order Number PR-03-20, Section 140, NR 45.13 (18). I would speak in opposition to this proposal. I live in Delafield. My children, ages 9, 7, 5, and 2, frequently play in Lapham Peak. Our property abuts Lapham Peak, and I would be deeply concerned about opening up this public land to be hunted on. Much of the reason why we live where we do is because of its proximity to the hiking trails and the other land in Lapham Peak. We do not want hunters on this land that our children roam on, though always within view of one of their parents. Undoubtedly it will be recommended that hikers and all others who come to Lapham Peak will wear clothing that should identify them to hunters. But I believe that this is too much to ask, as there are many young children that are in Lapham Peak on a daily basis. In short, permitting hunting in Lapham Peak will drastically change its accessibility to the thousands of people who hike in Lapham Peak, and would mean that this public land would be avoided by the public. I would recommend that other solutions be pursued in order to cull the deer herd that would not endanger the lives of my children and the many other visitors to Lapham Peak. I thank you for your time and attention.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
503	I'd prefer keeping the check-in and check-out times the same as they are now. Most of the campsites are left very clean and don't need this 2 hour time. I go camping many weekends each year with my children and grandchildren and would have to cut our trips very short if we were forced to leave the campsites so early in the day on Sunday. Thanks for the chance to comment.	The department stands by this proposal. The proposed gap between check-out and check-in times is necessary to 1) reduce conflict that has been known to occur between arriving and departing campers and 2) accommodate maintenance tasks such as cleaning, mowing, or tree trimming or removal. The department also notes that many state park systems enforce a gap between check-out and check-in times. These systems include but are not limited to Michigan Maryland, Missouri, Iowa, Virginia, Kansas, California, New York and Ohio.
504	I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional

		judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
505	I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
506	I am not in favor of allowing a hunting season for deer or turkey at Lapham Peak. This park is one of the few places I can trail ride my horse now during the hunting season, which by the way is the best time to ride, without fear of having my brown horse shot at even though we wear orange. Meeting hunters in other State Parks is always a tricky situation because I don't want to scare them. Trigger fingers... I can't imagine hunters at Lapham Peak. When I've been there, there are usually lots of families. Some do not seem too knowledgeable about outdoor safety. I cannot imagine these kids, and their dogs, mixed with hunters.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
507	Please do not allow bow hunting in Lapham Peak during normal archery seasons to address the deer overpopulation problem. There are other solutions for the DNR to solve this problem so a park that is so popular for visitors and hikers can continue to be used safely where hunting is not allowed and a risk for personal injury.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
508	I was made aware of the proposal to allow bowhunting of whitetail deer and turkeys at Lapham Peak at our December 2, 2023 Nordics Ski Club meeting at Trecker Lodge at Lapham Peak. I understand that the DNR feels that the deer herd needs to be culled due to crowding and disease. The bowhunting season would extend for almost 6 months, starting next fall. Accidental shooting of humans and other animals by bowhunters is less likely than with shotguns, but can happen (a horse with rider was hit in the Southern Unit a few years ago and had to be put down). My concern is about the number of people that recreate at Lapham Peak year round (hiking, biking, horseback riding, cross country skiing, etc.). Many of these people bring their children and dogs to recreate with them. What if a deer was hit by an arrow, but didn't die right away and was observed bleeding to death by other users? Or if a dog was off leash and hit by an arrow? Some people might be turned off or frightened by seeing bowhunters in their camouflage gear hiding in the woods at Lapham Peak. Or seeing dead deer being loaded onto their vehicles in the well used parking lots. It seems much safer to me to bring in sharpshooters to cull the deer during specified times and donate the deer meat to those in need. Although I appreciate the opportunity to comment, I heard that Lapham Peak neighbors were not notified of this proposal, which I find extremely inconsiderate.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
509	Hi, I agree with the possibility of hunting in the Lapham Peak park area as I drive Hwy C regularly and see deer along there a lot.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

510	I am writing to object bow hunting of any kind at the Lapham Peak unit. I frequently hike with my dogs year round. I used to live in the northern kettle moraine state forest and now enjoy the southern kettles. However, I don't hike the southern kettles during hunting season. I feel I can still hike without worrying at Lapham during this time. Please don't take this away or allow hunting of any kind.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
511	As a 30 year resident of the Town of Delafield I totally support an archery hunt at Lapham Peak. I have witnessed car deer collisions and see dead deer along Highway C all the time. It's only a matter of time until there is a major accident, or worse yet a fatality. With Lyme disease and CWD the deer population needs to be reduced. I've had Lyme disease and had ticks attached when I've never left my yard. Deer are in my mowed yard all the time and their droppings are a nuisance. In addition the deer eat native plants and encourage invasive plants. They have browsed everything as high as they can reach. There is little to no regeneration of native trees, unless there is a fence put around them. My driveway is about 300 yards long and I've counted as many as 18 deer in that stretch. 6-10 is the norm. To deny that the deer population is major problem is sticking our head in the sand.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
512	I was surprised to hear about this proposal to open the park to hunting. I am opposed to this rule change that would allow bow hunting anywhere in Lapham Peak State Park. There are too many private properties in this area to make it safe for hunting to take place. This change would lead to a multitude of conflicts between landowners and hunters, and there are not enough park staff to enforce or keep visitors safe. Wounded animals would leave the park and venture onto private properties before dying. This proposal raises great concern over public safety. The trails are used by so many non-hunters - dog walkers, horse back riders, cross-country skiers and families with children out for a hike. There have already been so many incidents with hunters and trappers injuring the public and non-target animals - including dogs out on a walk with their family. Please reject this proposal and give our park system, our wildlife and our non-consumptive users a break.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
513	It has come to my families attention a couple of days ago that the DNR is considering allowing bow hunting in a designated portion of Lapham Peak. Hunting is a great sport and way to control the deer population, however, my family & I STRONGLY OPPOSE hunting in this family friendly park. The bow hunting map creates a legitimate safety concern for the many, many people and families who enjoy the health benefits and natural amenities of the park. It would be nearly impossible for non-hunters to enjoy the park for the duration of the hunting season. Non-hunters are not required and most do not wear bright orange or pink. Their lives would be endangered walking through the park. Many non-hunters would avoid enjoying the park out of fear for their families safety. Bow hunting in Lapham Peak is NOT a safe option for this much loved public parkland. NRB Order Number PR-03-20, Section 140, NR 45.13 (18) Thank you for your time and consideration.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
514	I am responding to the proposal to allow turkey hunting and bow/crossbow hunting at Lapham park. This park is one of the busiest parks year round because of the many activities and hiking done there. Having hunting there would ruin the park. I for one would not go there to hike and worry about being shot at. Please vote down this idea.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
515	I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.

516	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
517	<p>I heartily endorse the idea of bow hunting at Lapham Peak Park. I live adjacent the park and can say for a fact that deer are overrunning the area to an extent that is not healthy for them nor for the park nor for the neighbors. I love this area and I love the deer but I don't want to see them starve and I'm not crazy about them eating my plantings. Plus I take Hwy C many, many times and see how often there are deer carcasses by the side of the road during rutting season and all year around. So I say, for the sake of the deer more than anything else, please cull the herd. I'm not worried about being shot myself because I know bow hunters can't shoot from super long distances. All hunters I know are very ethical and careful to be sure of their targets.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
518	<p>I am voicing my objection to allow bow hunting in Lapham Peak State Park. When I go there in the fall, I am always amazed at how many people are hiking there. It is indeed the best state park for outdoor recreation closest to the metropolitan Milwaukee area. I also know several people working to hike the entire Ice Age Trail, and their optimum hiking times are in the spring and fall. They are in more remote areas where I would suspect hunters would be. I don't think that allowing hunting, even bow hunting, would provide a secure feeling to day hikers. In essence hikers would need to wear orange vests to ensure they are not mistaken for deer. The same goes for dogs. I have been told numerous times "you can't take your dog out in the woods during hunting season" because her coloring and mannerisms are very deer like. I understand the need to thin the herd if there is an over population of deer, but I'm not sure opening the park to any kind of hunting is the way to do it. Hiking in state parks has always giving me the feeling of being safe during hunting season. I am also curious why bow hunting season would additionally be open for turkeys, when it didn't mention an overpopulation of turkeys. Down with hunting in Lapham Peak State Park!</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
519	<p>I oppose the proposed rule change that would allow bow hunting anywhere in Lapham Peak State Park for all of the following reasons: The small staff of the park currently would not be able to reasonably enforce or address the safety concerns of visitors. The DNR would need to add additional staff and Conservation Wardens. The areas suggested for hunting (Homestead Hollow, Tower, &amp; the Westside Prairie) are too close to incredibly popular hiking trails used by families and dog owners as well as cross-country ski trails during the busiest time of year. This goes against all logic for safety.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
520	<p>My partner &amp; I are regular users of Lapham Peak. As you know, this is an extremely well-used property - as close to an urban park as there is in the system. There is no place for hunting there with the diversity of users. It has always been an oasis for hikers and others who are not safe in other properties during regular hunting seasons and who are greeted by often hostile hunters during that time. Please do not take that oasis and free/safe space from us. There are so many other places in the Southern Kettle Moraine for hunting. In particular as the number of hunters decline statewide and other park uses increase, why inconvenience the majority of users to the benefit of a declining minority? I understand that the size of the deer herd in this area is of concern. I think the public deserves a careful review of the alternatives to solve the issue. Again, please leave this special resource to the hikers, bikers, skiers, and other non-weapon wielding users.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
521	<p>I understand the need to cull the deer herd and probably the pheasant population as well. An overpopulation of any animal can have serious negative effects on the environment. I used to have a wildlife rehab permit and even those of us who had one understood that. I saw the suggestion that since Lapham Peak has conservation wardens, it would be safer for the wardens to cull the herd during the park's closed hours or you could even extend the closed hours for a period of time to allow them to do the work. Additionally, the wardens would dispose of the deer in a non-wasteful and clean way, and not have to worry about some possibly irresponsible hunters leaving remains near trails. While most</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

	<p>hunters are respectful, just like any group, there are some who are not. It might be reasonable to donate the the deer meat as well. If I remember correctly the state has used sharpshooters in some situations in the past because of CWD. That would also be more acceptable option than opening this Park to any hunting and maybe more acceptable to the wardens as well. Please Leave this park No Hunting! I didn't have a yearly park permit this year but I usually do buy one or my kids get me one for Christmas and I had just been thinking about getting the 2024 permit when I heard about this. If this hunt is allowed I may have to. reconsider.</p>	
522	<p>I oppose the proposed rule change that would allow bow hunting anywhere in Lapham Peak State Park. I spend considerable time at the park for hiking and cross country skiing, and appreciate the fact that Lapham Peak is one of the only State Parks I know of that prohibits hunting, making my enjoyment of the outdoors there more relaxing and peaceful. Other key reasons I oppose this rule change include: The Friends of Lapham Peak State Park group opposes this proposed change that would allow hunting in the park. The random patchwork of land that the DNR is recommending being open to archery is not realistic for even the most ethical hunter to stay with in. Hunters most certainly will be tracking and retrieving wounded animals all over the entire State Park and neighboring private properties. This creates conflict, confusion, and reason for concern. The small staff of the park currently would not be able to reasonably enforce or address the safety concerns of visitors. The DNR would need to add additional staff and Conservation Wardens. The areas suggested for hunting (Homestead Hollow, Tower, &amp; the Westside Prairie) are too close to incredibly popular hiking trails used by families and dog owners as well as cross-country ski trails during the busiest time of year. This goes against all logic for safety. The horse trails on the Prairie Path pose a particularly dangerous risk for trail riders. Just in 2020, a horse in the Southern Kettle Moraine State Forest was shot by a bowhunter while under saddle on the trail with a group of several riders. This regulation is wide open for "archery for all animals" for the entire archery season that runs from September to February. This is far too long of a time that would impact the visitor experience for all recreational users for almost half the year. Especially, after significant efforts and investments have been made to make the Lapham Peak a winter destination for all of Southern WI with the snow-making and the future Lapham Lodge.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
523	<p>I would like to be on record as being opposed to hunting at Lapham Peak State Park. I would like to add that I am opposed to all hunting and trapping in any of Wisconsin State Parks for that matter! Citizens need places to recreate in this state that are not open to hunting and trapping. Not only for citizens but for the wildlife therein as well. Most WI State Parks have a large volume of attendance. People want to view the wildlife in these places not watched them dead, dragged out. Please consider not allowing hunting of any kind or trapping in this park. Thank you!</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
524	<p>I have learned from reading the paper that there are proposals to all deer hunting at Lapham Peak next year, and am writing to voice my concern that this is a large mistake. I frequent the park on a bi-weekly basis with my dogs and enjoy the park's nature and conversation. Without even getting into the many safety concerns of allowing hunting allowed us walkers and our pets, I also would remind you to consider that many of users of the park enjoy the deer in the park in their natural state. Hunting is allowed in the private areas all around the park, and the park serves as a statutory to the deer and turkey. Offering those animals a safe home and then turning into a hunting ground is like fishing with dynamite. And losing the nature in the park is very disappointing to me as a user and tax payer. I think there are plenty of other areas in the state of WI to harvest deer. Particularly in our state forests. This seems like little thought went into this decision, and little public notice has been done. The majority of the parks users and tax payer DO NOT WANT this. I strongly encourage the State of WI Department of Natural Resources to rethink your decision and protect the wildlife. Promote conservation and preservation. 20200 Poplar Creek Parkway Unit 111 N Brookfield WI 53045 Sorry, I forgot to include my home address. I live 15 minutes down the road of I94 and visit mostly every Sunday throughout the entire year. I love the park the way it is and hope it remains in its current natural state with animals alive for me to enjoy. I trust that you will do the right thing so thank you for listening to the majority of us.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
525	<p>I oppose the proposed rule change that would allow bow hunting anywhere in Lapham Peak State Park. I spend considerable time at the park for hiking and cross country skiing, and appreciate the fact that Lapham Peak is one of the only State Parks I know of that prohibits hunting, making my enjoyment of the outdoors there more relaxing and peaceful. Other key reasons I oppose this rule change include: The Friends of Lapham Peak State Park group opposes this proposed change that would allow hunting in the park. The random patchwork of land that the DNR is recommending being open to archery is not realistic for even the most ethical hunter to stay within. Hunters most certainly will be tracking and retrieving wounded animals all over the entire State Park and neighboring private properties. This creates conflict, confusion, and reason for concern. The small staff of the park currently would not be able to reasonably enforce or address the safety concerns of visitors. The DNR would need to add additional staff and Conservation Wardens. The areas suggested for hunting (Homestead Hollow, Tower, &amp; the Westside Prairie) are too close to incredibly popular hiking trails used by families and dog owners as well as cross-country ski trails during the busiest time of year. This goes against all logic for safety. The horse trails on the Prairie Path pose a particularly dangerous risk for trail riders. Just in 2020, a horse in the Southern Kettle Moraine State Forest was shot by a bowhunter while under saddle on the trail with a group of several riders. This regulation is</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

	wide open for “archery for all animals” for the entire archery season that runs from September to February. This is far too long of a time that would impact the visitor experience for all recreational users for almost half the year. Especially, after significant efforts and investments have been made to make the Lapham Peak a winter destination for all of Southern WI with the snow-making and the future Lapham Lodge.	
526	Thank you for taking the time to read my comments regarding the proposal of allowing bow hunting within Lapham Peak state park. I am an avid hiker out at Lapham Peak and am against this proposal. If the conservation wardens are able to cull the herd during the park’s closed hours and dispose of deer in a non-wasteful and clean way, this is how the deer herd should be managed. see families with pets and small children in the park all the time, they should not need to worry about stray arrows while enjoying the park.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
527	We do NOT support hunting of any kind in Lapham Peak. We love walking our dogs, bringing our families to enjoy hikes and the enjoying the surrounding nature and peacefulness of the parks areas frequently and would not want that ruined by the presence of and results of hunting. Thank you for considering my opinion.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
528	I frequent the park as a resident of the area. I wouldn’t feel safe knowing that there is hunting anywhere in the park. I want to enjoy the experience the park without any concern of hunting. Even if it’s isolated to a certain area, I now have to know about it and actively avoid it. If this were the case, the park is no different than general forest area where hunting regularly takes place. I usually visit 10-20 times per year. If hunting were to be allowed, I would rethink my annual permit and no longer visit. I also frequent the park as a volunteer in the summer to clear invasive species and make snow in the winter. These activities have me anywhere throughout the park, and perhaps more likely to encounter hunters. If this were the case, I would not volunteer any further. Do not allow hunting at any time in Lapham Peak.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
529	Thanks for the opportunity to offer commentary on the proposed Lapham Peak hunting idea. My opinion is that all over Wisconsin there are so many opportunities available for hunters, I see zero reasons why this expansion of allowable hunting is either necessary or desirable. Hunters have so many options. Why not allow some areas to be free of hunting? Additionally, the Lapham Peak site is highly trafficked. Why take a chance someone could be tragically injured or killed? Today’s bow hunting is not what it once was. Crossbows in particular are deadly. Please, keep hunting out of Lapham Peak!	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
530	Good evening. I have BCC'd the rest of the folks on our Lake District email list for their information too. I have also copied , in case she would like to respond too. Thank you very much for your prompt reply. WOW! 153 Sections in the code? Some observations upon a quick review of #5 in the link ... I did not know there were such things as "boat in" campsites. I also never knew the term "teepee" was used in state law (section 19). I see the use of drones in section 30, so are they used on our pond for surveillance? Invasive plants are addressed in a few sections, but I am not sure how our approach to them should be after losing the 10 acres of open water weed harvest area due to less EWM after our last draw down. I never did plan on going nude on public property, but good to have it clarified here. (sect 37) Section 100 is kind of interesting, in that "sensitive habitat" does force non-motorized recreational use. Section 101 shows ponds can disappear. I assume then you put wetland restrictions on them? I see sections 102 and 103 apply to all waters regarding air-boat use. I myself have been interested in wake boat use, so I am guessing restrictions on those statewide are in the works. While most of these do not appear to impact us directly on the lola Millpond, it is good to know what is possibly in the works that could impact us down the road. Again, thank you very much, Andrew, for your prompt response, and for bringing this to my attention. Hope you all have a good evening.	Comment is noted and has been entered into the record.
531	I recently found out about the proposed hunting at Lapham Peak. I'm voicing my opposition to this proposal. I frequently hike at Lapham Peak and go on the Blue/Black trails and west side of the park. I was informed that this is where hunting would be allowed. It is peaceful and comforting to know hunting is not allowed there. I walk alone and do not feel comfortable with hunters in the woods. Delafield utilizes sharpshooters in the surrounding area to cull the herd of deer. It is totally not necessary to allow hunting at Lapham. The Ice Age Trail runs through Lapham and has been designated as a National park trail. I think hunters put a conflict of beautiful hiking trails with shooting at animals in the park. There is enough violence in the world. Nature should be left to balance on its own.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
532	I’m writing to express my strong opposition to allowing hunting and trapping in Lapham Peak State Park. Allowing these activities in piecemeal sections of this area is the same as allowing it in the entire park. How can bullets and arrows be confined to specific patches of land? It is far too dangerous for hikers and skiers and horseback riders. My friends, family, and I as well as the general public will no longer be safe there if this happens. This disastrous proposal would deny enjoyment of this park to the majority of us who do not hunt and trap in favor of the few who do.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

533	I am a resident of the State of Wisconsin. Every year I purchase a State Parks tag for my car to enjoy our wonderful parks. I am a Wisconsin Master Naturalist and spend many hours every year in the parks working on trail and park maintenance to support my fellow residents and visitors in their enjoyment of the park. I believe that expanded hunting in our parks makes it more difficult for people to enjoy the park. I know family members and friends who won't go to our parks during hunting season because of fear of being shot or struck by an arrow.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
534	It has been brought to my attention that consideration is currently being given to allowing bow hunting of deer and turkey in Lapham Peak. Being one of the few public lands on which hunting is prohibited, it seems counterintuitive to add it to the already extensive areas. This is one of the few areas which afford a risk free opportunity for hikers, bicyclists, and horseback riders to enjoy the outdoors without worry. I feel you would be inappropriate to open this area to hunting when there are already sufficient properties already designated for this purpose.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
535	Do not allow hunting within Lapham Peak boundaries. We have several alternative areas in and around the park to hunt and even cull the deer herd as needed. An avid park and Ice Age Trail hiker, I am very excited about the Ice Age Trail designation as a National Park and hope it remains a safe hiker's park.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
536	I would like to comment on this proposal in regards to hunting. This is an excellent way to try and control the population of deer in the park. The hunting program should resemble the current town of Delafield hunting program as it works very well. Stand locations should be placed as to not interfere with the public and access to the location should be considered. A slow roll out of a program would help with conflicts. I am sure you would get many volunteers to help with this. I wouldn't be surprised if different tree stand manufacturers would donate equipment to this program if approached.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
537	As a resident of Waukesha County (Donald Martinson, 208 Harrison Avenue, Waukesha, WI) and a user of Lapham Peak Park, I wish to express my opposition to opening the park to deer hunting by the general public. The principle cause of my objection is safety. I understand that the DNR has to control the size of the herd, however I only trust employees of the Department to carry out the work required to do that work. Thank you for considering my opinion.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
538	I am writing to express my concern about the possibility of proposed bow hunting at Lapham Peak. People should be able to enjoy our state parks without threat of errant arrows. Please do not allow hunting at Lapham Peak.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
539	I fully support bow hunting at Lapham Peak. I am an avid cross country skier, hiker, trail user, runner, hunter and conservation patron. Thank you for your draft proposal. I believe what would assist for safety would be to have a lottery or some sort of control on how to limit the amount of hunters utilizing the park to bow hunt.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
540	I'm writing about the fact that the DNR had determined that Lapham Peak is becoming overpopulated with deer, and is thus proposing bow hunting during the normal archery season for deer and turkeys in some areas. I understand that some of the area is not being considered because it's too close the road or trails, etc. Also, some of the land is permanently restricted by "deed" as it was given or sold to the Park with the stipulation that it not be hunted on. Safety of the public should be considered more seriously. While those restrictions make it sound safer in the areas where most people hike or ski, it adds to the challenge to communicate to hikers, skiers, and hunters what is open and what is closed to hunting. Lapham Peak sees 600,000 people each year, or 50,000 people each month, and most of those people use the east side of the park. Lapham Peak State Park has been a jewel among the Wisconsin Park system in that no hunting or trapping was allowed. This is because the people who donated the majority of the land put in the deed that no hunting or trapping would EVER be allowed. These small and random parts being open to hunting essentially opens up the entire park to hunting. It would be next to impossible for the bow hunters to stay in these boundaries. I urge the DNR to reconsider this proposal.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.



541	<p>This email is to provide commentary on the proposal to open parts of Lapham Peak State Park to bow hunting for purposes of reducing the existing deer population. I strongly oppose this being considered. Lapham Peak sees roughly 50,000 people per month; the vast majority of those use the trails on the east side of the park where much of the hunting is being recommended. And the area on the park's west side sees large numbers of hikers and dog walkers as well – at all hours of the day. Effectively communicating that active hunting is occurring would be difficult to impossible, as many of those people arrive with children and pets who are not able to be vigilant to deer hunters. This is a HUGE safety concern and a misguided option. I strongly disapprove. In addition, I would like more information on the data being used to suggest that the deer population in the park is indeed over recommended management limits. I live on the west side of Cushing Park Road, directly across from a trail entrance, and am in the park weekly – at all times of the day. I see no signs of over population – especially with the increasing number of cars speeding down Cushing Park Road in flagrant disregard for wildlife. Finally, the fact that large tracts of the park were given or sold to the state with the stipulation that no hunting occur on that land created the legacy of this park being meant for safely enjoying nature and wildlife. To wantonly change that – even in areas not under this stipulation – would create great confusion and ruin the experience our state parks should be diligently trying to protect for our residents. Please reject this proposal.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
542	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
543	<p>I wanted to send my appreciation and approval of opening deer hunting in Lapham Peak Park. I believe deer management here is necessary and appropriate. As a responsible hunter, I'm confident visitors and hunters can coexist in a safe and healthy manner. Could I ask when a likely decision is expected to be made?</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to write. After careful review of public comments and any subsequent revisions to the rule package, it will go to the DNR's governing body, the Natural Resources Board. We are hopeful that the rule package will go to the governor in February of 2024. After that, it would go to the Legislature. I would expect that it would be enacted sometime after that, perhaps August of 2024 at the outset. The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
544	<p>My wife and 8 children fully support the idea of deer and turkey hunting via upright bow or crossbow for the sole purpose of managing the overwhelming deer population in the area. The unchecked explosion of deer population in the area has led to safety concerns with local traffic, endangering the lives of local residents and those traveling through our community. Allowing proven, skillful, licensed, responsible, hunters to keep this population in check would lead to safer roads, expanded use of public grounds for outdoor recreation at times that are rarely used by others primarily early morning and dusk. Minimally, I implore you to advocate for local hunters interested in responsible deer population management coupled with a desire to feed their families using organic, self sustaining resources left unchecked that would also reduce human injury, property damage and vehicle accidents that further stretch other valuable public service agencies such as law enforcement, fire department, ambulance, public works and other road maintenance crews robbing local tax payers of such resources. Allowing such access to a limited, licensed, local, and proven group of hunters would provide an overwhelming upside for our local community at ZERO COST to tax payers</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>



	while also supporting said hunters' ability to provide nutrition for their families using a sustainable resource. Set limits, predetermine rules, designate areas and re-evaluate year to year. The risk/downside is low, while the advantage for the entire community is great. Please consider support of this program and do not hesitate to find a "win - win" for our great community! Thank you for your time and consideration in this important community issue. Note: I would gladly VOLUNTEER my personal time to further understand this important initiative to see our local community continue to prosper.	
545	I support the future bow hunting season at Lapham Peak	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
546	This email is written to voice our concern for the proposed open deer hunting in Lapham Peak park. Our main concern is for safety of all visitors using the trails for hiking, biking and skiing. The proposed hunting period of Mid September thru mid January is too long of a time frame to have park visitors and hunters sharing same space. This is just unsafe as general public will not be aware of bow hunters for that long of a period. As a hunter myself, if you miss the target arrows do travel quite a distance and could end up injuring an innocent human or dog. The general public that doesn't hunt will not be in lookout for hunters where they are skiing or hiking. Another concern is that many dog walkers use the trails including us. Many visitors do let their dogs run off leash under their control and we are fearful for what this open hunt could create. To thin the herd our suggestion is to consider a special hunt of two weeks or so in this area instead of four months due to the amount of people who use this park. Thank you for listening to our concerns.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
547	I do not think that deer hunting in the park is a good idea. Hunters would not have a clear understanding of the hunting boundaries causing potential conflicts with property owners. Other concerns are the number of skiers and hikers utilizing the same area as the hunters. If the deer herd needs to be culled it should be done in a more organized and professional manner.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
548	As avid hikers, we have always relied on Lapham Peak as a safe place to hike during deer hunting season. I see that many other people use Lapham for walking and trail running. So we oppose plans to open any part of the park to hunting, including bow hunting, for obvious safety reasons.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
549	I am a resident of Watertown, WI frequently visit the park and buy a park pass yearly to support it. I am also an avid outdoorsman who enjoys all things hunting and trapping related. I feel opening the park to hunting and using my funds is beneficial all around for all parties involved. Letting hunters help manage the deer and turkey population is a great way for all parties to work together. I look forward to hearing the outcome of this in the near future.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
550	We agree with the DNR rule change for the Lapham Peak Unit - Kettle Moraine State Forest. As stated" the Department may designate areas where hunting deer and turkeys with archery equipment, but not firearms is allowed" Some reasons for supporting this change are: + Control herd size and over population is area + Limit disease and sickness in herd + Potential to decrease deer/car accidents and related insurance claims and costs + Eliminate need and cost of hiring sharp shooters to cull herd + Lessen deer damage to residential landscape plantings. Hunting areas designated on the map will not affect park users ie: hiking, biking, X-C skiing. We are X-C skiers and hike frequently at the park and see no danger or problem with allowing archery hunting.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
551	We are extremely concerned about the plans to open areas of Lapham Peak to bow hunting. We frequently walk up Government Hill Road into Lapham Peak (one of the great perks about living just outside Lapham), as do many of our neighbors, and understand that this is in the bow hunting open area. We love living in a family- and community-oriented area which feels very safe and protected. While we understand the issue of the overpopulation of deer, we strongly feel that these plans create a risk of accidental injury for all of us. Kindly consider our perspective and explore alternatives to this plan.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

552	<p>I'm writing in regards to the proposed bow hunting in Lapham Peak state park. My wife and I moved to Delafield because of this state park so that we could run, hike, and ski in an area where we could feel safe and hunting was not allowed. This aspect became even more important after a horse was euthanized after being struck with an arrow by a bow hunter in nearby Scuppernong in 2020. We enjoyed Lapham Peak so much that we bought a house that backs up to the park and paid a premium for the "No Hunting" signs that are posted at our property line. I am not against hunting. I'm a deer hunter, and I take advantage of pheasant hunting in the Kettle Moraine Southern Unit on a weekly basis. But those areas, though the Ice Age trail goes through them, are not nearly as heavily trafficked as Lapham Peak. This is a resource that is vital to the community of Delafield and the surrounding areas. It's an area that has amazing recreation opportunities, and during hunting season, draws people away from other areas in the region that are open to hunting because it is perceived as safer, or at least a spot where patrons do not have to be concerned about encountering hunters. The original Lapham Peak master plan deed restriction on hunting stated it was not just for the 409 acres, but was extended to include all lands within the project boundary. I practice archery and even my wife has a bow. We are good friends with an owner of a local archery shop, and I know many, many responsible bow hunters. The problem is I have encountered many who are arrogant, and violators. There will be arguments made that the effective range of a crossbow is 40 yards, but that does not prevent some hunters from thinking they are in possession of a rifle with a string, and taking 100 yard shots. My house is less than 100 yards from the park, and less than 100 yards from the potential bow hunting area. We have had hikers come onto our property who have lost their way on the trails and we've had shed hunters walking on our property. Will we have to worry about bow hunters sitting in our yard? I coach high school cross country and track and field, and we run workouts regularly through Lapham Peak. I would not want the liability of having these high school athletes running through an area where there are bow hunters present, where they have to worry every time they encounter a deer, where they are running in excess of 10 miles per hour, that an arrow or bolt may be on the way. I do not want them to have the extra burden of checking their footing in the event that a broadhead is on the trail. People will ignore the rules, people will hunt within 300 feet of our house. Hunters will mistake our property for the park or claim ignorance, it has happened numerous times in the short time we've lived here with people looking for antler sheds. The no hunting sign that is prominent on the border of our lot is comforting to our family. My wife specifically did not want to buy adjacent to the nearby Ottawa field trial grounds due to concern for hunters ignoring the no shooting toward property signs. There's a difference between buying a house adjacent to public hunting land and trying to prohibit hunting vs buying a house adjacent to land where hunting had been prohibited and now is under consideration. Will we now have to be concerned of letting our dogs run around our property because hunters can sit at our property line? Will we need to worry for our own safety?</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
553	<p>I want to voice my feelings that I do not support bow hunting in Lapham Park, Waukesha County. This is a very busy park and has wonderful hiking trails available. Hunting is important but do not feel that this area should be open when it is so well used by families</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
554	<p>I am a resident in Twin Oaks Dr. I believe this is a terrible idea to have bow hunting in Lapham Peak. This is public land where hundreds of people walk every day and this law would put several people at risk of potential injury and/or death. There would be a lot of people, including myself, that would be frightened to walk in Lapham if this law were to pass. This would be awful for the community.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
555	<p>I would like to provide input on the forest usage. I am a lifelong resident of kettle moraine area, and have used the horseman trails and park at New Prospect, along with the snowmobile trails in the whole forest. I believe the current uses in the park have a lot of different recreational opportunities for everyone. I would hope the variety of usage stays the same.</p>	<p>Comment is noted and has been entered into the record.</p>
556	<p>I am writing to provide my comments on the DNR Board Order # PR-03-20 regarding the proposal to allow bow hunting of deer and turkeys within designated areas of the Lapham Peak Unit of the Kettle Moraine Forest in Waukesha County, where hunting is currently not allowed. I am opposed to this proposal as a matter of safety for the thousands of people who use Lapham Peak every month, particularly during the fall for hiking, biking, and horse back riding, and in winter for X-C skiing. The proposal would allow hunting for the entire bow hunting season from Sept to Jan, the months when the park is the busiest. This makes no sense, as there would be no way to prevent hunters from wandering into a "no hunting" zone nor innocent families, dog walkers, runner, etc. to use a trail that is partly or all within the hunting zone as suggested on the current map. It appears that the entire horse riding trail would be in the hunting zone, along with many of the hiking trails, and even parts of the X-C ski trails. There is simply no way that people who use the park for recreation could be kept safe from hunters in such a crowded area. While I am</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

	<p>aware that there is an over population of deer at Lapham Peak, I strongly urge the DNR to remove this proposal PR-03-20 from inclusion in section 140. As an alternative, I would suggest that DNR work with the city/town of Delafield to coordinate their efforts to cull the deer population. Perhaps the park could actually be closed for a couple days of intense hunting, similar to what Delafield might be doing, as a one-time measure to cull the deer numbers. It would need to be publicized and then posted at closed gates to keep visitors out while hunting was going on. There just is no way to keep people safe at Lapham Peak if you allow any kind of hunting. For many people, that feeling of safety is a strong draw for them to recreate at Lapham Peak without fear of being shot by someone, or their dogs or horses injured. The Friends of Lapham Peak have worked tirelessly with DNR staff to make many improvements over the years, resulting in one of the premier parks in this heavily populated area, including visitors from Illinois. Please don't do anything to spoil this.</p>	
557	<p>To the people who run the government of the state of Wisconsin, please stop being so oppressive. This is the United States of America not Iran. Stop using your government positions to enforce the religious dress code of the dominant religion on all people at all times where ever you can. There are posted clothing optional beaches in in many european countries and they are just fine. Civilization does not fall apart if you let people have some freedom. I have been to many clothing optional beaches and have found the people there polite, fun loving and, clean just normal people without clothes. National polls have been conducted on the subject. 15% are naturist, people who enjoy out door recreation in the nude. 70% think that it would be fine to have some posted beaches on public lands for clothing optional recreation. 15% are intolerant religious control freaks. Hunters are 4.5% of the national population and look at all the public lands that are allowed to them. Naturists don't kill the animal or leave shotgun shells and lead pellets everywhere. Our activities are far safer. Having several posted clothing optional beaches on public lands would help your 15% naturist wisconsinites feel safe while recreating and let the intolerant jerk wisconsinites know where not to go if they do not feel like being offended. Please do not pass these anti nudity laws. Be a freedom loving American not an oppressive control freak.</p>	<p>The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.</p>
558	<p>I don't think hunting in Lapham Peak is a good idea. It's not safe for people that hike and ski there. I have been hiking there exclusively for the past 4 years with my friend. We hike 2 to 3 days per week. I'm against the proposal to hunt at Lapham Peak.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
559	<p>I am a trail rider that is opposed to opening Lapham to bow hunting. I am all for sharing the trails, and used to ride the KM State Forest trails during bow hunting. Then a horse was shot (in the hoof and resulted in the horse being euthanized). I rode that trail an hour prior ... and even years later I am shaken by that. It could have been me or my horse. I no longer ride in the Forest during peak bow and gun seasons. Which truly is a shame as it's a long season and beautiful time of the year. Alternatively, I am lucky enough to be able to choose other parks that have bridle trails that do not allow hunting. Lapham is that alternative for me. Please do not restrict those that desire the comfort of "safety" during hunting season by opening a park so heavily used by hikers, dog walkers, bikers, and horseback riders to bow hunting.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
560	<p>As a Waukesha County resident, I am against the addition of bow hunting to areas within the boundaries of Lapham Peak State Forest as a method of population control. NRB order number PR-03-20, Section 140, NR 45.13 (18) This park sees over a half million visitors a year. Hundreds of thousands of people will be impacted by this decision, and it does not appear as though sufficient respect is being given to the visitors of Lapham Peak. For example, the proposed map of allowable hunting spaces does not appear to have clear boundaries, and in fact, often runs into areas included on the well-known and well-respected Ice Age Trail. These hunting areas appear to be placed sporadically, wherever they "fit"; some are across trailways, one is arguably very near to Homestead Hollow picnic area, and others have to stop for reasons of private ownership or public access before continuing. This lack of continuity will be confusing to all parties and creates undue and unnecessary safety risks. Furthermore, as the area is partly residential, this creates issues with personal property as well. Not only trespassing, but of individuals feeling safe to enjoy their property freely at will. The staff of the park cannot be expected to take on these additional stresses and responsibilities, without a clear plan when moving forward. Thank you for your consideration, and please keep Lapham peak free from all hunting/trapping!</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
561	<p>I am just now getting to sit down and read through the new proposed regulations, and saw the above statement. Can you explain what the use on roads open to motor vehicles would entail? Response on 12/9/23: Thank you for clarifying! I don't think I need to comment on any of that!</p>	<p>I realized Ariana may not see this until after the comment period has closed. Below are the changes related to horses. We're seeing more types of domesticated hoofed animals/ungulates, and this rule attempts to apply the rules for horses to those other types of "horse-like" animals. There are no real changes proposed for horses. The road-related changes are to change the rule from only applying to horses to "equine animals, llamas, and alpacas" (see SECTION 71). SECTION 13 expands the definition of "equine" to include other species and breeds of hoofstock that are considered to be equines and are used</p>

		<p>for the same purposes as the animals currently covered in the definition. Section 13. NR 45.03 (9m) is proposed to be amended to read: NR 45.03 (9m) "Equine" means any horse, pony, donkey or , burro, mule, and hinny. SECTION 20 creates a definition of "ungulate," which will be used to distinguish the activities allowed for equine animals from activities that would be prohibited for all hoofed mammals. Section 20. NR 45.03 (23s) is proposed to be created to read: NR 45.03 (23s) "Ungulate" means any hoofed mammal. SECTION 71 specifies that all ungulates rather than just equines are prohibited from being on beaches, posted or marked hiking trails, nature trails, picnic areas, non-equine campgrounds, or contrary to posted notice on the northern state forests or the Turtle-Flambeau scenic waters area. These are higher-use public areas on which user conflicts would likely arise with the presence of these animals. This section also expands the rules on riding animals on certain public lands to all equine animals, llamas and alpacas. While these animals are generally prohibited on department lands, they may be ridden or led on public highways, areas open to public vehicle use, areas and trails open to their use, and by permit on field trial areas. Section 71. NR 45.06 (6) is proposed to be amended to read: NR 45.06 (6) (a) Except as otherwise authorized by the department, No no person may ride, lead or fail to prevent any equine ungulate animal from being on any beach, posted or marked hiking trail, nature trail, picnic area or non-equine campground or contrary to posted notice anywhere not posted open to their use. Ungulate animals are allowed in all areas, except where posted against such use, on the northern state forests or and the Turtle-Flambeau scenic waters area. (b) Horses Equine animals, llamas, and alpacas are prohibited on all other department lands except on public highways as defined in s. 340.01 (22), Stats., and consistent with ch. 346, Stats., and areas or trails posted for their use, or by permit on field trial areas, in accordance with ch. NR 17. SECTION 72 replaces "horse" with "equine animal" and adds llamas and alpacas to the provision prohibiting a person from recklessly riding or leading an animal on department lands in a way that would risk public health and safety. Section 72. NR 45.06 (7) is proposed to be amended to read: NR 45.06 (7) No person may ride or lead a horse an ungulate animal in a careless, negligent, or reckless manner so as to endanger the life, property or persons of others on any lands under the management, supervision and control of the department.</p>
562	<p>I am emailing on behalf of myself, my husband, our 4 children, and a local group of homeschool families (50 of us on average) who visit Lapham Peak regularly. We are hunting family, my husband bow hunts and is a part of a local archery club, so we are familiar with the benefits of hunting as a whole. There clearly is a deer population issue on the grounds of Lapham Peak, every time we visit the park we see deer and we understand the downsides and dangers of overpopulation. However we have some major concerns about the all out allowance of hunting at Lapham Peak. From our understanding the proposal would be to have the park open to hunting the entirety of bow season. We feel like this is not the best option and don't understand why other options haven't been considered. We absolutely feel park attendance will drastically decrease with the allowance of hunting for the entirety of the season. We would not feel comfortable being there during the season if there was active hunting and would find other parks to hold our homeschooling co-ops and hike as a family. Our major suggestion we feel would be a good compromise would be to only allow certain days of the months for hunting. This way some days park visitors would be able to enjoy the park without concern and other days visitors would be able to make the decision to visit or not when it is open to hunting. The public would know ahead of time and would be able to make the decision and plan. We also read nothing about any accountability as to who is hunting. We propose there should be a sign in and out sheet daily as the hunters arrive and leave so in case of incident there is a record of who was there. Lastly we are also extremely weary</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

	<p>about allowing crossbows as there is a much higher chance for misfires and possible incidences with them versus a regular bow , and we would absolutely not feel comfortable knowing hunters would be using them as we enjoy the park along side them. We suggest not allowing crossbows for hunting in this very populated park. Based on our understanding now we will not be visiting the park during hunting season if the full allowance goes into effect. This will be very disheartening for us as it has become our favorite regular spot for our homeschool group every Friday (again a group of on average 50+, but 95 mothers included total in our group with an average of 3 children, so near 400 people). We hope and pray a compromise and middle ground can be found over the current fully open proposal so that regular park guests like us can enjoy the grounds without concern, while also providing a great location for hunters to enjoy the park and help decrease the clearly overabundant deer population. Thank you for taking the time and hearing public concern.</p>	
563	<p>I am an avid user of Lapham Peak year round. I am a Lifetime Friend of Lapham Peak. I have previously volunteered to clear buckthorn and am also a volunteer snowmaker and xc skier. I am in support of what helps the long term health of the forests and fields of Lapham Peak. I believe reducing the deer population is important to the regrowth of native species of plants. I support the new bowhunting proposal. The areas of the map seem reasonable. Online reservations of hunting times and areas would be reasonable if compromise is needed. Reducing the length of the season would be another compromise if needed.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
564	<p>I am commenting on NR45 in regards to snowmobile trails in the Northern Kettle Moraine State Forest and request that they remain unchanged. This great asset to snowmobiling has been in place since the 60's and has served the community in many ways including bringing in snowmobilers from other areas to the NKM State Forest and surrounding businesses. The trails are maintained and groomed for winter use by our snowmobile club as well as others. We work under a strict contract that has worked well as a partnership between the clubs and the NKM State Forest management.</p>	<p>Comment is noted and has been entered into the record.</p>
565	<p>Good morning. I am writing to share my thoughts on the possibility of allowing bow hunting within Lapham Peak. I understand the need to reduce the deer herd within the park. The following are my questions and requests for consideration related to bow hunting to do this. 1. Length of the season - The park is a magnet for fall outings (which is why I tend to avoid it during this time, but it's nice for people to have this space so close to an urban area). To allow hunting in Lapham Peak during the entire bow hunting season would be unfortunate for the people who want to enjoy a fall day without the concern of sharing the space with hunters. 2. Days allowing hunting - For the same reason that the season length should be shortened, I would suggest reviewing the days of the week that hunting is allowed. Again, I visit on week days, but I don't think it's practical or most effective to allow hunting on holidays and weekends. 3. Type of bows allowed - I am not a hunter, so have no knowledge of bows. I just know that I would not want the use of bows that can result in arrows/bolts traveling far distances allowed in Lapham Peak. 4. Carcass disposal - My strong preference would not to "witness" anyone hauling a deer carcass on a trail I am using. A subset of this is establishing guidelines for disposing of the remains of a deer when someone "dresses" a deer - it's not a positive experience to come upon the leftovers, and I have had that experience in other areas of the Southern Kettle Moraine Forest. That's why Lapham Peak has been a refuge during hunting season. 5. Identification - In order to allow people to report abuses of whatever guidelines are in place, I would suggest requiring hunters to display some identification. 6. How will the DNR identify areas of Lapham Peak closed to hunting, and how will these areas be monitored? What guidelines will be established if wounded deer enter areas closed to hunting? If hunters follow wounded deer into these areas, how will hunters be allowed to dispose of the deer if one is still alive? Thank you for allowing me to convey my questions and concerns as you consider allowing hunting within Lapham Peak. It would be interesting to see the analysis that has been done to pursue bow hunting as the published option for addressing deer overpopulation.</p>	<p>I will respond to your questions the best I can. I expect there to be future conversations on the specifics of what the Archery hunt will look like exactly. 1. What is currently being proposed is an Archery that would follow the typical archery season from mid-September through the end of January. Archery season dates can be found at the following link: <a href="https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/hunt/dates">https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/hunt/dates</a> 2. To my knowledge, there would not be any days during the proposed archery season that would be closed. 3. The type of bows being used would also fall under the typical statewide archery regulations. This would include longbows, recurve bows, compound bows, crossbows, etc. 4. Carcass disposal would follow the same regulations. Hunters are required to remove the entire carcass excluding the entrails. A complete list of hunting regulations can be found at the following link: <a href="https://widnr.widen.net/s/fjhxhtzq6t/2023-wisconsin-hunting-regulations">https://widnr.widen.net/s/fjhxhtzq6t/2023-wisconsin-hunting-regulations</a> 5. The DNR utilizes a DNR Tip Line for hunting violations that is posted on the property. That phone number is: 1-800-847-9367 6. A property hunting map will be available on the property that will show designated hunting areas as well as areas that are closed to hunting. These boundaries will also be clearly marked throughout the property with adequate signage. These would be enforced by Conservation Wardens. I hope these answers are helpful for you. Please let me know if you have any further questions or concerns. Thank you! The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
566	<p>I live in Oconomowoc WI I have been hiking at Lapham Peak for over 30 years and am now taking my grandchildren there to hike as well. It is a jewel of a park and one of the only places left where no hunting is allowed. It is a safe and sacred place for 1000's of non hunters. Please keep Lapham Peak safe and free from any kind of hunting. Thank you for your support.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for</p>

		managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
567	<p>I would like to start this out by stating that I have been legally hunting since 1986. I believe in the benefits of hunting to the environment and the economic landscape. I primarily target deer in the state of WI every year. I now only hunt in Northwest WI in the Iron River area. I track deer and still hunt covering many miles a season. In part for this I spend a lot of time every week throughout the year at Lapham Peak Park hiking to get ready for the deer season. I've come to find out that there is an effort to establish hunting at the park. I think this is ridiculous. I've read the numbers of deer are overpopulated. As I said I spend hours there on and off trail, have I seen deer? Of course. Would I say they are overpopulated? No, just about right. It's refreshing to see deer when the Northwoods is pretty much void of them. As of now you can see where the bordering properties are already hunting. Tree stands are visible from the trail now. Anyone that would come into the park is going to target bucks and that will do nothing for your population goal. Other issues going on there is the clearing of brush or browse. This keeps the deer moving and searching for food (car kills). Ultimately, based on what I've seen happen over the years in the north I don't trust how you look at deer numbers. I invite you to take me along and show me evidence of the overpopulation with actually walking through the woods instead of looking at a computer screen. I will give the same invite at the park or in Bayfield County. In Bayfield I can show you section after section that carries no deer. Plenty of Wolf, Bear and Bobcats though. Perhaps you should employ the same predator strategy down here. It's done everything the Insurance and Timber companies wanted. The WDNR has destroyed the deer hunting tradition and many small businesses with the science. Computer models don't work. Bottomline a park is a park. I shouldn't have to go there and worry about seeing some slob trying to get an "easy" one. Are those little areas that are designated really going to do anything except anger the people that use the area the majority of the time?</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
568	<p>The Nonmotorized Recreation and Transportation Trails Council authorized these comments on proposed administrative code changes (PR-03-20) at its meeting on November 5, 2023. Section 18. The proposed language for the new NR 45.03 (21e) defining Special property use is overly broad. Of specific concern is the phrase "may be otherwise prohibited but authorized by permit". Any special use must be consistent in character with the designated use for a property. Motorized use of a use area or trail designated for nonmotorized recreation must not be shoehorned in as a special use. Past examples are proposed motorcycle events on equestrian trails and ATV events on trails designated for hiking and bicycling. These uses cause inconvenience to the designated users and may cause damage which must be repaired before normal use can be resumed. Section 48 - 50. The language of these sections is confusing and appears to be contradictory. It needs to be clarified. Section 48 states in NR 45.04 (a) that all special uses require prior written approval except for those cases listed in NR 45.04 (c). Section 49 in NR 45.04 (am) lays out the process for obtaining the required written approval. It calls for an application to be submitted 30 days prior to the proposed use. Section 50 in NR 45.04 (b) calls for a request for a special event to be submitted 90 days in advance. There is no rationale provided why a special event requires 90 day approval and all other special uses require only 30 days. This is confusing. The process should be consistent. Section 56. NRTTC believes that NR 45.05 (3) (em) should include Class 2 electric bicycles. Class 2 bicycles are growing in popularity rapidly. Experience has shown council members that they pose no more threat to safety than Class 1 or Class 3. They are valuable to older people and those with disabilities who want to cycle, but find pedaling difficult. The key factor in safety is the speed limit of 15 miles per hour and enforcement of that limit. Section 63. Department staff requested consideration of language of NR 45.05 (3) (fm) as the department received a comment suggesting language designed to reduce glare to oncoming riders. Council members believe this would be unworkable. The different heights of lights on various bicycles, such as a standard bicycle versus a recumbent would make occasional glare unavoidable. The proposed language is appropriate.</p>	<p>These comments have been reviewed, entered into the record, and will be taken into account in department policies related to special property use. At this time, any person with a mobility impairment can use a Class 2 ebike, or other device, on DNR lands, via a mobility device permit. For more information, please see: <a href="https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/OpenOutdoors/PDMD">https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/OpenOutdoors/PDMD</a>.</p>
569	<p>I have been in parks where bow hunting is allowed and it changes the experience entirely. The whole reason parks exist is to offer a feeling of calm and peace, appreciation of nature, and contemplation. Hunting of any kind ruins that. I do not trust hunters to be careful and follow the rules. The consequences would be unnecessarily disastrous for some innocent bystander. Why risk death or injury to someone or their pet when other options exist? I implore you to consider the solution offered in the Waukesha Freeman: "He said that Lapham Peak has conservation wardens, and it would be safer for the wardens to cull the herd during the park's closed hours. Additionally, it would be easy for the wardens to dispose of deer in a non-wasteful and clean way, and he worries about hunters leaving remains near trails."</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
570	<p>My wife and I have lived in Mazomanie, WI for over 20 years. We own a restaurant in the Village for over 15 years. We have supported the Naturists who attended the "Mazo Beach" in years past. Since the demise of "The Beach", we, along with many other businesses in our area, suffered a significant loss of business. The attendees of "The Beach" were respectful and welcomed in our establishment and community. They were self policing to prevent any form of hedonism or debauchery, only wanting a miniscule portion of the Wisconsin River to enjoy the beautiful wilderness "au Naturele" and be left alone. On the other hand, I feel "The Nude Bike Ride" in downtown Madison during the Farmers Market was</p>	<p>The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.</p>

	obscene and should be prevented with rules as proposed. What's the difference, expectation of privacy! An obscure and extremely remote area of wilderness is not the same as Capital Square. Therefore, we oppose the overly broad scope of these rules and request these rules be more narrowly defined.	
571	I'm completely all for the hunting.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
572	I have had the good fortune of living next to Lake Kegonsa State Park for the past seventeen years and pay visits to it nearly every day, weather permitting. I am familiar with all areas within the park's boundaries and those surrounding the park. I recognize many of the regular park users and we often share our observations of park activity among us. I can tell you that most park users, hunters and hikers alike, were outraged when the park opened its doors to hunting and trapping. Most of us gravitated to the park to forget about life for a while and immerse ourselves in the peaceful surroundings of nature. That experience has now been ripped away from us, even during the off season of hunting and trapping. Now when we see a doe and her fawns or a turkey leading its brood, we no longer experience the joy we once did, knowing that soon to come their presence will be replaced by blood-soaked pavement by the kill site, a few gut piles here and there, and trails of blood along ski trails. It is just not the same. Some deer were seen hobbling around during the open season. I had never seen deer in that type of physical state within the park prior to the allowance of park hunting. Hunters also ended up in the areas closed to hunting searching for their deer, because of what they termed, "a bad hit." One hunter even pulled out a knife in front of me in the area closed to hunting where I was hiking to slit the throat of a deer slightly larger than my dog, and which was lying on the ground about to die on its own. I have heard mention that over browsing by deer is a key reason used to justify hunting in state parks. Now that hunting has been allowed at Lake Kegonsa State Park and many other state parks for about ten years, please send me the data which tracked specific patterns of over browsed vegetation within that time frame. Is the park achieving its objective? Also, how is the consumption of vegetation by rabbits differentiated by that of deer? Is your data isolating for vegetation planted by park staff within that time frame? Mixing hunting with other recreational users is just not a good idea. Park staff already closed their office when I tried to report a few violations. The game warden was too far away to make it to the park in time to issue warning or citations. The game warden did spend more time in the park for a while after I shared what I witnessed, yet I feel lack of staffing in parks that have mixed use definitely warrants adequate staffing, which does not seem feasible with current DNR funds available. Hunting in state parks, depending on the size and layout of areas open to hunting, is not the same type of scenario as hunting on private or public land that is away from other kinds of users of that land. Please give serious consideration to my shared thoughts, which were the same as many other park users at Lake Kegonsa State Park and reject the proposal to open Lapham Peak State Park to hunting and trapping. Please confirm that you received this email.	Your email has been received and read and entered into the record as public comment. Thank you for taking the time to provide your comments. The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
573	Our home abuts Lapham Peak. We have lived here for 28 years. We are in the park AT LEAST once a day. You are taking a very public, very safe place for people and their pets and for four months you are turning it into a place where you have to worry for your pets - who are the size of turkeys - and yourself. I have nine grandchildren who run and play not only on the trails, but we play hide and seek in the woods, we have treasure chest hunts in the woods, and we walk and play in the woods. I wonder if you understand the mentality of a lot of hunters and the safety regulations and rules that are broken once they get on public land. Plus the thought of walking through a public place with someone hiding in the trees or on the ground in wait to kill something. Seriously, I have to ask you, what are you thinking? On a regular basis we have people's pets as well as people wander into our yard - as does everyone who's properties abut the Park. Are these hunters allowed to come on to my property to track their turkey or deer? Are these hunters allowed to point their arrow in the the direction of my home, my children, my grandchildren and my pets? I can't believe that 'FRIENDS OF LAPHAM PEAK' are betraying the safety that the public has enjoyed since the beginning of the park. I just barely found out about this and I am stunned that this is what you came up with. I could not be more angry or more disappointed in your decision to turn our park into a dangerous situation for people and their pets. I seriously don't understand what you are thinking. I wonder if any of you really understand exactly what happens when hunters shoot and miss, think they see or hear movement and shoot at anything, and how they could carry a weapon on to someone's private land as they track their kill, or if they are following the rules, leave their weapon alone in the park. What are you thinking??? By the way, my husband is an avid hunter who follows all rules and regulations - bow and gun - so we see and hear the stupidity of so many hunters who do not care about rules and regulations. Shame on you. I buy a park pass, a horse pass, and a bike pass every year. We come to every event. WE are truly friends of Lapham Peak...Are you??? I am begging you to reconsider - PLEASE - for the safety of every human that walks or rides into our park and their pets.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

574	I am writing to encourage you NOT to allow hunting of any kind at Lapham Peak. As an avid hiker, I find myself with ever fewer places where I can hike in the fall and winter, and I have come to count on being able to hike at Lapham without coming upon someone who is armed. Despite all good intentions, accidents do happen--even with the best trained and most careful hunters. Having a hunt-free zone at Lapham eliminates this possibility.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
575	I oppose due to safety concerns—donated for years to snow making efforts. Increased traffic as ski destination not compatible to hunting.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
576	Why???? You want to take over all the Equestrians safe riding. Can you remember the horse that got hit by a loose arrow at Southern Kettle. What if it would have been a person. There is enough land to hunt on . No i would not like to see that hunting in the designated area you are planning.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
577	The Lapham peak unit is a smaller trail with usage by many different groups - bikers, hikers, horses and dog walkers. Because of the varied population using this trail, and its location closer to populated areas, these groups are less experienced with hunters than the larger trails in the southern kettle area. Additionally, when the hunters are on the larger trails, Lapham Peak is where I & others from the horse community go for a safer ride with our horses - especially during gun hunting. We are not interrupting hunters and they are not being bothered by our presence as we scare away the deer and flush out the turkeys. Less than 10 miles from the Lapham Park location is the greater southern kettle moraine forest- let the hunters stay there, please. Thank you for your consideration and have a fine day-	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
578	I am an avid outdoorsman — hunting, fishing, XC skiing, mountain biking, and trail running to name a few hobbies. I have lived in Waukesha County for 22 years, enjoy Lapham Peak almost daily, and feel WDNR is doing everything right the way it's set up now. Based on the sheer volume of visitors to Lapham Peak, I can't imagine a scenario where hunting deer within the park is a good fit. Perhaps local adjacent land owners could allow hunting of the Lapham Peak deer herds to help cull? Or, as suggested, allow for some sort of organized after hours hunting to cull the herd? As both someone who enjoys Lapham Peak, and a bow and gun deer hunter, I definitely sense the supermajority of visitors to Lapham Peak visit because it provides both solitude and safety ...and knowing someone might be close by with a weapon changes that dramatically for visitors. I appreciate the opportunity to provide this feedback.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
579	I am writing to add my concerns about opening Lapham Peak to bow hunting. As a parent who regularly purchases a yearly park sticker, I would not feel comfortable bringing my children and our dog to hike at Lapham Peak if hunting was allowed anywhere on the premises. Allowing hunting anywhere in the park allows the risk of injury or death for people trying to enjoy the beauty of the State Park. Lapham Peak has been an important place for our family. My husband and I got engaged on a hike there. My daughter's first hike was there. We go hiking regularly as a family and enjoy the park. We should be able to enjoy it without concern of being in the crossfire of hunters. There are plenty of places where hunters can legally go to hunt. There are very few places where hikers can go to safely hike during hunting season. Please don't take away another safe haven where we can enjoy the beauty of nature while also caring for our own bodies, minds and souls. Please keep Lapham Peak a hunting prohibited area.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
580	I live near the Southern Kettle Moraine State Forest and use many of the trails often both horseback riding and hiking with my dogs. While I understand that hunting is a necessary tool for managing wildlife populations and have no problem sharing with all responsible users, I feel that it is crucial to have an area free of hunters year round. I do agree that Lapham Peak's deer population should be managed and would support conservation warden "sniper" culling after park hours. So, "no" to bow hunting, and "yes" to warden culling.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
581	I am writing to oppose the proposed hunting in Lapham Peak State Park, NRB order number PR-03-02, section 140, NR 45.13 ( 18), as it has been presented. I would encourage you to develop a new plan which doesn't endanger visitors to the park, cross bow usage seems problematic, and which doesn't involve months of interrupted Park usage. If deer herd management is one of the desired goals, then design a plan that will accomplish that result as quickly and safely as possible. I know there are other park properties that are in somewhat similar settings that are able to accomplish herd management, as a resident of St. Croix Cty., Willow River State Park comes to mind. Thank you for your time and the	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.



	opportunity for me to share my concerns.	
582	I butt right up to the north side of lapham, on county road C. If there's an opportunity that land is being considered open for hunting would be considered to be sold I would be very interested.. I would like to clarify our offer to purchase if you would be willing to sell would be from our property from our southern property line (South) towards lapham and the (East) property line of our property . We would be interested to purchase. I'm completely all for the hunting.	Your comment has been entered into the record. There is no opportunity currently to purchase land that is park of Lapham Peak State Forest but we appreciate your offer. The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
583	Administrative Code, especially chapter NR45. The Wisconsin Climbers Association (WCA) was formed over two decades ago to serve as a voice for Wisconsin climbers. Our mission is to promote stewardship of climbing areas, address access issues, and foster connections within the climbing community. We work in the areas of stewardship, advocacy, and community, on behalf of our 200+ members and the hundreds of thousands of climbers in Wisconsin and who come to Wisconsin for outdoor rock climbing. Most climbing occurs on public land, and in Wisconsin the largest single land manager overseeing rock climbing sites is the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. We appreciate that Wisconsin Statutes and Administrative Code have long recognized rock climbing as a traditional outdoor activity, on par with hunting, hiking, and fishing. To take better care of our climbing resources, the WCA has for decades sought to engage the DNR, mainly seeking to work with individual property managers. The climbing community is known nationally for its commitment to conservation. With a few notable exceptions, this effort has been frustrated by two major obstacles. Most land managers tell us they are unwilling to address climbing area management unless climbing is explicitly mentioned in their property's management plan. And at some point the Department decided that climbing is incompatible with conservation in State Natural Areas.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
584	SECTION 78. Each range should be evaluated on its own. To have a blanket rule for all ranges is overly restrictive. For example, the Boulder Junction Shooting Range has miles of public lands, devoid of housing, downrange. There is no reason for prohibiting armor piercing or .50 BMG ammunition. The DNR has no role in maintaining the backstops so why should they care if the range allows this ammunition? Additionally, there is no way for the DNR to enforce the use of armor piercing ammunition. SECTION 79. I fully support the military use of public ranges. Why should they and LEO's be required to contact the DNR before using these ranges? Does anyone really expect the DNR to come out and supervise the use by anyone desiring to use them? SECTION 78 prohibits the use of firearms other than handguns at handgun ranges, prohibits shooting from anywhere other than designated position or firing line, and prohibits armor piercing, tracer, incendiary, and .50 BMG ammunition in order to extend the service of range backstops and reduce closures for maintenance. SECTION 79 expands an exception from shooting range regulations so that military training can be conducted but both military and law enforcement users will need to arrange with the department before using these ranges.	The intent with the rule language is to provide consistent regulations that can be applied at all the state-owned ranges for the safety of range users and protection of range infrastructure, while continuing to provide shooting opportunities. Consistent regulations prevent confusion among shooters that may visit multiple state-owned ranges, and assume that the same rules apply at all ranges. Inconsistent regulations may result in the unintentional breaking of rules and require additional staff time to explain and follow-up with our customers. Infrastructure (backstop) protection is a consideration for all ranges owned by the state and restricting the use of large caliber rounds helps maintain the longevity of that infrastructure.
585	I am opposed to opening up turkey and deer hunting in the Lapham Peak Unit. I live in the City of Delafield and the city has an aggressive program of eliminating deer. The Lapham Unit is a much needed sanctuary for wildlife. I also know how heavily it is used by the public for hiking/walking. It is a better use of the land than allowing hunters on it.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
586	I strongly am for hunting in the park, as an avid 20yr plus bow hunter and lover of whitetail deer I truly understand the importance of maintaining a herd. Running highway cat 5am to get to I94 for work every morning is a gauntlet to say the least. I would love the opportunity to be able to harvest an animal so close to my home and would be willing to pay for such opportunity if need be.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

587	<p>I'm reaching out to share my concern with bow hunting being allowed at Lapham Peak State Park. I visit the park 1-2 times a week, I hike the black loop most often and walk the prairie paths occasionally. I'm specifically concerned with allowing this at Lapham Peak because it is a high traffic park and it has been developed with many hiking and skiing paths throughout the property. I reviewed the proposed map and see many areas where hunting would be allowed where these paths exist. A few of my questions and suggestions are below, I'm not expecting a reply but hope these are considered and discussed as a decision is reached. Are there other options for the deer population to be controlled? Going from no hunting to bow hunting open to the public for nearly a third of the year (including fall peak and skiing season) is a very significant change. I understand the map is showing all areas that could possibly be opened. Could the allowed area be only west of Hwy C, in the area of the park that has lower traffic? This would also be easier for the public to keep track of, "This side allows hunting, this side doesn't." How would the DNR communicate this significant change and ensure that visitors are aware that hunting would be allowed and advise on appropriate safety precautions?</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
588	<p>I am writing to express my absolute disappointment in the DNR for proposing the offensive intrusion into the Lapham Peak State Park system to allow bow hunting of deer and turkey. The proposed pieces of land not only include areas frequented by tens of thousands of visitors monthly, but it would also be next to impossible for even the most ethical bow hunter to stay within all these boundaries. This park has been a longstanding peaceful haven for residents, visitors and wildlife alike, so this proposal is irresponsible and capitalistic. Please do NOT go forward with this proposal!</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
589	<p>I approve of the draft plan to allow bow hunting at Lapham Peak. Careful planning and posting of the hunting areas are needed, but the overpopulation of deer greatly affects native vegetation and wildlife and is a needed step to restore a balanced ecosystem.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
590	<p>I have a few comments, questions and proposed changes, specifically the topic of "General Public Land Use:". I significantly understand the challenges when it comes to establishing rules and laws to be put in place that apply to all individuals who used public lands, everyone has the privilege public lands. My family and I spend a significant amount of time on public lands primarily state parks and county land. We as in my sons and daughter do a lot of hiking, hunting, fishing, trapping, and foraging. One thing I don't understand is why State Park hunting is only opened from November 15th through the December 15th. There are several hunts outside of the regular deer gun season such as the youth hunt, the antlerless only holiday hunt, and late archery season where State Parks are closed. Despite the fact state parks such as Willow river and Kinnikinnic river are farm zone units and the metro unit which has a significant number of hunting licenses issued/available due to the DNR stating an overabundance of white tails in those locations. So depending on when the season starts he recently only get a few days to archery hunt within a State Park prior to firearm season opening. There's only a 30 day period to be able to hunt and trapped within a State Park. So, my proposed change is that you increase the amount of time (days) hunting and trapping is allowed in state parks especially the ones who are in farmland and metro units. By allowing this change you would be able to give more people more time to use the public lands thus one would think you would reduce hunting pressure in those areas during a shorter period of time. This would definitely equate to reducing potential problems with too many hunters other park attendance in one space/area of the park. If the purpose of the WI state park system is to "provide areas for public recreation and for public education in conservation and nature study" (State parks, Wis. Stat. § 27.01) why is there such a small amount of time within a year where hunting and trapping are allowed, but for example in Willow River State park the mountain biking trails are open 335 days out of 365 within a year. Hiking and walking trails are never closed throughout the year for any reason except a safety issue or trail repair. They're just clearly seems to be an unproportional amount of time given to hunting and trapping within public lands specifically state parks despite the fact the hunting seasons are well before and well after the standard November 15th through the December 15th rules. Another issues I have seen is some areas that are closed to hunting within a State Park just do not make sense. I understand areas where people do a significant amount of hiking and walking should be allowed to use those areas safely during hunting seasons. An example, Willow river state park has areas where there is no hiking trails where there's a limited amount of foot traffic on the South end of the property where no hunting is allowed it makes no sense it would a perfect area to take child hunt for the first time, you can see a long distance, boundaries are well marked and easy to walk into the area. My question is who/how determines what areas are open to hunting and what areas are not within the state parks? What are the characteristics that allow an area to be open to hunting within a State Park and what characteristics disqualifying area where hunting is not allowed? I'm making a specific proposal for Willow River State Park to open up some areas that are currently deemed closed to hunting and trapping specifically the closed area on the South end of the park property just east of the area that is open to hunting. More specifically the area near white tail trail and trout brook trail. There is a vast amount of land between those points which there is no reason as I can see from a safety perspective should not</p>	<p>Prior to 2012, Wisconsin state parks were closed to hunting by default. Some areas of specific state parks were open to hunting, by those were an exception. In 2012, legislation was enacted that "flipped" the presumption of state parks being closed to hunting to instead having the presumption be that all parks were open, everywhere, for all seasons, unless the DNR's Natural Resources Board closed the property, or an area of the property, to hunting. This process resulted in what we still have today, a curtailed season at most state parks. It was a compromise, determined to be the only way that some widespread hunting could take place at state parks across the state. The areas that are closed in state parks entirely to hunting can fall into a few different categories: places where DNR does not have the ability to allow public hunting (for example where the former landowner put a deed restriction on the property), picnic areas and campgrounds, which are closed to hunting on DNR lands by law, places where it was determined to be a health or safety issue to allow hunting (certain trails fall into this category, likely including the ones at Willow River; often these closures are for 100 yards, similar to the statutory closure around most buildings), or a miscellaneous reason that may have been determined to be the most feasible implementation of the legislation for the property. The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

	be open to hunting and trapping within the State Park. Again by opening this land would just give more opportunities for those who want to haunt the park and thus reduce hunting congestion. Please let me know if you have any questions or concern, or need any further clarification.	
591	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
592	<p>Thank you for all the time and effort that has been put towards making Lapham Peak and all our park areas the wonderful spaces that they are. I can guess that a lot more time, effort, and thought goes into it than the general public must realize. As a lifelong resident of Delafield and then Dousman/Ottawa I wanted to write to state that I am very concerned about the decision to open Lapham Peak to bow hunting during the normal archery season. I can appreciate the mindfulness of excluding certain areas determined to be too close to neighborhoods, buildings, parking areas, etc. However, with Lapham Peak as busy of a park as it is, I do believe the described delineation of hunting/non-hunting areas is insufficient means of protecting others in the park. Plenty of hunters are incredibly diligent and cautious of such boundaries, but plenty of hunters are not. I do not believe this is a risk worth taking and have heard many who share the same opinion. Additionally, those boundaries are all over the place with bits carved out here and there. It is very realistic that a hunter may not realize they have ventured into or through the no hunting area. Likewise, I could see myself as a hiker not realizing I had ventured into the hunting area. Carving out a bunch of areas here and there to make the proposal safe does not seem realistic. As an avid hiker and master naturalist volunteer, I utilize as many of the trails in our area as I can. As a hiker with a dog, I am severely limited as to which trails I can utilize (before having a drive that is long enough to make it not reasonable to do on a daily or nearly daily basis. There are miles and miles of ice age trail that are wonderful, but come hunting season I no longer use them; it's just not worth the risk. I pretty much exclusively hike in Lapham Peak certain times of the year because it is much safer there for the non-hunting hiker. This change would be incredibly disappointing. I would no longer have a need for a state park pass. During non-hunting season I would hike on the ice age trail and other times of the year I would no longer be able to hike - at least not on a daily or nearly daily basis and with my dog (there are lots of alternative places around, like Retzer Nature center, but they, understandably, do not allow dogs). It would be a farther drive which means it couldn't happen daily. Of course I am but one person, but I know this to be true for many. While I would prefer no hunting at all, I always feel it is best to see an issue from both sides. As such, I do understand that overpopulation of deer is a concern - like it has been in the Delafield area in general. I might be more inclined to support a one or even two week harvest. The park could be made available to hunters that one week and post very large and clear signage in multiple locations. This is to let the non-hunting hikers know the situation and that they may return to the park, free of hunters, the following week. Of course, the above point of some hunters being very mindful/respectful and others less so does apply here as well. There certainly could be hunters that are not mindful of the date. But that seems a lot less confusing than the proposed map. Thank you for taking the time to read my thoughts. I can appreciate that a lot of work goes into finding a solution to this challenge, but I also feel the work is not done as this does not appear to be the appropriate solution. Please feel free to reach out to me for any clarification or follow up questions. Thank you for all you do.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
593	I would prefer a closed park and open gun season. Bow hunting is cruel. Sharp shooters with guns is more humane.	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will</p>

		pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
594	Deer herd reduction does need to happen at Lapham Peak. I am all for any solution that respects the deer and utilizes the meat they produced. So, this leads to basically 2 options: 1) Give hunters access to hunting Or 2) Have deer harvested by sharpshooters Either accomplishes the goal of herd reduction in an effective way. THEN You have to facilitate a safe way to provide for deer harvesting. Lapham Peak is a really busy park! The park would likely have to be temporarily closed to non-hunters for specific hours OR specific days, to facilitate safe conditions. Posted closing of a few days, for two weeks in a row, for this very specific reason, would likely be most efficient, most safe for all park users(, and will of course attract some protesters. That is to be expected). A strong DNR presence the first few years would be advised. I would also suggest hunters wear blaze orange to/from their deer stands, and wear their preferred camo once on stand. I lean toward allowing bow hunters to be offered this hunting opportunity. It could even be a "Learn to Hunt" DNR option. I haven't really thought that part through. It would provide one more accessible public hunting option. If successful, it could be incorporated into other state properties. Wounded deer that end up inside or outside of the park are a stronger possibility with archery in general. Surrounding landowner permissions to retrieve deer that die off park property would also need to be obtained.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
595	Please do not open the hunting season at Lapham Peak state park. Please compromise if you feel the need to cull and pick a specific week only. I love to visit that park in safety.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
596	I am commenting on NR45 in regards to snowmobile trails in the Northern Kettle Moraine State Forest and request that they remain unchanged. This great asset to snowmobiling has been in place since the 60's and has served the community in many ways including bringing in snowmobilers from other areas to the NKM State Forest and surrounding businesses. The trails are maintained and groomed for winter use by our snowmobile club as well as others. We work under a strict contract that has worked well as a partnership between the clubs and the NKM Stake Forest management.	Comment is noted and has been entered into the record.
597	Wisconsin State Parks have a general reputation as being dog unfriendly. Both MN and MI parks allow dogs in more areas and have more infrastructure, including swim areas for dogs. Our comments on NR 45 are bolded. We support NR 45.06 (1) (a) No person may allow that person's dog, cat or other pet, or a pet under that person's supervision, to unreasonably interfere with the enjoyment of the area by others. However, section b is very restrictive. These areas should be open unless posted (b) No person may allow a dog, cat, or other pet in any building, yurt, observation tower, area that has been designated as closed to pets in a property master plan, Paradise Springs area in the southern unit Kettle Moraine state forest, or on any swimming beach or on any Great Lakes shoreline zone that is not designated as a pet swimming beach, or in any picnic area, playground or fish hatchery ground, unless the area is posted as open to pets. Pets should be allowed off leash unless posted in state forests (c) Except as provided for in par. (d), dogs, cats, and other pets shall be kept on a physical leash not more than 8 feet long and under control at all times. Another very restrictive component is the following. Pets should be allowed unless posted closed to them (d) In areas where allowed in a property master plan and posted by department sign, during the times of year indicated on the department sign, pets may be off leash as long as they are under the verbal control of the person supervising the pet. We support this section, but it should include keeping pets off groomed mtn bike trails. SECTION 67. NR 45.06 (3) is amended to read: NR 45.06 (3) No person may allow their dog, cat or other animal on any cross-country ski trails during that period of the year when such trails are used groomed or being prepared for grooming for cross-country skiing. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. Including the above changes will help provides a more pet friendly environment on Wisconsin lands.	Thanks for the (additional) comments. Just to clarify, right now, pets aren't allowed in all of the listed places and many more. The proposed language is a compromise to begin to open up more places to pets, and to allow still more to be potentially opened up (usually via master plans). The viability of posting everywhere that pets aren't allowed is not workable on a statewide basis, so in order to open up more places to allow pets (for example, in administrative rule right now, NO picnic areas or beaches can allow pets), this is the proposal. It is a fundamental shift away from a presumption of pets not being allowed in most places to pets being allowed, with exceptions. You might be interested to know that we are doing the research to consider what you're proposing (possibly close groomed MTB trails to foot and pets), but I want to do that carefully, and only after we have a good handle on the status of all of our groomed MTB trails and know how such a proposal might impact each groomed MTB trail, and also be able to talk to the volunteers doing the grooming and otherwise supporting those trails (nationally, prohibiting pets on groomed MTB trails is much less common than XC trails, even after it has been considered, and I want to make sure I understand why (lots of people like biking with their pets, pet footprints may be less impactful on MTB than XC trails, etc.) before officially proposing anything. Also, for example, we still have quite a few places where groomed MTB trails are also officially posted as snowshoe trails (remember that used to be the case at Greenbush?)

598	Hello. I am a resident on Abitz Road just along the outskirts of Lapham Peak Fields. We walk and run through the fields and surrounding areas every day with our Lab. Opening up the area in Lapham seems like a great idea - but I am wondering if you will be providing bright orange vests for the walkers. I am not sure I trust someone who has not been approved and vetted as an honorable hunter to hunt in the forests that SO many People use on a daily basis. Like I said above, It may seem like a good idea but I am not 100% on this venture. The deer population is getting larger and there does need to be something to help the herd. I just don't think that four months of hunting without providing some safety for the people who do not know there will be hunters stationed throughout the park when they come to visit is going to keep Lapham as a park with growing income.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
599	While I agree that deer are a problem in our area of Wisconsin, I do not agree that opening Lapham Peak State Park for bow hunting during the entire season (Sept-Jan) and in the random areas designated which would require hunters to hike to the far corners of the park is a solution. Lapham Peak has significant numbers of people who utilize the park in the fall to winter months and if they are to hike or ski the entire trail they would need to go thru these areas to make a complete loop. This would affect a large group (40,000 visitors each month or more) of people over a long period of time. Seems like there might be a better way to cull the herd.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
600	I wish to make a comment about the proposal covered under NRB Order Number PR-03-20, Section 140, NR 45.13 (18). Lapham Peak Park, and specifically the areas designated for possible hunting per your draft map, are areas that are heavily used by bike and horseback riding enthusiasts. This is the only area in the entire Kettle Moraine Forest, north and south units, that has been designated as a "no hunting" zone. It is the only WI State Park where bike riders, horseback riders, dog walkers and hikers can feel safe from being accidentally shot by both arrow and bullet during the hunting season. I see no practical reason to make any changes now. There are thousands of acres available to hunters with in the Kettle Moraine units to enjoy their sport. You may reason that this is a silent sport with little chance for anyone, or any animal to get hurt. I would like to point out that arrows do not always reach their mark. The arrow may not make a good hit and fall out of the animal struck. The arrow head blades are incredibly sharp which is why they can kill an animal. These same blades, if unintentionally left behind or are lost, can pierce the paw of a dog, cause major or permanent damage to a horse's hoof (the underside of the hoof is made up of soft tissue), or possibly impale a hiker's foot through their shoe while on a walk. For these reasons, I am asking you to remove proposal PR-03-20, Section 140 from your final approved plan.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
601	I am a very frequent user of Lapham Peak State Park. I make use of the park for biking, skiing, hiking as well as other park sponsored events like Fright Hike, Lapham Loppett ect. I check the park attendance numbers every month and know that the average monthly visits are around 35000....65000 in October 2023.....I feel that with these types of numbers that it just does not make sense to initiate bowhunting within the park boundaries. Just way too many people wandering around the park to make bowhunting feasible. I feel that a different approach would be a better way to lower the deer population such as having the rangers take down the herd numbers during off hours. I think the old adage that if it's not broken don't change it	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
602	I'm not sure if my comments pertain as I missed the zoom meeting on Dec 5th. I don't like to see meetings that pertain to hunting and fishing held during hunting hours. I myself was muzzleloader hunting at the time of the meeting in an area with poor cell service. My comment is about leaving stands, blinds, and cameras on state owned as well as state managed lands. I've had some bad experiences with both hunters and law enforcement officers on dealing with me carrying in my stand and finding ladder stands attached to trees that I had scouted out to hunt just days before. The rules are clearly posted on the property and on the DNR website that all stands and blinds are to be removed at the end of the day. The properties that I'm specifically referring to are VPA lands. The warden initially agreed that the stands were placed and left illegally and removed them only to have to put them back and try to find the owners by orders from his supervisor. I can't understand why we have to deal with this on public land. I'm 68 years old and have been taking my stand in and out ever since it's been legal to hunt from an elevated platform. There's enough issues to deal with on county and federal land so please keep state managed lands out of the drama. People always try to claim an area whenever they're allowed to bait, leave a stand overnight, or place cameras for extended periods. If you need any clarification feel free to contact me, I would love to talk more about it. I'm attaching a picture of the sign posted on a VPA parcel that is complete opposition to the warden's supervisor that was updated 5/3/22 which is after I dealt with the situation. By the way, at least one of the stands are still there. I'm annoyed and frustrated!! Response on 12/11: Thank you for the clarification.	Response from Brigit on 12/10: Hello and thank you for taking the time to write. This administrative rule package does not directly propose rules related to the VPA program or the related topics, but I am copying our VPA program managers and wildlife rules manager on this email. They may be able to provide helpful information related to your comments. Response from Anne Reis on 12/11/23: Thanks for reaching out to the DNR about your concern. Are you a VPA landowner or VPA user? Ethan Graves is our VPA-HIP/THAP Coordinator (I'm copying him here). The DNR has very limited rights on VPA lands and we have to be careful about removing nuisance property. We can have staff flyer the stand with a warning or reach out to the individual (if there is a name/address tag) and let them know stands are not allowed on these lands. If after 2 weeks we don't have a response, then VPA staff can move the stand to a driveway or area near where local law enforcement can pick up the nuisance property. We can only do this on behalf and with permission of the landowner. Please remember that some VPA landowners also hunt their own property and the landowner maintains full rights to erect stands and/or allow friends or family to erect stands. Ethan will follow-up with you via phone to talk more about your particular situation.

603	I write this as both an avid cross country skier, and a bowhunter who has used the public stands maintained by Delafield. The deer population is out of control, and with no predators other than the automobile something has to be done, and I do think limited bow hunting should be allowed in the park. What should NOT be allowed however is hunting near the ski trails, or especially the man-made loop. This is frequently the only place to ski in SE Wisconsin, and although it is illegal to walk on a groomed ski trail, it frequently occurs anyway. Second, this would potentially endanger skiers, or impact the experience. There is no shortage of hunting areas in the state, but there is a severe shortage of groomed ski trails, and manmade snow. I would urge you to please not impact our ski trails to allow hunting on them. This can and should be done elsewhere.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
604	I am not in favor of allowing hunting at Lapham Peak. I hike at Lapham Peak several times a week and specifically choose the park because no hunting is allowed. Lapham Peak is a very busy park and has many trails that intersect, thus making the possibility of a stray arrow or bullet coming in contact with a hiker a real possibility. If the deer need to be thinned at Lapham Peak, I suggest an alternative plan such as allowing a set number of hunters (maybe by invite only) to come in for a set number of days (maybe 3 days in the middle of the week), with the public being notified via media and large visible postings on site. There are other parks in the area open to hunting. I hike those parks with caution, noting when specific hunts are taking place, and making sure I wear blaze orange clothing items for safety. Lapham Peak is currently a park where I know I can hike safely any time of the year and not have to worry about my safety because of hunters. Please don't change that by opening the park up to hunting. Let's keep Lapham Peak hunt free!	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
605	I am a neighbor and very frequent visitor to Lapham Peak, primarily to go on walks with my dog. I live a few miles away in Town of Genesee (but have a Dousman mailing address) and go several times per week, in some cases every day. I walk on the various paths and trails with my dog. I am greatly concerned that introducing bow hunting to Lapham Peak will make this safe and tranquil environment not safe at all. I don't want to have to worry about getting hit by an arrow or my dog getting hit by an arrow. Lapham Peak is a very busy park and used for many hikes and walks throughout its entirety. It is also used by school groups and boy scouts and other groups. Lapham Peak is far too busy of a park to allow this hunting which will only bring danger to all within it. Please do not allow this bow hunting proposal to go through.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
606	I am not in favor of allowing hunting at Lapham Peak. I hike at Lapham Peak several times a week and specifically choose the park because no hunting is allowed. Lapham Peak is a very busy park and has many trails that intersect, thus making the possibility of a stray arrow or bullet coming in contact with a hiker a real possibility. If the deer need to be thinned at Lapham Peak, I suggest an alternative plan such as allowing a set number of hunters (maybe by invite only) to come in for a set number of days (maybe 3 days in the middle of the week), with the public being notified via media and large visible postings on site. There are other parks in the area open to hunting. I hike those parks with caution, noting when specific hunts are taking place, and making sure I wear blaze orange clothing items for safety. Lapham Peak is currently a park where I know I can hike safely any time of the year and not have to worry about my safety because of hunters. Please don't cha Our neighborhood learned this week that there may be a possibility of the DNR allowing bow and crossbow hunting within Lapham Peak State Park. For 22 years that we have lived with Lapham Peak park as my backyard, we were under the assumption that the state would respect the Hausman's deed restriction of having no hunting in the entire park, not just on the land they donated to the park. Our neighbor David Buckley reviewed the draft map of the potential hunting areas, areas with deed restrictions, areas of closure around campgrounds, the observation and communication towers, maintenance buildings, ranger residences and private lands. He questioned what the DNR is safely trying to accomplish? He also asked how is the DNR going to manage and keep hunters within boundaries meant to protect buildings, residences, deed restricted areas and places where park goers have had a safe haven for decades? He asked if the DNR have the staff to patrol what appears to be a patchwork of hunting areas overshadowed by a higher percentage patchwork of non hunting areas? Dave Buckley also said that given the number of visitors, the irregular areas proposed for hunting, the ongoing dawn to dusk management of keeping hunters within the boundaries and the potential risk of having an unfortunate hunting accident, in my view, hunting does not fit within Lapham Peak. The park has evolved over time beyond the new proposed use through the help of many hands to be much more than most State Parks and it would be best to leave well enough alone. If it works, don't fix it. You have a success story here. We do not want our Lapham Peak Road congested with cars of hunters. We do not give permission for hunters to cross our land to find their dying animal. We are very much opposed to this dangerous idea. If the deer and turkey population is out of control, why not close the park for a week and have a hunter slaughter-fest.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
607	I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed hunting in Lapham Peak State Park, NRB order number PR-03-02, section 140, NR 45.13 (18). I am a lifetime member of the Friends of Lapham Peak group, I volunteer in the beautiful butterfly garden within the park, and I hike with friends, family, and my beloved corgi in Lapham Peak several times per week. I am also a Wisconsin Master Naturalist and have a deep appreciation for the natural world around me. Bottom line: As a Lapham Peak State Park "super user" and silent sport enthusiast. I love Lapham Peak State Park because I feel safe there. It is a place I can go - without worry of conflict with hunters or fear of becoming a target or even having to encounter a wounded deer, gut piles, or other evidence of violence against the very wildlife I am there to enjoy as a paying visitor. I have been fortunate to be	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

	<p>raised in Lake Country, to have graduated from Kettle Moraine High School in 1999 and to move back to raise my family here. My connection to the park runs deep – with over 30 years of hiking with several generations of my family and spending holidays together hiking. I have always been incredibly grateful for having this jewel of a State Park so close with the safe year-round access Lapham Peak has provided – especially because ALL other, wooded public land where I can walk my dog is open to hunting from September to February. As an avid hiker, I am not comfortable gambling with my life, for almost half the year relying solely on the judgement and ethics of a stranger wielding a crossbow when using the Southern Kettle Moraine Trails, Ice Age Trail, and Waukesha County Parks. I strongly encourage you to keep Lapham Peak in the spirit that was intended (and as the vast majority of the park land was deeded to the state) with NO hunting or trapping allowed EVER. Here are the most obvious reasons you should NOT move forward with current proposal: The Friends of Lapham Peak State Park group oppose this proposed change that would allow hunting in the park. Really consider what that means – those who volunteer significantly to maintain the park and donate sizable amounts of money, DON'T WANT BOWHUNTING. This is a safety nightmare. Crossbows shoot on average 50-60 yards and can be carried by convicted felons creating even further safety concerns for Park visitors and Delafield residents surrounding the park. This creates conflict, confusion, and reason for concern for all other user groups. The random patchwork of land that the DNR is recommending being open to archery is not realistic for even the most ethical hunter to stay within. Hunters most certainly will be tracking and retrieving wounded animals all over the entire State Park and neighboring private properties. The areas suggested for hunting (Homestead Hollow, Tower, &amp; the Westside Prairie) are too close to incredibly popular hiking trails used by families and dog owners as well as cross-country ski trails during the busiest time of year. This goes against all logic for safety. The horse trails on the Prairie Path pose a particularly dangerous risk for trail riders. Just in 2020, a horse in the Southern Kettle Moraine State Forest was shot by a bowhunter while under saddle on the trail with a group of several riders. The DNR will need more staff. The small staff of the park, already stretched thin, currently would not be able to reasonably enforce or address the safety concerns of visitors. The DNR would need to add additional staff and additional Conservation Wardens to help respond to additional calls with questions, violation investigations, and trying to explain this puzzle of what is open and what is closed. (And the department already has enough issues trying to fill and retain Conservation Wardens – this change only makes enforcement MORE difficult.) Deer “over population” is an easy scapegoat – I have spent 30 years hiking in this park. If anything, I see fewer deer now than in the late 1990's! The amount of increased human activity and local community development has impacted the number of deer and how long they linger. I have never seen a sick or starved deer in the park and would welcome any data the DNR has to support this claim. If food is scarce, they will move on. Additionally, should a deer pass away by natural causes within the park, it is a food source for others in the ecosystem. I can assure you after this mast year of acorns, the deer herd is certainly not going to starve. If the DNR is worried about CWD, then deal with the deer farms in Waukesha County who have been the source of many CWD cases locally. If deer are a real problem, then work with the Friends group along with data to examine the need and find a more reasonable – ONE TIME solution. Legally questionable - The state will find itself with potential legal questions when a hunter has a “bad shot” and tracks and kills a deer or turkey on the “deed restricted portion” of the park. This is a direct violation of how the land was given to the state. In fact, by opening it as currently proposed, one could make a reasonable case to a judge - that in effect the entire park has been opened to hunting because very few hunters are able to bow hunt using the legally allowable archery methods and drop a deer without having to use the “deed restricted area” to track or retrieve an animal. Mixing hunting with other recreational users is just not a good idea at a park with this volume of people – 100,000+ per year. This recommendation for a FIVE-month season is wide open for “archery for all animals” for the entire archery season that runs from September to February. This far too long of a time that would impact the visitor experience for all recreational users for almost half the year. Especially after significant efforts and investments have been made to make Lapham Peak a winter destination for all Southern Wisconsin with the snowmaking and the future Lapham Lodge. There are weekends in winter when the park is over capacity – staff turn people away at the gate prior to entry. Thank you for your consideration, and I hope the WDNR reconsiders its position. Opening bowhunting in this park is beyond dangerous - it's reckless.</p>	
608	<p>I was very disappointed to learn about a proposed plan for deer hunting at the park. I have walked there for several years now and have always felt safe. That would come to an end. Have hunters in the park while people are skiing, hiking, and walking dogs is not a smart move. I would turn in my 2024 pass if that happens. I agree the deer population needs to be culled and having the conservation wardens do it, is the safest and clean way. There is also the school for boys property in Wales that the conservation wardens could use. No hobby hunters.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
609	<p>I am against the proposal adding bowhunting in Lapham Peak State Park from September to January. I see it as a danger to the public who use the trails for recreation during this period.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for</p>

		managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
610	We want to express our objection on the proposed bow hunting in Lapham Peak park. How are you going to protect the nearly 600,000 hikers, horseback riders, bikers, etc. that use the park yearly. Who will be responsible when someone is injured??? Please tell me that the people who sign off on this have some civil liability for damages occurred for any and all people who have suffered loss, either personal injury on our property, property damage or property value decreases for those who own land abutting the park such as we. We bought this property 22 years ago to have not only privacy, but because they DID NOT allow hunting in Lapham Peak Park. We do not want our Lapham Peak Road congested with cars of hunters. We do not give permission for hunters to cross our land to find their dying animal. We are very much opposed to this dangerous idea.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
611	I am a Waukesha County resident and horse owner. Lapham Peak is one of the extremely few bridle trails that are open to horse s during the fall that do not also have deer hunting. While bow hunting is less dangerous to equestrians than gun, we are all aware of the accident that resulted in the death of a horse in the Kettle Moraine State Forest -Southern Unit recently. In fact, the person who shot the horse (who's rider was wearing blaze orange) has still not been identified. Compound and cross bows are getting more and more powerful, and can be just as deadly as a gun. Public hunting lands allow hunters of any skill level, experience or common sense, which increases the risk level. I am strongly against allowing bow hunting in Lapham Peak Park, as this area is utilized by many hikers, dog walkers, bikers and equestrians. If this plan goes forward, I do ask that the DNR takes steps to keep more of the bridle trails open later in the year (as weather permits) instead of automatically closing them Nov 1st. This would allow riders to utilize the other trails without the danger of bow hunting. Thank you for your time and hard work keeping these properties running and beautiful! We appreciate it!	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
612	If hunting is necessary, the hunting public need be involved. Like many other parks that have been closed the deer population will go up and to only allow wardens to hunt or exterminate the deer is wrong. Like Nashotah Park hunting can be done safely bow or crossbow hunting only, 50% orange, during gun season. The wardens can help to enforce that part as 25% of the guys I saw only wore camo. Deer in the park always see people and not hunted by them so will be easier to hunt the 1st year. To keep the hunt time to a minimum and knock the population down quick I believe it to be necessary to use an earn a buck program 1doe earns your buck, then 2 more does if possible. Other hunters I talk to believe it to be wrong for the public not be allowed on a special hunt....please get this right! Willing to share my opinion Anthoy Heppe	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
613	I am in favor of bow hunting on KMSF-Lapham Peak property. The deer population is terribly high on this park and so.ething must be done. This large population threatens to be a source population for CWD and Lyme disease. Also, the negative impact this population has on native plant species is already evident by the growth of several invasive plant species; not just in this park, but on neighboring properties. Finally, there have been several car vs deer accidents on Hwy C leading to Lapham Peak. At the very least, I hope the Wisconsin DNR will open a restricted/limited hunt at Lapham Peak.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
614	I suggest removing Section 37 of the drafted rule updates. Not only does it fail to meet the law (whether law changes are made or not), but it also doesn't align with public opinion. Section 37 fails to meet the current laws: Statute 944.20(1)(b) requires a measure of "ind ecency" in order to be a crime. This language is NOT mirrored in the DNR proposed rule changes. The DNR is going too far in trying to ban something that is legal. Section 37 fails to meet the proposed laws: Assuming SB477, SB478, HB503, HB504 are signed into law, the DNR proposed rule changes still fail to meet the law. These proposed laws ban nudity in any form everywhere in the state. Nudity in changing areas, bathrooms, and showers, along with taking children to these places, will become a criminal offense, but the DNR has proposed exemptions for these things. The DNR would be allowing criminal behavior on state lands. Secondly, proposed NR45.04(3)(am)(2) calls out "any of the following areas not open to public view:". It's ambiguous, in that it could mean nudity is OK as long as the whole changing area building is hidden. Or does it imply the nudity within is "not open to public view"? Again, the proposed senate/assembly laws don't define what "public" means, but the jury instruction for the laws state "the conduct is observable by or in the presence of other persons". Inside these buildings is "public" per the proposed law. The DNR's use of the word "public" doesn't align with the proposed law. If the state-wide laws stick, and the DNR's exemptions stick, perhaps the future of nude recreation in the state is in the showers and changing facilities at all the parks. Hopefully other users don't mind. Section 37 fails to align with public opinion: The opinion of specific DNR individuals is clearly stated on the proposed updates. It just doesn't reflect the reality of the situation. The reality is that there are about 430 miles of sandbars and beaches for the general public to enjoy on the Wisconsin River, and the tiny slice (0.15 mile) that should be legally designated as clothing-optional draws about 70,000 visitors and contributes \$1-2 million to the local economy, including many out-of-state visitors. The problems of "crime" are misleading -- I did a crime analysis about 10 years ago (attached) and found that	The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.



	<p>the crime rate is far lower than neighboring Mazomanie and Mount Horeb. Problems stemming from such a popular beach have been basically non-existent. The reason the DNR calls Mazo Beach such a beautiful place is because the naturists have kept it that way. Driving away these good stewards is a mistake. The Naturist Education Foundation has commissioned public opinion polls for decades. The most recent data from 2021 is attached. Although the poll is nation-wide, Wisconsin itself is likely close to these same numbers. (West-coast states and Florida probably have higher numbers, and the bible belt states probably have lower numbers, putting Wisconsin in the middle.) The conclusions are: 75% of people believe that we should have the freedom to sunbathe in the nude, regardless of they participate themselves. (Which, 40% of the population has.) 74% believe there should be an area set aside for nude sunbathing and skinny-dipping, similar to other lands set aside for things like camping, dog parks, snowmobiling, horse riding, and hunting. Speaking for myself personally, I really miss Mazo Beach -- both the hike to the location and the beach itself. I live in Dodgeville, and have been frequenting Governor Dodge State Park recently. There's large areas of land designated for horse camping on the north side which is pretty unwelcoming to everyone without a horse. Hiking on the horse trails is unpleasant -- meeting horses, and dodging their poop. Most of the trails are dominated by horses. Same with the mountain biking trails and almost being run over. Hunting season, hikers risk getting shot. There's also two designated beaches on the lakes with fancy changing areas and bathrooms. A lot of money has gone into all these designated areas and uses. Would it really hurt "the public" to designate a small secluded piece of the 5,350 acres in Governor Dodge for clothing-optional sunbathing or skinny-dipping for the 74% of society who want it and the 40% of society that would use it? Would it really hurt to keep Mazo Beach clothing-optional? Compared with other users of public lands, naturists really aren't asking for much. The DNR should avoid following opinion and actually study the statistics -- low crime, better-kept natural land, increased tourist dollars, and what the public actually wants -- and plan accordingly. Please remove Section 37 from the proposed changes. It's causing far more problems than it solves. See attachments, "Doug Hickok"</p>	
615	<p>We oppose having any hunting including bow hunting in the Lapham Peak State Park. While our land does not attach directly to the park it is next to two family members whose land does share the park's lot line. We occasionally have people wandering on our properties now and having hunters in search of their prey will certainly lead to more trespassing.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
616	<p>I am writing to you and the DNR to voice my comments in opposition to the DNR proposal to permit bow hunting in the Lapham Peak Unit of the Kettle Moraine Forest (hereinafter referred to as Lapham Peak). In so doing, I am making these comments based upon the information I have received as a member of the public, Wisconsin State Park Sticker Holder, City of Delafield resident, Leader of the Friends of Bark River, and regular user of Lapham Peak. Like so many outdoor enthusiasts who enjoy hiking, biking, running, skiing and snowshoeing in and around Lapham Peak, I support public access to Lapham Peak, its beauty and natural setting, its many events and activities, the Friends of Lapham Peak, and the freedom to enjoy and capture the special moments it provides us as its visitors, all of whom are being protected without fear or anxiety under the bridle of safety Lapham Peak has created for our benefit. Unfortunately, this DNR proposal is inconsistent with the positive attributes Lapham Peak has given us as members of the public over the years of its existence without bow hunting. This extends to realizing our expectations as Sticker Holders in making our choice to visit Lapham Peak, pay for our Sticker, make a return trip, and recommend it to others. In essence, we have become volunteer promoters and stewards of Lapham Peak for the public to enjoy its uniqueness and natural gifts without the interference, restrictions, and confusion caused by bow hunting. Also, there is the corresponding economic benefit to the State by the increased number of stickers purchased to visit Lapham Peak without bow hunting. To further illustrate the problems with this DNR proposal and its potential negative outcome on the public access and enjoyment of Lapham Peak, I am setting forth below some, but not all, specific examples of these issues which have not been addressed in the proposal and upon which I am expressing my opposition to it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety Risk Bow hunting itself presents a safety risk to the public. Its location in Lapham Peak makes it exponentially more dangerous. Lapham Peak is the highest attended state park of its kind in Wisconsin. It is a relatively small area. One third of the area is prohibited for bow hunting by deed from the prior property owners, The remaining two thirds of the area not covered by such deeds would be the subject of this DNR proposal. The result is a disproportionate physical relationship between the heavily used human population and the deer in the smaller two thirds area, causing a greater risk to the visitors trying to enjoy Lapham Peak. One errant arrow striking one human or domestic animal is one too many. It is better park management to take steps to prevent such an incident from occurring rather than repairing the damage or injury after it occurs. The proposal fails to address the danger and safety issues created by allowing bow hunting in Lapham Peak. Obviously, such a danger has not been a problem for the many years of Lapham Peak use and operation without such a risk.</li> <li>2. No Time Restrictions The proposal has no time restrictions for bow hunting. The public has a right to know the time established for bow hunting in Lapham Peak and the reasonable opportunity to be heard on this issue.</li> <li>3. No Reasonable Locations The proposal does not provide reasonable locations for bow hunting to protect the public from harm. The public has a right</li> </ol>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

	<p>to know and a reasonable opportunity to be heard on this issue. 4, Unreasonable Period of Bow Hunting Activity The proposal covers a period of bow hunting permitted between September 16 and January 7, starting in 2024. What is the origin of this time period for bow hunting and how does it apply to Lapham Peak? . This represents approximately 3 plus months (over one quarter) out of the year. It also covers the prime times of the year for public access and enjoyment of the natural beauty, colors, and physical activity in Lapham Peak, to wit: the fall for hikers, runners, and bikers and the winter for skiers and snowshoers. The proposal fails to justify such an unreasonable period and length of time to permit bow hunting in Lapham Peak. Contrary to a primary purpose of Lapham Peak to make it available, accessible, and enjoyable to the public, it shifts its focus to primarily serving bow hunting in Lapham Peak. It also removes the uniqueness of Lapham Peak in providing openness, access, and enjoyment to the public during these prime times without dealing with the impact of bow hunting affecting their decision to visit Lapham Peak during this extended period. 5, Deterrent Effect The proposal fails to address the impact of bow hunting on the reputation of Lapham Peak as an open, engaging, beautiful setting, drawing many different visitors involved in many diverse activities at various levels of performances, It is extremely popular. Much of this popularity comes from its accessibility, availability, and use, including training for and participating in a variety of events and races without the interference, complication, and confusion of bow hunting. The introduction of bow hunting into the mix of Lapham Peak activities would significantly alter and decrease its reputation as a unique experience for all. It would not have the appeal it has enjoyed over the many years without the bow hunting distraction. As a result, with bow hunting under this proposal, it would be reasonable to expect a downturn in use and the unique Lapham Peak experience being enjoyed by its visitors today. 6. Anxiety The proposal would likely cause unnecessary anxiety to many of the visitors of Lapham Peak worrying about the bow hunting, including its location, times, and 3 plus months in use. From hikers, walkers with their dogs, runners, bikers, skiers, and snowshoers, they do not want to be concerned about bow hunting while they are in Lapham Peak. They want to relax, exercise, breathe fresh air, enjoy quiet time, socialize with others, train for fitness or an event, and just be calm and healthy without thinking about arrows being shot in the sky nearby. Eventually, they will lose that special relationship with Lapham Peak as a natural source of refuge, positive energy, and lifestyle. and look elsewhere for an alternative experience. 7. Precedent Lapham Peak has the highest attendance of visitors in similar settings in the State. Bow hunting has been prohibited by deed and DNR rules for decades. This fact is not just the result of a coincidence. It is a relationship shaped over many years by the public knowing, using, and appreciating the freedom of the Lapham Peak experience without bow hunting. As such, the public has the right to rely upon this unique setting without bow hunting in choosing to use Lapham Peak. The positive collaboration between the public and the DNR in the form of Lapham Peak is a relationship worth preserving, not undermining with bow hunting. Precedent has been established to continue its use as it exists today without bow hunting. The public has spoken by the high number of attendees, their varied interests, and the activities provided in Lapham Peak. Moreover, the Ice Age Trail runs through Lapham Peak, which brings more visitors, attention, and access to Lapham Peak. In fact, the Trail has just been designated as an official unit of the National Parks Service, drawing more attention to Lapham Peak. The timing is right for the DNR to promote the benefits of Lapham Peak as part of the National Parks System and a great setting to visit along the way. To introduce bow hunting into Lapham Peak at this time would be inconsistent with this recent Ice Age Trail designation as a national trail. Plus, we have the Friends of Lapham Peak, a volunteer group, protecting the best natural interests of Lapham Peak. Precedent and the public interest are working together in favor of the continuation of Lapham Peak without bow hunting. To do otherwise at this time would be a mistake which can be avoided by supporting the status quo. 8. Solutions The DNR needs to focus its attention on solutions to the deer population in Lapham Peak other than this proposal of unrestricted bow hunting in Lapham Peak. It should not abruptly change a successful park setting in the form of Lapham Peak. The proposal as it stands today is an overkill approach to the deer herd issue. It is contrary to the public interest and public service. A due diligence inquiry and vetting process into the issue as to whether there is a need to control the deer population in Lapham Peak would be a more reasoned and responsible initial approach than arbitrarily establishing bow hunting in Lapham Peak by this proposal. The character of Lapham Peak is at stake. It is too good to bypass with bow hunting under this proposal. It should be preserved, not soiled. Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments to you for your consideration. As fellow stewards of Lapham Peak, we need to cooperate with each other to protect Lapham Peak, its character, its history, and value to our state parks/forests community. To do so is clearly in the public interest. The proposal is not.</p>	
617	<p>I just became aware of dnr consideration of opening up Lapham peak state park to bow and arrow hunting during the season. (Is that mid September to January 7th?) I am opposed to this as it is one of a few parks that I can safely go to now during hunting season. If necessary to contain deer population, I suggest other options and/or a limited one or two week period (but not during deer gun hunting season around Thanksgiving) and warning to hikers and skiers of that time period. A four month time period is way too long for people who like to use the park safely.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

618	<p>I come from a family of hunters and fishermen. I personally fish, but don't hunt, but am not anti-hunting in any way. However, I feel allowing bow hunting at Lapham Peak during the whole deer bow season is not prudent. Lapham is one of the closest easy access State Parks, being right off I-94 near the very populated Milwaukee/Waukesha county areas. It is much more heavily used per acre than other well known state parks. The hunt season overlaps with the most heavily used fall hiking season. With the snow making equipment, it would also overlap with the early ski season. I wouldn't think of taking my grandkids there, if a hunt is going on, so scratch that park off my list with them, at least. The park is not that big when you look at acreage vs. usage. If something must be done, then I feel sharp shooters on a more limited designated well publicized weekdays would be a better answer, and actually yield better kill results. Bow hunting on more limited days (no Sundays -Tuesdays, for example) would be better than all week. However, bow hunters might actually not want to hunt when hikers are around making noise anyway, so it could be sort of a Catch-22 as well.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
619	<p>Please be it known that opening up the traditionally non- hunting zone called Lapham State Park to a hunting area is unsafe and unacceptable. Here is why: 1) Since its inception, locals and other attendees know this as a safe land for non consumptive sports, gathering and stargazing. There is no guarantee that all visitors would become aware that hunting was suddenly permitted. This brings into being a huge safety risk for humans and animals alike. 2) The friends of Lapham State Park, oppose hunting of any type in these lands. 3) allowing hunting at Lapham State Park, would be grossly disrespectful to the residence of that Region, by putting their safety, and lives at risk. 4) There is enough hunting permitted on on more than enough public land for the 10% of Wisconsinites who are hunters. 5) The DNR, or any other organization, government, or private, does not have the permission of the constituents of Wisconsin to change the land usage from non-hunting to hunting at Lapham Peak State Park. Taking over one more space for the use of the few defies all logic. Locals disapprove of any such change of land uses at Lapham Peak State Park.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
620	<p>The Friends of Lapham Peak State Park o..pose the rule change allowing hunting in this park. I studied the park map and was stunned to suggest the parcels of land where hunting would be allowed. I am a member of a deer hunting family and have experience being in the north woods during the deer season. My first thought was the scenario of wounded, deer racing away from sounds and sights into resident yards and other spaces where recreation is allowed. The hunting season, between September to February is winter sports time posing safety risks for these groups. I oppose this proposed hunting plan. Thank you, Brigit Brown, for taking into consideration my position.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
621	<p>I live in Delafield. My property abuts Lapham Peak where a proposed open hunting area is being considered. Myself and my husband are in favor of this. Thank you! We have lived here for 17 years and the deer have been a consistent problem. They are a daily nuisance and cause property damage. We sincerely appreciate your consideration and hope deer hunting by bow and crossbow will be allowed.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
622	<p>I am writing to oppose this bow hunting in Lapham Peak Park. I walk my dog daily through much of the park that would be deemed huntable for 4 months of the year and would feel very unsafe! My husband and sons run in the park daily - sometimes at dusk/dawn depending on the time of year and daylight savings. I feel that introducing this to this area would greatly de-value the use of the park and make it an unsafe place to be. There are many Children and Schools that use this park as well for field trips and learning. I feel this would be affected negatively too by being surrounded by hunters for the fall/winter months of the year. This is some of the most beautiful times to enjoy the park and all the trails it offers. All it takes is for 1 unskilled hunter to wrongfully use that bow or crossbow and hit a person or pet to start a huge lawsuit against the park/state. Who is responsible? Parking is also a concern as many times there is limited parking in many areas of the park and if you now have hunters there too taking up parking space, it is less for paying members to use. Will the Park be responsible for handing out Orange Vests to all of it's paying visitors and pets during this time? That is not a way to make sure you are not hit by an arrow, but it is suggested in the proposal that visitors wear them....yet not their responsibility if the park doesn't allow hunters currently. I would like to suggest that this proposal be changed, if to control the population of deer, allowing (some predetermined number of hunters) to be in the park for 1 week (M-F) to cut down on the amount of deer population, that could allow enough of a change instead of it being open the whole hunting season. Making something like that known to the public and area users of the park would be much less of an issue than what is currently being proposed. Thank you for listening to my concerns (I live across the street from the park where bow hunting is allowed, however we do not allow our kids or pets to be outside if my husband is hunting) Safety is Always more Important.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
623	<p>I think that hunting should be allowed. It's about time that somebody has common sense about this issue. Driving down Hwy C at dusk or night is dangerous. The park is no different than the forest to the south. There's all kind of people hiking over there and you rarely hear of any issues. The park has more issues with the skiers. The DNR caves in to their demands( you can't hike on the trails there in the winter). Give the hunters a chance. Thanks</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

624	<p>I'd like to preface this by saying I grew up in northern Wisconsin and come from a family of hunters, so I am not opposed to hunting in general, but that being said I am very opposed to hunting of any kind at Lapham Peak. Lapham Peak is the crown jewel of trailheads in this area, with the best and most varied system of trails in Lake Country. I've hiked all over the world, including the Rocky Mountains and Tuscany, and I think I am incredibly lucky to have a park like Lapham Peak just a few miles from my house. Other hikers I've talked to in other areas of the state plus in our neighboring states often know about Lapham Peak and have visited it for hiking or skiing. Allowing hunting in the park creates unnecessary risk and possible unpleasantness in what's an amazing park that's known as a destination for people from all over. Hunting is already allowed at many other parks and public lands in the area. Because of this, Lapham is considered the "safe" park by many hikers, dog walkers, etc, during the fall hunting seasons. Why can't us non-hunters have one safe haven? The length of the bow hunting season would encompass all the fall and early winter months, which includes the fall foliage and the first snow (plus early cross-country skiing season), meaning hunting would be taking place in the park during some of the best times to visit for non-hunting reasons. I've driven past other trail systems in the area that do allow hunting and it hasn't escaped my notice that hunters often park their cars on the road directly outside the entrance in order to avoid paying to enter the park, which I find infuriating. They are happy to use the land for hunting but can't be bothered to spring for a few bucks to pay to use it. It's not the hunters keeping the parks going by paying for the stickers, it seems, it's the non-hunters. I understand that at this point it's just bow hunting and only in certain areas, but we all understand how the slippery slope works. Let's keep Lapham Peak like it is -- peaceful and hunter-free.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
625	<p>Keep us safe while we enjoy this beautiful quiet natural resource please! There is no reason bow hunting is needed at Lapham Peak. There are so many alternatives for hunters, but during hunting seasons, there are limited choices where citizens feel safe to enjoy our outdoors and are inhibited from going to places near or where hunters hunt. Please keep this place safe for us. You will also lose money from a lack of visitors.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
626	<p>I object to the anti-nudity provision of Rule NR 45.04 section 37. This is a part of a greater package called "CR 23-060." I believe that simple nudity in appropriate places on DNR lands, that is not lewd and intended to offend, should be allowed. Please remove the anti nudity provision from the proposed rule.</p>	<p>The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.</p>
627	<p>Lapham Peak is one of the few places in Waukesha County we feel safe hiking at during the long hunting season. Plus, we don't have to wear blaze orange from head to toe to feel safe there, or listen to loud gunshots. More than 600,000 people, including many children, use Lapham Peak per year, and it would be very dangerous to add hunters to the mix. There are many, many places for hunters to hunt deer and turkey by gun and bow throughout Waukesha County. Please, I urge you, do not add hunting to Lapham Peak. It makes no sense when there are so many people hiking around the park, and it would be a recipe for disaster.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
628	<p>I'm one of the 50,000 average monthly recreational users of the Lapham Peak Unit of Kettle Moraine State Forest Southern Unit. Lapham Peak Unit is one of the busiest and most developed forest recreation areas in the state. Allowing hunting in the Unit is taking too much risk for the reward of herd management. Recreational use of the Unit would be highly impacted by allowing bow hunting there. The proposed hunting areas include busy sections of the Main trail especially near the NR11 exclusion areas for the DNR Maintenance Sheds and Summerstage Theater. The Main Trail up and over the Peak is also part of the hunting zones. The Ice Age Trail skirts much of the proposed hunting zone. These trails are normally groomed for cross country skiing in December and January. When groomed they are closed to hiking. Some hunting areas would be inaccessible due to ski trail grooming. Hunting use, like hiking, would damage the grooming and require staff to restore ski access or close sections of trails. Lapham Peak is very hilly and trails on hillsides are especially difficult to groom and maintain. Any Bow Hunting at Lapham Peak Unit should be LIMITED BY LOTTERY, LIMITED IN TIME, and NOT ALLOWED IN DECEMBER AND JANUARY.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
629	<p>Hello: I understand that you're taking comments on the deer population control. I am very concerned about the large deer herd at Lapham State Park. It is very nice to see all the deer, but I realize that the deer are susceptible to cruel starvation if a tough winter comes along. I retired from the City of Brookfield Police Department a few years ago. I had direct contact with the deer sharpshooters. They are discreet, polite and quiet. My recommendation would be a combination deer herd reduction effort. 1) I would recommend a short bow hunting season on Tues, Weds and Thurs. 2) After the bow hunters are done, cull down to the desired deer herd number using the sharpshooters. My wife and I love Lapham. Take care.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
630	<p>I'm all for it. Good idea.</p>	<p>(This comment was submitted with an email string indicating the comment was about the proposal for bow hunting at Lapham Peak.) The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during</p>

		the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
631	<p>I have reviewed the proposed changes stated in the document PR-03-20, Section 140, NR 45.13 (18) found on page 68 of the online version of the document. I write to state my opposition to any changes to the existing ordinance that would permit hunting at Lapham Peak State Park. My rationale for this opposition is as follows: Legal Concerns (1) Possible violation of zoning protocol. To allow hunting adjacent to moderate density residential areas usually requires direct contact, or at least some form of reasonable public notification, to the residents affected by such proposed zoning changes. To the best of my knowledge, residents affected by the proposed allowance of hunting at Lapham Peak State Park (e.g. those with properties adjacent to Lapham Peak State Park) were not contacted by the WI DNR concerning this proposed zoning change. (2) Vague language. As of now, the proposed language allows too much latitude for interpretation. Cf. "The department may designate areas where hunting deer and turkeys with archery equipment, but not with firearms or airguns, is allowed." The criteria for the department designating the areas for hunting is not elaborated. E.g. there are no guidelines or rationale given and thus, this leaves an uncertainty or openness of interpretation of why the hunting areas are needed. Also, the designated areas are not specified. Pragmatic Concerns (3) Safety violations. Lapham Peak has a truly incredible visitation rate of 600K people per year. With more than half a million people visiting the park, and with hunting boundaries adjacent the most popular hiking and skiing trails, someone will be hurt or killed. It will take just one incident to overturn this hunting proposal. (4) Trespassing violations. It is known that bow and crossbow hunting usually does not drop a deer right away. Deer that are struck will wander -- sometimes quite far. There is high probability that wounded deer will end up on private property adjacent to the park. Will hunters realistically gain permission to go on private property to find and retrieve the deer? Probably not. What are private property owners to do in this situation? Call the police and report trespassing? Call the DNR to report violations? Etc. (5) Parking violations. Since the proposed hunting portions of the park are not near the parking lots, hunters likely will resort to parking on streets adjacent to the to the park to more easily access the hunting areas. Parking in these areas could be construed as violating Town of Delafield parking ordinances. At the very minimum, it will be considered a nuisance and danger to the residents to have increased traffic in their front yards. (6) Seemingly impossible hunting spaces. The draft map of potential lands open to bow hunting shows a piecemeal arrangement of hunting tracts -- some which are impossible to hunt legally. For example, the narrow swath of land around the Ice Age trail is shown to be open to hunting. Yet, current legislation prohibits hunting of any kind 100 yards on either side of the trail. Functional Concern (7) Defiance of purpose. It is well known that Lapham Peak State Park is one of the few non-hunting state parks in WI. The incredibly high visitation rate attests to that. In other words, people come to Lapham Peak State Park because they know that they do not have to contend with hunters or have safety fears. The park was designed to function in this way. That is its purpose from the very beginning of inception -- to be a public place for hiking and skiing. It was not intended to be a place for hunting. If hunting is permitted at Lapham Peak, hikers and skiers must give way to the hunters per the very known and respected WI Statutes 29.083. It is absurd to take a park that was designed for hiking and skiing and make it something "other" for several months of the year. This, for the record, is my main reason for opposition to the proposal to open up Lapham Peak to hunting. It is rumored that the main reason that hunting at Lapham Peak is being considered is to control the deer population. I agree that the deer population at the park needs to be controlled. There are, however, much better ways to control the population than archery equipment hunting for an entire season. Please note that I have CC-ed my state representative and senator so that they, too, may know my concerns about this proposal to allow hunting at Lapham Peak State Park.</p>	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
632	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to allowing any kind of hunting at Lapham Peak State Park. I strongly urge you to reject this initiative and do not grant any kind of permit to any kind of hunting in Lapham Peak State Park. There are numerous obvious reasons why this proposal to allow hunting in this park is a bad idea. The park is and has ever been heavily used by non-hunting visitors who enjoy the park for recreation that does not involve killing and without fear of being harmed inadvertently by hunters or without having to fear for their pets or children or having to watch a hunter retrieve a carcass. It is a well-loved park used by those who walk, run or hike often with kids and dogs and watch or photograph and peacefully enjoy wildlife, or cross country ski in the winter, as well as by those who ride horses on the trails. These users and the kids, dogs and horses all would be put at risk. The introduction of hunters in such proximity to non-hunting users would create dangerous confusion and likely conflict, were hunters permitted in the areas identified in the proposal. It is simply inviting harm and confusion for no justifiable reason. Even for the hunters, who might try hunting in the park in the areas designated as legitimate hunting areas, it would be difficult to actually restrict their activity safely within those areas. This of course raises the matter of how the DNR would be able to ensure safety of all users and neighboring property owners and enforce the regulations around hunting without adding supervisory park staff and Conservation Wardens. Without doing so, there of course would be little in the way of assurance to non-hunting users regarding safety. Indeed the areas that have been</p>	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.

	<p>proposed for hunting (which include the Tower, Homestead Hollow and the Westside Prairie) are very close to heavily used hiking, cross-country ski and even the Prairie Path bridal trail; so the matter of safety is critical and should make this proposal clearly unwise. Finally, the regulation that would allow bow-hunting "for all animals" for the whole length of the archery season, from September to February, would utterly alter for the worse the experience of the Lapham Peak State Park for all the other recreational users during that entire half-year; it would limit the joy and the sense of peaceful presence in nature and the safety from human harm that makes being in a State Park one of the great pleasures for all non-hunting visitors. Allowing any kind of hunting in Lapham Peak State Park strikes me as being unwise, risky and likely to undermine the investments and efforts to make Lapham Peak State Park a special destination for winter recreation in Southern Wisconsin. It was at this park cross-country skiing at night, that I first saw northern lights so far south; it is a park that is special to those who live in a part of the State, which is losing so quickly its wild space to reckless development. Do not deprive those who have come to this park without the aim of killing animals of one of the few places in the area where they can recreate in nature without human interference; do not introduce hunting in a place where it does not make any sense to do so. Thank you for considering my comment.</p>	
633	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposal to allow bow hunting in Lapham Peak State Park. We walk our dog and bike frequently in the park. It will be extremely dangerous for my wife and I to walk our dog and it is unrealistic to expect non-hunters to wear clothing that hunters are required to wear for safety. There will be more incidents like the woman in northern Wisconsin that was shot while walking her dog during the recent deer gun hunting season. If hunting is allowed in Lapham Peak State Park the regular usage by folks like ourselves and neighbors would decline greatly out of safety concerns.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
634	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed bow hunting at Lapham Peak. I am deeply concerned about the potential human safety risks associated with allowing hunting in this area. The overlap of proposed hunting areas with existing ski trails, including human-made ones, raises alarming safety concerns for recreational users. Bow hunting involves inherent risks, and allowing it in a popular recreation spot like Lapham Peak could jeopardize the well-being of both hunters and non-hunting visitors. Moreover, I advocate for a stance against hunting in general, emphasizing the importance of preserving natural spaces for everyone to enjoy without the threat of firearms or projectiles. Lapham Peak is a haven for nature enthusiasts, and introducing hunting may compromise the peaceful coexistence of humans and wildlife in this area. As a supporter of animal welfare and science-based decisions, I urge the Department to consider alternative methods for wildlife management that prioritize non-lethal approaches. The well-being of our environment and its inhabitants can be safeguarded without resorting to hunting practices that may disrupt the delicate balance of the ecosystem. Thank you for considering these concerns, and I hope the Department will prioritize the safety and enjoyment of all individuals who value Lapham Peak as a unique and tranquil natural space.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
635	<p>As someone who lives near public lands and knows how challenging it can be to balance all the interests of these public lands, I oppose the proposed rule change that would allow bow hunting anywhere in Lapham Peak State Park based on the following concerns: The random patchwork of land that the DNR is recommending being open to archery is not realistic for even the most ethical hunter to stay within. Hunters most certainly will be tracking and retrieving wounded animals all over the entire State Park and neighboring private properties. This creates conflict, confusion, and reason for concern. The areas suggested for hunting (Homestead Hollow, Tower, &amp; the Westside Prairie) are too close to incredibly popular hiking trails used by families and dog owners as well as cross-country ski trails during the busiest time of year. This could lead to significant safety issues. This regulation is wide open for "archery for all animals" for the entire archery season that runs from September to February. This far too long of a time that would impact the visitor experience for all recreational users for almost half the year. Especially, after significant efforts and investments have been made to make the Lapham Peak a winter destination for all of Southern WI with the snow making and the future Lapham Lodge.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
636	<p>Dear Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits</p>

		provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
637	Dear Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.	No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.
638	I oppose the proposed rule change that would allow bow hunting anywhere in Lapham Peak State Park for all of the following reasons: The Friends of Lapham Peak State Park group opposes this proposed change that would allow hunting in the park. The random patchwork of land that the DNR is recommending being open to archery is not realistic for even the most ethical hunter to stay within. Hunters most certainly will be tracking and retrieving wounded animals all over the entire State Park and neighboring private properties. This creates conflict, confusion, and reason for concern. The small staff of the park currently would not be able to reasonably enforce or address the safety concerns of visitors. The DNR would need to add additional staff and Conservation Wardens. The areas suggested for hunting (Homestead Hollow, Tower, & the Westside Prairie) are too close to incredibly popular hiking trails used by families and dog owners as well as cross-country ski trails during the busiest time of year. This goes against all logic for safety. The horse trails on the Prairie Path pose a particularly dangerous risk for trail riders. Just in 2020, a horse in the Southern Kettle Moraine State Forest was shot by a bowhunter while under saddle on the trail with a group of several riders. This regulation is wide open for "archery for all animals" for the entire archery season that runs from September to February. This is far too long of a time that would impact the visitor experience for all recreational users for almost half the year. Especially, after significant efforts and investments have been made to make the Lapham Peak a winter destination for all of Southern WI with the snow-making and the future Lapham Lodge. Thank you for reading & considering tabling this poor idea.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
639	I am an alumnus of UW-Madison, a Wisconsin landowner, a member of the Wisconsin-based Naturist Society Foundation, and an occasional user of Mazo Beach when it was open as a traditional site for nude recreation. I am a resident of Minnesota. I have just learned of a proposal to make nudity on Wisconsin DNR-managed land a criminal violation. This would be a poor policy choice. The differences from one culture to another in expectations as to what body parts must be covered in public are vast. In Wisconsin, variations in accepted dress from one public setting to another (the beach, the tennis court, the supermarket, the Wisconsin Senate chamber) are almost as vast. This high degree of variation tells us that our various expectations are rooted mostly in tradition, not necessity. Naturism is another tradition among many. It is a tradition in which simple nudity isn't a signal of sexual interest or availability. Naturists go bare because, when it's warm enough, nakedness feels good. It's natural. Some traditions about covering up are rooted in religious teaching. In our multi-cultural society, we are wise not to legislate based on religious teaching; rather, we should allow, and DNR-managed space is vast and diverse enough to allow, space for people to practice the traditions they are comfortable with. In our society, naturists are a small minority group. Most Wisconsin people have not experienced what naturist settings are like. This makes people prone to imagine that users of clothing-optional beaches are looking for titillation. The majority might be surprised to hear that many naturists think brightly-colored swimwear that provides minimal coverage is in poor taste, precisely because it intends to draw undue attention to the body parts which anti-nudity laws require us to cover. Naturists, when they give it some thought, realize that their recreation choice breaks a strong taboo for many people. This creates a PR problem. Naturists by and large are good citizens, but the public doesn't know it. The naturist community responds by, for instance, taking on roadside litter pickup of a segment of highway near Mazo Beach.	The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.

	<p>And in my experience at least, the Beach itself, despite large numbers of users, was kept picked up. Serious crime is an important issue in our society. Finding enough well-qualified people to staff our law-enforcement, court, and corrections institutions is proving to be a challenge. Defining yet another victimless crime won't help solve this problem. The sheriff shouldn't be going after a bunch of naked people playing volleyball on a secluded beach.</p>	
640	<p>As a resident of Wisconsin, an avid outdoors person, and someone who logs hundreds of hiking miles in our state parks, state natural areas and designated public trails yearly. KEEP HUNTING of any kind out of Lapham Peak. Sharing resources with all citizens never trumps safety considerations. This area is heavily used, year round. Hunting isn't a compatible activity for this area. It's never been allowed, and should remain as such.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
641	<p>Please do not expand hunting in our State Park at Lapham Peak. The community is not happy nor comfortable with more hunting in a park where so many of us walk, hike and run. It is just too close to patrons and the residential community.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
642	<p>Dear Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>
643	<p>I am opposed to allowing archery hunting at Lapham Peak except for a very limited number of days (e.g., a week in the late fall) each year to control deer overpopulation. This park is highly utilized for (hiking, biking, snowshoeing, and cross-country skiing) year-round. Allowing archery hunting during anything more than a very short season is not safe with current park uses.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
644	<p>I am against hunting in the park! The park is for those who wish for solitude &amp; enjoying animals &amp; nature. We don't need to worry about being at risk for being shot or hit with an arrow!! Look at what happened at the gun range. Over shooting. Hit someone. Hunters can get excited when they see a deer &amp; forget safety. How can you reassure hikers and those enjoying the park their safety? If a hiker was shot you'd be in for a law suit &amp; would deserve to pay for liability. The park is not a shooting range. Deer can be flushed out and hunted on other land. Lame excuse to indicate for disease. It is not open season for hunters in the park. Bad idea. I hope you listen to those who want to keep the park safe &amp; enjoy nature undisturbed. Remember the horse shot with the arrow at the southern kettle. It happens. Would be terrible to hit a person mistaken for a deer!!</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
645	<p>These comments are regarding the proposed changes to allow archery hunting at the Lapham Peak Unit State Park. While I am generally in favor of this proposal and understand the need to manage the deer population on the property, I also appreciate the unique aspect of having an area where no hunting is allowed. As a horse owner and trail rider, the ability to have an area where we can ride during hunting season is a great thing. While I know that the overwhelming majority of hunters are perfectly safe, and respectful of the needs of the diverse factions that use the property, some people who want to think the worst of hunters and hunting in general simply will not see this as a good thing. As a hunter, I also would like to see public access to the property for the purposes of archery hunting expanded. The increasing pressures put on any huntable public land in SE Wisconsin is going to continue, and I believe it will get worse. With the lousy economy and high fuel prices, many people are simply not</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>



	<p>going to drive for hours to go "up north" and then not see any deer. I have spoken to many hunters that are feeling that way after the 2023 season. It's tough to drive away from a deer-rich environment, to an over-hunted, predator-rich environment in the North Woods. You spend a lot of money to see nothing but empty woods. Yet- the lower 3rd of the state (most of which is either private or posted non-hunting) has huge populations of ag-fed deer being slaughtered on the roadways. I know I am offering conflicting opinions- I am torn on the matter. To that end- would it be possible to open the property up to selective bowhunting? I know different methods have been used at other parks: Perhaps a lottery draw for limited tags? Limiting the number of hunters that have access on any given day. Having alternating weeks where hunting is allowed or not allowed. Having "zones" for hunting on given days- allowing hikers and trail riders the ability to avoid that corner of the property. I would like to keep some aspect of the horse trails available for the trail-riders who want to avoid hunters. I have often come across hunters in the Southern Kettle Moraine. Most have been respectful. Some less so. Some have kept their distance, and some have been hunting on the trails- even hanging tree-stands directly on the horse trails. Some hunters have not been especially receptive when we ask them to say something to the horses (to help avoid spooking) when the hunters "think" they are hidden in their camo. Perhaps a "horse etiquette" sheet would be helpful, if non-horse owning hunters are going to be sharing the property with trail riders? Some of the issues have been with Hmong, where language has been a challenge. I think most of the discomfort has simply been confusion where and how the hunters should be using the forest, and ignorance about the needs of the horse riders. We have tried to bridge the gap and explain things with limited success. As a bow-hunter, pheasant hunter and trail-rider, I understand the competing pressures on a multi-use property. I think the main factors need to be education and communication if these diverse populations are going to co-exist. As a hunter, I want the horse people to feel comfortable. I want them to know we respect their access, and their safety. As a hunter, I want to see hunting access expand. But, as a hunter we need to do more to make everyone else using the property feel okay with that expanded access.</p>	
646	<p>This letter is in response to the proposed new hunting regulations inside Lapham Peak State Park. Let me first state that I am a hunter and understand that bowhunting (at least with a traditional bow) is a relatively safe activity. My objections are based on the increased nuisance that bringing an additional population of people into non-traditional areas of the park is going to cause the surrounding landowners. As a landowner on the northern boundary of the park off S Lapham Peak Road, the two available hunting areas are adjacent to multiple landowners and have no easy access to the available land. The area that contains the maintenance shops shows an access point to the land, but there is no designated parking area on S Lapham Peak Rd. You will have people parking and accessing the park without paying entry fees while also congesting a narrow rural road or parking in areas that landowners regularly maintain. We already have individuals that regularly park at the end of our driveway to gain free access to the park. Adding hunters would only make that worse. This will occur everywhere around the park where there is access from a public road. Additionally, you have the private driveway that extends east from the end of S Lapham Peak Rd across my property shown as a public road. Everyone is going to be going down that private driveway looking for access to the northeastern block of land and ending up at a private residence. Are YOU providing the private property signage? How are YOU going to control traffic? My other major concern is who regulates and enforces the rules? The complexity of the boundaries will always be an issue whether intentionally circumvented or by error. Who is going to resolve disputes? Is it the employees of the park? Is it the DNR? Is it the Waukesha Sheriff's department? Sadly, the first line of enforcement is going to fall on the adjacent landowners. While we have always taken a stewardship role with the park, the added responsibility of having to deal with an increase in trespass and nuisance issues is not appealing. Additionally all we ever hear is that state facilities are understaffed. With the volume of visitors to this park and the urban nature of the surroundings, it doesn't seem to be within the park staff's capacity to effectively monitor this activity. I sincerely hope you revise your proposal. I cannot speak to whether the areas west of Hwy C and off the southern portion of the park are suitable, but I reiterate that the two sections on the northeast portion of the park will be troublesome areas for all involved due to access and residence density issues. Thank you for your consideration</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
647	<p>Please do not allow any type of hunting at Lapham Peak at any time of the year. Lapham Peak is a wonderful park for everyone who wants to get outside in a safe environment. Hunters have many places they can go to hunt. Non-hunters have one. Please do not take this ONE away from us.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
648	<p>I oppose the proposed rule change that would allow bow hunting anywhere in Lapham Peak State Park for all of the following reasons: This is VERY UNNECESSARY. I'd like to see the data that scientifically shows there is a problem only solved by taking this approach. What is the real problem and what options were considered before landing on this? Are the referenced deer who will "starve" in captivity? This proposal suggests that the deer cannot move on to other areas. It provides a very narrow view and frankly seems to only have "more hunting" as the desired outcome. How many hunters are there by % compared to our overall State population? Maybe 10%...and dwindling. Again, this feels VERY</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

	<p>UNNECESSARY. This is reckless. The way the maps are drawn, there are hunting zones that conflict with popular hiking trails, cross country skiing trails, and roadways. There isn't enough room in the park to support this and on paper and it will take away many recreation activities from others in favor of hunters. This isn't safe and it is confusing. Further to the previous point, there is no way boundaries can be clearly marked for people recreating to truly understand where hunting zones are and for hunters to know where they cannot pursue - at the end of the day, the core of this park doesn't allow hunting based on the land deed and any such activity would be in violation. Based on other State Parks that have hunting and non-hunting zones, there are many examples where a hunter will track his deer to the non-hunting zone and "finish the job"...those are some blurry lines. Being real, this feels like an accident (and hopefully not fatal one) waiting to happen. Taking a risk like this is VERY UNNECESSARY. Even hunters I know think this is a bad idea and will fuel a general animosity toward hunting. Lapham Peak State Park has long been known as a place where people can go during hunting seasons to safely enjoy the outdoors. Using public land that should be shared for hunting makes it unusable for many others. Try looking at how other states have worked out ways to leverage private land in safer ways. My wife, daughter, dog, and I currently enjoy this park and all it has to offer - especially during hunting season. Please reconsider this...it truly is VERY UNNECESSARY.</p>	
649	<p>Yes I read with utter dismay of the DNR's intention of letting bow hunting occur at Lapham Peak. Lapham Peak has long been a very peaceful park where you can get away from everything and feel safe other than the occasional tumble perhaps. Also, the DNR collects fees from people who want to go hiking there or for seasonal passes. And now you want to allow bow hunting in a place where people value the peace and tranquility and freedom. Obviously no one is going to go into the park during bow hunting season. There are a lot of people who just don't agree with hunting regardless. While I do not like hunting I do understand that deer can overpopulate areas. And as you say there is a necessity to occasionally cull the deer. Why would you allow free-for-all bowhunting as opposed to marksman culling when the park is closed and using the meat to give to homeless shelters or food banks. Again no one would be interested in hiking when there is hunting going in the park and people who have seasonal passes or want to pay to get in shouldn't have to worry that there is hunting going on. And obviously you are pairing both deer and turkeys as though to make it more attractive to hunters. To be honest this all just turns my stomach and I am disgusted that I am just finding out on the last day from an article that was written in the Freeman on December 8th. We all know that hunting has decreased throughout Wisconsin. People aren't interested in hunting like in the past and I suspect the hunting lobby is behind so many of these decisions and not the necessity to cull deer and throw in wild turkeys while you're at it - just as the hunting lobby beats its drum that wolves are creating so much havoc that they too have to be "culled."</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
650	<p>I am opposed to allowing hunting at Lapham peak state park.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
651	<p>I am puzzled as to why the DNR is determined to ban nudity on its land. We go to the woods and lakes and rivers of Wisconsin to escape the noise and hassle of our lives, to experience the world without the rules and trappings of jobs and schedules and billable hours. We feel good there because we feel at one with the world, at one with our physical, spiritual beings as we originally were born into the world. Since I was a kid, every time I find myself in the forest on a summer's day, my instinct has been to take off my clothes, to get down to the elemental, pure, humble human animal that we all are. I feel closer to the great life force. It is indeed my spiritual place, my temple, on this planet. You may ask why I need to be naked. I might ask you why you need to be clothed. We are just hairless animals and we should have the right to experience our green earth in the clothes in which we were born. I know the DNR is about regulating, licensing, and managing Wisconsin's public lands, but I think outlawing nudity is regulating the very thing land is for – the experience of it, and there is no more heightened experience of nature than being naked in it. At this point, naturists assume that those who want to ban all nudity are associating it with sex as if that is the only thing nudity could be about, but the naturist community is pretty wholesome. We shun creepers. We consider it impolite to look at the bodies of fellow nudists, so we look them in the eye. We police our spaces and pick up after ourselves. We discourage lewdness. We strive to make women and children feel safe. Hence the term "family-friendly naturism." And if sex on public lands is what you're worried about, though I don't know why the DNR should, it's obviously possible to have sex fully clothed. These rule changes won't stop that. The other thing that bothers me about these rule changes is exemplified in the closing of Mazo Beach years ago. That beach served 70-80,000 people a year, partly because it was the only place open to clothes-free public life. But it also concentrated quite a few tourist dollars on area businesses, and they feel the loss. A blanket change like the DNR proposes is taking away all local control of how communities want to deal with naturism. Some little, free-minded community on Lake Michigan might look enviously at the \$7 billion nude tourism nets in Florida every year. At Haulover Beach in North Miami, the parking lot alone pulls in \$1 million a year. Like</p>	<p>The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.</p>

	<p>Mazo, the nude beach is so limited in size, it is packed, while the rest of the beaches are half empty. With demand so high, I have to ask why you aren't considering opening up designated areas for naked recreation all over the state. Post them with signs and give the people what they want. The demand is there, as are the dollars. Reliable sources report that 56% of Americans have skinny-dipped, 25% in mixed company and 15% consider themselves naturists. I have to believe Wisconsin falls somewhere close to those numbers. After all, skinnydipping is as traditional as a brandy manhattan in Wisconsin. My grandparents, born in the late 1800s, took their "chocolate dip" as dusk settled on their Oneida County lake. Would they be outlaws today? I dare say naturists outnumber wolf hunters and bear hunters and on Wisconsin lands, yet those questionable activities aren't banned. They probably outnumber horseback riders and other various recreational allowances, too. Why not expand permission to naturists? Give us the far end of beaches. We are willing to walk. Put up signs to alert people to our presence, as you might to a hunting area or high voltage lines. People will either choose to avoid us or join us. But we really don't need a paternalistic state regulating our naked essence. No one is asking for these rule changes and many want a liberalization of public land use to allow us to disrobe and follow our spiritual quest.</p>	
652	<p>We do not support the proposed rule change. It attempts to solve a problem that does not exist. Checkout time at 3 allows a day of enjoyment at the end of a trip. We have not encountered a problem with the existing system. The change is unnecessary and will do more damage than good.</p>	<p>The department stands by this proposal. The proposed gap between check-out and check-in times is necessary to 1) reduce conflict that has been known to occur between arriving and departing campers and 2) accommodate maintenance tasks such as cleaning, mowing, or tree trimming or removal. The department also notes that many state park systems enforce a gap between check-out and check-in times. These systems include but are not limited to Michigan Maryland, Missouri, Iowa, Virginia, Kansas, California, New York and Ohio.</p>
653	<p>It is my understanding that a proposal to allow bow hunting is being considered at Lapham Peak. At first, I assumed that this was a joke since Lapham Peak is a heavily visited park with many families and all generations coming to enjoy the beauty of its landscape. When I found this proposal to be under serious consideration, I wanted to reach out and express my staunch opposition to this idea. I cannot feel safe with my children here and would no longer be comfortable running there, either. Please do not move forward with this proposal.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
654	<p>As both a frequent visitor of Lapham Peak State Park and an environmental attorney who has worked closely with WDNR on manifold water and wildlife policy matters over the years — encompassing appointments to DNR advisory committees, testimony before the Natural Resources Board and legislative committees, and legal action — I strongly recommend that the Wisconsin DNR reconsider and reject the agency's recently proposed rule change that would allow bow hunting within Lapham Peak State Park. For any one of the reasons outlined below, the risk of injury or death to Lapham Peak State Park visitors far outweighs any rationale in favor of opening the park to bow hunting: The random patchwork of land that the DNR is proposing to open for bow hunting will make it difficult for most hunter to stay within. Hunters most certainly will be tracking and retrieving wounded animals all over the entire State Park and neighboring private properties. The small staff of the park currently would not be able to reasonably enforce or address the safety concerns of visitors. The DNR would need to add additional staff and Conservation Wardens. The areas suggested for hunting (Homestead Hollow, Tower, &amp; the Westside Prairie) are too close to popular hiking trails used by families and dog owners, as well as cross-country ski trails, during the busiest times of the year. This regulation is wide open for "archery for all animals" for the entire archery season that runs from September to February. This far too long of a time that would impact the visitor experience for all recreational users for almost half the year. I urge the WDNR to prioritize public safety and the interests of the Park's non-hunting recreational users/visitors and to desist from any rule change that would allow bow hunting in Lapham Peak State Park.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
655	<p>I would like to go on record as being against the proposed plan to allow bow and crossbow hunting in Lapham Peak State Park. The park has grown steadily in popularity and averages 1700 park goers a day. I can't see how you could safely allow bow hunting with that much traffic. I can't believe that park visitors would feel safe and have the safe, relaxing outdoor experience that they now enjoy. In addition, I would like to know how park management plans to make sure that hunters are obeying the proposed boundaries. I don't even want to think about a possible confrontation or hunting accident! It would certainly be tragic and could be avoidable. Bow hunting in some parks of Waukesha County can be and is being conducted currently. I know some of the landowners adjacent to those parks and they aren't happy. Lapham Peak State Park is not a park that should allow bow hunting within its boundaries. There are too many visitors and it would be too difficult (expensive?) to manage safe hunting compliance. I have been blessed to be a hunter my entire life, bow hunting the last 25 years. I have hunting experience and I know things can go wrong. I urge you to reconsider your proposal to allow bow and crossbow hunting within Lapham Peak State Park. I would vote against it if given the opportunity. Thank you for your consideration!</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

656	<p>Please reconsider your proposal to allow bow hunting at Lapham Peak. I live about a mile from Lapham and the beautiful park is one of the main reasons my husband and I chose to live in Delafield. We hike there often with our 2 young children and would not feel comfortable bringing our children on trails that allow active hunting. But more than my own personal feelings, it would be irresponsible to allow bow hunters to hunt in such a populated park. The current proposal would allow bow hunting in and around the actively used hiking trails. These trails are used to welcome hikers, families, pets, field trip groups, and Lapham Peak event visitors (fall colorama, fright hike, etc.). It should also be noted that people are very often going off trail or cutting through forested areas to get to other trails which would create an even more dangerous situation. In addition, your map is deceptively incomplete. The map that was circulated is missing two very used trails that cut directly through the proposed hunting grounds - the Nemahbin spring trail (historical landmark) and the trail from the tower to government hill road. Additionally, it should be stressed that Lapham peak is an extremely populated park. Lapham Peak welcomes nearly 600,000 visitors each year. Lapham peak receives visitors from all over the midwest to see the beautiful fall colors. In fact they receive so many visitors that they have to cord off sections of the grass in order to accommodate surplus parking in addition to their 4 large parking areas. This would put a large number of people potentially in the path of an armed hunter. The winter season is no less busy with the actively used cross country ski trails. Second, it would be potentially fiscally irresponsible to allow bow hunting in Lapham Peak. Lapham peak draws huge crowds from out of town visitors that buy day passes to see the beautiful colors of fall and to use the cross country ski trail. People travel from far away to experience the beauty that is Lapham Peak. Given the potential for danger of hiking or skiing in an area I find it hard to believe that day visitors would still feel comfortable bringing their spouses, children, grandchildren, etc. to the park. Out of town visitors will inherently not be aware of the allowance of bow hunting. Signage is not enough to ensure people's safety from serious injury or death. It is unreasonable to expect visitors to wear orange, stay on trail, read every sign just to keep from sustaining serious bodily harm. I would imagine most people, like myself, would find visiting Lapham now worth the potential risk. Third, I truly believe that if the DNR allows hunting in such a populated park they are not only creating a dangerous situation but in fact a grossly negligent situation. As an attorney (currently inactive), I hope the DNR considers the potential legal issues and repercussions of their actions. Not only is injury or death foreseeable by allowing bow hunting in a crowded park but you have been put on notice of the potential dangers and it is your responsibility to protect visitors of Lapham Peak from potential harm. Lastly, although bow hunting can be seen as less dangerous than firearms, it is not free of danger. Particularly cross bows can not only be fired at a greater distance but would also be much more lethal and have a greater potential of accidental misfiring. I know many hunters familiar with Lapham Peak that also think bow hunting should not be allowed due to the potential danger to visitors.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
657	<p>I live in Oconomowoc. After hearing the proposal to allow bow hunting at Lapham Peak, I want to share some of my concerns: - The health of Wisconsin will be Negatively impacted. This information will deter people from going to the park for a walk, picnic, hike or ski. As you know, nice days in fall, winter and spring are not as easy to come by, so when it is nice outside, the freedom to walk on a public park is good for the health and wellbeing of all. Having hunting at the park will scare people from going to the park and will negatively impact people's health. - Lapham is so unique in its landscape and location, that going to a different park in the area does not compare. Allowing hunting will bring less people to the park and may even cause people to leave the state in hopes of finding parks like Lapham that do not allow bow hunting. - This land was never intended to be hunted-upon. As one who likes to abide by laws and rules for order and structure in society, allowing hunting on land that was originally never intended for hunting seems wrong and a poor way to manage land that has been given to the state of Wisconsin. -Safety of kids and families on hikes will be negatively impacted with hunting. If you have or had children in your household, you know the need for kids to run and be free. And also, how kids don't always understand or listen to rules. If there is hunting, and a child is carelessly running around in the forest, they could get struck with a bow. I would never want to hear this in the news. This would wound the community for years and also make Lapham a place that families find unsafe to visit for years. I hope you strongly consider my points and the point of views from others who do not want this to happen any time soon.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
658	<p>I would like to share my view that Lapham Peak State Park should not be open for hunting. My family are frequent hikers all year round there, and the nature of the park and rambling trails makes me feel skeptical that it will be safe or clear to hunters and hikers which areas are ok to hunt in and which will not be. Many people bring small children to the park, and dogs. This is a well used and well loved park, please keep it inviting and safe for visitors.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
659	<p>I read with utter dismay of the DNR's intention of letting bow hunting occur at Lapham Peak. Lapham Peak has long been a very peaceful park where you can get away from everything and feel safe other than the occasional tumble perhaps. Also, the DNR collects fees from people who want to go hiking there or for seasonal passes. And now you want to allow bow hunting in a place where people value the peace and tranquility and freedom. Obviously no one is going to go into the park during bow hunting season. There are a lot of people who just don't agree with</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for</p>

	<p>hunting regardless. While I do not like hunting I do understand that deer can overpopulate areas. And as you say there is a necessity to occasionally cull the deer. Why would you allow free-for-all bowhunting as opposed to marksman culling when the park is closed and using the meat to give to homeless shelters or food banks. Again no one would be interested in hiking when there is hunting going in the park and people who have seasonal passes or want to pay to get in shouldn't have to worry that there is hunting going on. And obviously you are pairing both deer and turkeys as though to make it more attractive to hunters. To be honest this all just turns my stomach and I am disgusted that I am just finding out on the last day from an article that was written in the Freeman on December 8th. We all know that hunting has decreased throughout Wisconsin. People aren't interested in hunting like in the past and I suspect the hunting lobby is behind so many of these decisions and not the necessity to cull deer and throw in wild turkeys while you're at it - just as the hunting lobby beats its drum that wolves are creating so much havoc that they too have to be "culled."</p>	<p>managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
660	<p>This email is in reference to allowing deer hunting in Lapham Peak. While I recognize that there is a problem with the deer population I do not believe allowing hunting in a State Park is the answer. Deer bow hunting season goes for several weeks including parts of October and November. The park is very much in use (especially in October) by people hiking and bicycling. From the map, it appears a large section of the projected area is the part adjacent to Cushing Park which is the primary area my family and I go for walks. Having to look out for hunters would put a cramp in the enjoyment to say the least and be a detriment to public safety. I also find it unlikely this would be a one year event. Once the door is open this would continue to occur and prohibit the enjoyment of the park as is its intended purpose. Let's keep our parks as the safe haven they are intended to be for the enjoyment of all.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
661	<p>Please do not open Lapham Peak to hunting, it is one of if not the best park in the area for hiking, with as popular as it is with hikers, opening it to hunting seems like it would be a safety concern. Also with the constant loss of habitat for wildlife to development, this is a safe haven, which would be lost.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
662	<p>I am writing to show my support for the rule change to allow archery hunting for deer and turkeys in Lapham Peak State Park. It is quite obvious that our area has an abundance of deer and in some cases, they are a nuisance. Being a participant for the last 5 years and an assistant administrator for the last 2 years for the Town of Delafield Deer Management program. I would ask that any hunting in the area be controlled/facilitated by a management group. All stand locations would be monitored-hunting "sits" would be logged and rules would be established. Doing this may ensure less pushback from the public. Letting every Tom-Dick-Harry into this area uncontrolled will lead to issues. I want hunting this property to be as safe and successful as possible and monitoring all hunts would be the easiest way to track the success of the program and minimize the negative impact. As we attempt to control the deer population in the town of Delafield, we are limited to a small amount actual area we are able to hunt/harvest deer. Right now, we have permission to have stands on the Ethan Allen Boys School Property and a few other very small tracts of private land. These properties have stands installed by the program administrators. Each hunt is reserved ahead of time by hunters who have completed a MANDATORY safety training. Each hunt lasts ½ of a day (morning or evening). Doe tags are provided by the DNR and each harvest is logged/tracked and registered by the program administrators. This allows participants to reserve a stand and know that they will not have hunting competition 30 yards away from another hunter. We do not allow violations in the program- we cannot risk the safety or negative public opinion to shut programs like ours down. As we get some calls for other small properties in which residents complain there are too many deer and are a nuisance, we need to get permission from other properties surrounding these. It is not always easy because as hunters seem to portray a negative image to a lot of people. To some, it is the blood and gore they do not want to see, some are concerned about safety, and others have just had bad experiences with "hunters" in the past. Below are some suggestions for the program. -Mandatory Safety Training. Just because someone has passed the state mandated hunter safety courses in the past does not mean they follow the rules at all times. The park has a very high population at any given time of people participating in other recreational activities. An extra above and beyond training module or power point presentation pointing out possible park specific safety hazards should be implemented. -Number of hunters/Identification. Lapham Peak would be a premier place to hunt and will generate interest from a lot of hunters, in the past you needed to wear a back tag while hunting in the state of Wisconsin, while I am opposed to this for the general hunting population I feel in a situation like this it expresses a sense of accountability because the hunters on the property would be able to be identified by any non-hunter participating in other activities or other hunters if there may be any rule violation. This would also mean that there would need to be a documented list of hunters that would be approved to hunt on the property. I believe that limiting the number of hunters that are allowed to participate on the property is also crucial. An application process should be implemented so you know who is using the property for these activities. Limiting the number of hunters that are using the property will also limit the number of hunter/non hunter interactions. In the Town of Delafield program hunters book hunts on</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

	<p>an appointment registration website. There is a limited number of “stands” on each property and we know who and when is hunting on any of the properties at any given time. This way when there are problems/complaints or violations it is easy to identify who the individual was, and we can deal with the situation. -Removal of gut piles/entrails. After harvesting a deer there is waste that is not the most precious thing to see in the field. Non-hunters using the park for other activities are not going to want to see or smell the guts/entrails of the deer or have their dogs eating anything they shouldn't. This is a requirement for our properties we have Town of Delafield sanctioned stands on for our program. This removes a lot of the blood/gore people are going to see. This seems to be a major complaint along with people's concerns with their safety on some the Facebook posts about allowing hunting on the property that I have seen posted. -Proficiency test. The image of seeing wounded deer or a deer with an arrow stuck in it walking around the park is also a main concern of the opponents of hunting at Lapham Peak. I know in other states, proficiency tests are required for hunters seeking to get special permissions or tags for certain areas for the opportunity to hunt. I feel this should be implemented as well. Something as simple as requiring a hunter to school a 3-inch group from 20-yards with their crossbow or vertical bow would be sufficient, I believe this is what was required to get special “Conservation tags” in Illinois. If you failed, you did not get a tag. -Designated Hunting Areas. I have seen a map with the proposed hunting areas circulating on social media also, I feel this is also crucial to keep hunter/non-hunter interactions at a minimum. Posting these maps at the entrances at the park and possibly posting signs along trails that are close to the designated hunting areas would also help. Designated hunting areas should try to be isolated from high concentrations of trails/recreational areas. As stated, I am absolutely in favor of allowing hunting in Lapham Peak State Park and am looking forward for the opportunity to do so if the rule change moves forward. Additionally, I would enjoy the opportunity to further discuss and share more insights/opinions to help move this further along. I would also be willing to volunteer my time to help coordinate and implement any special rules or processes to make it happen. Please feel free to reach out to me directly or you can also email us at delafieldddeermanagement@gmail.com if the option to roll this property into the town of Delafield's management program is available- we would love to discuss it further.</p>	
663	<p>Lapham peak holds a special place in my heart. Please don't allow bow hunting at Lapham. We should cherish the beauty of wildlife in the area. There are many other places hunters can go in Wisconsin. Please protect this area from hunters.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
664	<p>I have been skiing, mountain biking, hiking and camping in both South and North Kettle Moraine for 45 years. Lapham Peak has been one of my favorite places to ski and hike. Please do not allow bow hunting. The amount of people hiking has increased over the years, and allowing bow hunting near hiking trails is definitely not safe. The open season is during the fall when many families are hiking to enjoy the fall colors. People should be able to feel that their family is safe while hiking or skiing. Wearing bright colors is no guarantee of safety. There are many other places to hunt that are not adjacent to hiking trails. Bow hunting at Lapham Peak should not be allowed.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
665	<p>I am writing to advocate for proposed changes to the administrative code NR 45, specifically for the retraction or revision of NR 45.13(1)(e), which prohibits rock climbing on most State Natural Areas. I believe that this prohibition is unwarranted and lacks a basis in evidence of adverse impact. In fact, the climbing community is known for its commitment to conservation, and climbers engage with the DNR in stewardship initiatives to preserve the natural areas they enjoy. There is no compelling reason to assume that rock climbing is incompatible with conservation, necessitating a special regulation beyond what applies to other recreational activities. I urge you to reconsider this provision and retract NR 45.13(1)(e). Alternatively, the code should be rewritten to align with existing language in NR 45.13(2)(c), which prohibits off-trail hiking, so that prohibitions are appropriately implemented based on evidence of adverse environmental impact. This approach would ensure that rock climbing is treated on par with other outdoor recreational activities. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I hope you will consider the merits of my argument during this public comment period. I appreciate your commitment to effective and equitable land management policies in Wisconsin.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed in this rule package that are directly related to rock climbing. The State Natural Area (SNA) program has reviewed the comments submitted on this topic. Requests to climb at specific SNAs will continue to be considered during the master planning process, and decisions regarding climbing at a particular site will be based on the assessment of impacts to the conservation values of each site. The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation (NHC) employs the precautionary principle when making decisions regarding appropriate recreational activities on SNAs, basing decisions on the best available science, the conservation values of the particular site, and professional judgement. NHC is in the process of developing evaluation criteria regarding requests to climb at specific SNAs. With regard to the climbing permits provision, the department is committed to developing a comprehensive rock climbing policy including potential revisions to administrative code, and will engage in a process that includes public comment opportunities on any specific administrative code proposals.</p>

666	I am opposed to bow hunting at Lapham Peak - I walk the trails frequently and some would be in the hunting zone. I shouldn't have to go out and buy special clothing to walk in the park and still wonder if my grand kids or myself could get hit. I am not opposed to deer hunting in general - members of my family are hunters and accidents do happen. Bow season is quite long - you want to select a few days and close the park that would be a better option than endangering us for such an extended period of time. Your decision will factor into my park renewal.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
667	I am strongly opposed to any part of Lapham opening up for hunting. Lapham is the only park my family and I hike during hunting season because we are safe. In 2020 a bow hunter took out a horse in Kettle Moraine South. We live just south of Lapham, and have found arrows on our neighborhood's communal area. There have also been arrows lodged in a neighbor's tree. It's impossible to trust in the precision and safety of bow hunters when such things have occurred (note these hunters were all trespassing). Please do not take away one of the only state parks in the state that does not allow hunting. It is the only place we go September through January every year.	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
668	I'm submitting this statement that was written and submitted by a respected and knowledgeable person in the fish and wildlife field, Everett Fuchs. I would appreciate if you would write my name in opposition to this proposed rule change because I agree wholeheartedly with the following statement. I oppose the proposed rule change that would allow bow hunting in Lapham Peak State Park. Some reasons are documented below. My opposition is not because I am anti-hunting, just the opposite. I am super pro-hunting. However, this issue is so controversial it has reached my attention on the western border of Wisconsin. As a hunting advocate, I believe the DNR should not be undertaking actions that will push non hunters off the State Parks. It is not in the best interest of hunters and the hunting heritage to do so. The backlash will only lead to more conflict. Instead, the DNR should be putting their effort into a program that gives bow hunters access to private lands for hunting. Such a program can be a win-win for the landowners and the bow hunters. Other states have extremely successful programs of this type. We need more unity, not more division, among all types of outdoor users in our state. The Friends of Lapham Peak State Park group oppose this proposed change that would allow hunting in the park. The random patchwork of land that the DNR is recommending being open to archery is not realistic for even the most ethical hunter to stay within. Hunters most certainly will be tracking and retrieving wounded animals all over the entire State Park and neighboring private properties. This creates conflict, confusion, and reason for concern. The small staff of the park currently would not be able to reasonably enforce or address the safety concerns of visitors. The DNR would need to add additional staff and Conservation Wardens. The areas suggested for hunting (Homestead Hollow, Tower, & the Westside Prairie) are too close to incredibly popular hiking trails used by families and dog owners as well as cross-country ski trails during the busiest time of year. This goes against all logic for safety. The horse trails on the Prairie Path pose a particularly dangerous risk for trail riders. Just in 2020, a horse in the Southern Kettle Moraine State Forest was shot by a bowhunter while under saddle on the trail with a group of several riders. This regulation is wide open for "archery for all animals" for the entire archery season that runs from September to February. This is far too long of a time that would impact the visitor experience for all recreational users for almost half the year. Especially, after significant efforts and investments have been made to make the Lapham Peak a winter destination for all of Southern WI with the snow making and the future Lapham Lodge. Thank you for consideration!	The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.
669	<p>SUBMISSION - IN OPPOSITION TO CHAPTER NR 45 (SECTION 37) CHANGES</p> <p>As part of introducing myself, I am involved in three groups - Friends of Mazo Beach, the Naturist Action Committee and the Naturist Education Foundation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Friends of Mazo Beach was formed in the early 1990s in part to have a cooperative relationship with the DNR to assist with helping keep the beach safe and clean. It consists of mostly naturists, but non-naturists and some local businesses are represented by FOMB as well.</li> <li>• Naturists practice naturism. One definition of Naturism is the practice of being as one is born in a non-sexual setting entailing an acceptance and respect for the integrity of one's whole person, other persons, and the environment – living in harmony with nature, with the intention of encouraging self-respect, respect for others, and respect for nature.</li> </ul> <p>Please accept this submission expressing opposition of the proposed Administrative Rules changes to Chapter NR 45 (in particular, Section 37) of the Wisconsin Administrative Code,</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of not only myself, but also thousands of beach users of the area popularly known as Mazo Beach, some of whom have respectfully skinny-dipped along that very small area of sandbar bordering the 93-mile long stretch of the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway since as early as the late 1950's. Among them, their ages range from newborn to over 100 years old, with great diversity regarding education levels,</p>	The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.

income levels, religious beliefs, political leanings, sexual identities, professions, etc...

Regarding the number of people impacted by proposed changes (both beach users and local businesses):

I am part of the thousands of supporters of that small area of public land, many of whom consider themselves “Friends of Mazo Beach”, most are naturists, some are not naturists, and some are local business owners. What they have in common, whether from down the road or another country, is that they all found benefit from the existence of the beach. Beach users have been very good stewards of the beach and riverway, and business owners have found financial benefit from the tens of thousands of tourists from across the state, the country and even other countries who have visited and supported their establishments. As recently as this week, there were local Mazomanie business owners who indicated to me the struggle they are having with trying to draw more customers from outside of the village to maintain their businesses.

Thus, it was surprising to read in the Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis, “No significant effects to businesses, business sectors, associations affecting businesses, or local governmental units are anticipated.”

Prior to the closure of the beach in 2016, the beach had drawn hundreds of thousands of people to the area over the years – Even the DNR’s own estimates confirmed the number of seasonal visitors at 70,000.

Clearly that number of people visiting has had significant effects to businesses. I am personally aware of a number of businesses that were hurt by the decreased volume of business when the beach was first closed during the weekdays in 2013. These businesses were then further harmed when the DNR restricted access to the entire beach area in 2016. During these times of change, I know of some businesses that had to close, and others have had their revenue impacted but are still trying to hang on while waiting for the beach to re-open and tourists to return.

If the beach were to re-open and be like any of the other beaches in the area, it would not draw the tourists back; and clearly the recent local Mazomanie studies have shown that local residents are in general quite satisfied with the existing natural recreational opportunities in the area. (Many local people that I know, prefer other beaches such as Peck’s landing due to the distance as well as the ease of parking.)

During the last revision of the Wisconsin Riverway Master Plan the following petition with over 2,000 signatures was submitted by FOMB to the DNR:

I, the undersigned, am either a naturist/non-naturist Mazo Beach user and/or a local business owner who benefits from this clothing-optional beach. I support the continued inclusion of the long-standing traditional clothing-optional usage of the beach as part of a multi-use management plan for the Mazomanie Unit of the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway. Whether or not I choose nude recreation as my personal option, I oppose any action by the DNR or any other public officials to restrict or eliminate such usage. I strongly urge public officials to allocate the resources to make beach visits safe and enjoyable every day of the week, and I request priority be given to preserving this site for the many thousands who use it each year.

As for the beach users, a recognized valid legal user group, over the years the DNR has acknowledged that the naturists are an exemplary user group as well as impressive stewards of the area.

I will not take the time now to go into details, but here is a brief listing of just some of the many ways that the naturist users have shown themselves to be respectful stewards of the area throughout the years:

- Maintaining Adopt-a-Highway stretches (four miles) along State Highways 78 and County Road Y since the mid-1990s.
- Maintaining the beach and carrying out all litter. (It was even acknowledged by the Riverway Coordinator at a DNR meeting when praising our stewardship and care of the area that he couldn’t find as much as a cigarette butt on the beach.)
- Having many food drives throughout the years providing many tons of food for local food pantries.
- Having many clothing drives throughout the years providing large volumes of clothing for local distribution.
- Being members of the local Mazomanie and Sauk City Chambers of Commerce.
- Helping the DNR with flood clean-up projects both in the river and in the area.



- Helping the DNR with various work projects at other state properties.
- Organizing and performing annual garlic mustard pulls in the woods and along the gravel road for many years at the Mazomanie Unit and elsewhere on state property, literally filling and removing thousands of bags of the invasive destructive weed. When the DNR closed access to the woods, FOMB could not enter the woods but continued to pull the mustard along the road up to the trees. In 2016 and 2017 after the DNR closed the entire beach area, requests by FOMB to enter the area during the months of the pulls to keep ahead of the invasive mustard were denied.
- Offering to pay for port-a-potties, road maintenance, etc over the years. (offers were denied)

And in case you weren't aware, even though the DNR reduced beach access to only weekends in 2013, the Madison Magazine "BEST OF THE BURBS" announced MAZO BEACH as the "#1 FAVORITE AREA ATTRACTION IN DANE COUNTY" for 2015.

In addition, the decision of beach users to voting for their favorite local businesses was greatly instrumental in getting a dozen local businesses the recognition they greatly deserved:

- Best bakery – The Old Feed Mill, Mazomanie (3rd place)
- Best bed & breakfast inn – Walking Iron Bed & Breakfast, Mazomanie (1st place)
- Best bowling alley – Black Earth Lanes, Black Earth (1st place)
- Best restaurant & burger – Wall St Gallery & Bistro, Mazomanie (2nd place)
- Best community newspaper – News-Sickle-Arrow, Mazomanie (2nd place)
- Best fish fry – Bay 5 Diner, Mazomanie (2nd place)
- Best florist – B-Style Floral & Gifts, Mazomanie (1st place)
- Best grocery store – Carr Valley Cheese, Mazomanie (2nd place)
- Best hair salon – Cloud Nine Salon, Mazomanie (1st place)
- Best library – Mazomanie Free Library, Mazomanie (1st place)
- Best neighborhood bar – R&J's Saloon, Mazomanie (1st place)
- Best neighborhood bar – The Shack Bar & Grill, Black Earth (2nd place)

Sadly, after Mazo Beach received the First Place title in 2015, that was soon followed in the spring of 2016 by the total closure of the area "until further notice."

These are some of the reasons that so many view FOMB as an exemplary user group. I believe it would be hard to find any other user group that invests so much of itself being good land stewards of the place they love.

We ask that prior to voting for the proposed changes, that those voting take a closer look at the perceived and reported issues to determine the types and amounts of real issues that can be addressed thru optional management choices.

We believe you will find that there is little difference in illegal activity between the clothing-optional beach and other beaches and public lands. Thru open record requests over the years, we have found numerous examples of biased reporting. I will gladly share more information and proof of the truth behind these statements at any time. For the few real issues that need to be addressed, there are already laws to take care of such behavior. More laws are not necessary – especially poorly written ones that would probably not hold up in a court of law on many levels. I will gladly expound on the potential problems that could be created by the proposed changes as written if you are interested.

Please show all vested parties, both on and off the beach, the appropriate respect that they deserve. This can once again be a win-win situation for all involved as it had been in the past, if the DNR is willing to work with the user groups. There is plenty of sand to share if one utilizes a multi-user group land management plan as should be the case. Many beaches are successfully managed with textile and clothing-optional areas.

That is the way Mazo Beach was for many years. Historically the clothing-optional area was upstream from the textile area. After the major flood reconfigured the sandbar FOMB proposed moving downstream from the textile area and the DNR agreed. Then the beach location was at the end of a peninsula downstream from the textile beach with willows blocking the sight from the textile area. Only after DNR personnel started

	<p>approaching clothing-optional beach users on a regular basis telling them that it was legal to be nude anywhere (and FOMB had no right to restrict where they recreate) that some beach users started using the more convenient textile area as there were rarely textile users in the area since the beach area is over a mile walk from the parking lot.</p> <p>This poorly written proposal will certainly lead to unintended consequences and secondary effects that will not resolve the management issues, but will only lead to further problems and greater time and costs for the DNR and the state.</p> <p>The user group has had many years of good working respectful relationships with both land management and law enforcement personnel, and they look forward to the day that the DNR is willing to do so once more. The river belongs to everybody, and there is enough sand for all user groups to share once more. Any criminal activity can be addressed without displacing this large respectful user group of traditional skinny-dippers who have always been of great benefit to the beach and the surrounding area.</p> <p>Naturally, /s/ On behalf of myself, as well as Friends of Mazo Beach Naturist Action Committee Naturist Education Foundation</p>	
670	<p>I would like to share my thoughts and suggestions about the proposed rule change to possibly allow bow hunting at Lapham Peak Unit in the Southern Unit of the Kettle Moraine State Forest. Mixing hunters and nonhunters on public lands makes me uneasy, since I already see a lot of nonhunters in areas with active hunting seasons not wearing bright colors. And I also think about the horse that was shot by a bow hunter (who was never caught) on a horse trail in the Southern Unit in 2020. (See JS Online article and Horse shot by an arrow). Will shooting humans be next?? Allowing public bow hunting in a high, year-round usage parkland property in a metro area like Lapham Peak could be an accident waiting to happen during the 5.5 months of hunting (nearly a half-year). If there is an incident, publicity about it might even drive down Lapham Peak's visitor numbers and fee revenue. Lapham Peak is much busier than even the most popular state parks, I learned, when considering the size of the properties and the number of visitors. It is my understanding that the DNR does not currently restrict hunting in areas with high levels of visitor usage. Here are my calculations for visitor "density": -Devil's Lake State Park has about 10,000 acres (Wisconsin's largest state park) and nearly 3 million visitors each year. (I used 2.9M.) That's about 290 visitors per acre. -Peninsula State Park has 3,800 acres and had 1.2 million visitors in 2022. That's 316 visitors per acre. -Lapham Peak Unit has about 1,100 acres and 600,000 visitors a year. That's 545 visitors per acre. So Lapham Peak has 88% higher usage than Devil's Lake and 72% higher usage than Peninsula. There likely could be a safety issue here. And this makes me wonder whether hunters would even want to hunt in such a busy place where the human activity could easily spook the quarry. I understand the issue at Lapham Peak is the need to reduce the deer herd size to prevent starvation and the spread of diseases like CWD. And there have been four deer-vehicle hits very recently on County Road C that splits Lapham Peak. So doing nothing about the herd is not a sustainable option. I would like to suggest trying out several methods to reduce the herd that keep hunters and nonhunters separate. (Perhaps contacting the municipalities that have tried these options for further information could be helpful): -Sharpshooters—tried during Paul Sandgren's time (a former Southern Unit superintendent) but was not successful. Yet it has been very successful in the City of Brookfield. A city employee during the time of the sharpshooters said 225-250 deer were harvested a year. They used bait stations in city parks. -Deer contraceptives—have not been scientifically proven yet so my understanding is that the DNR will not use them. Perhaps there are newer forms of control to consider now. -Shut down the park to all but bow hunters on several consecutive mid-weekdays, or on early mornings during some weekdays. My understanding is that this has not been tried by the DNR elsewhere. -Shut down a section of the park (such as the whole area west of County Road C) for several days to all but bow hunters. -Hunting only from DNR-installed blinds or tree stands with advance signup—Could be offered during quieter, early-morning hours. Done currently in the City of Delafield by its Deer Management Committee. Info on its deer management program: 2018 program draft, also 2023 August agenda/revised program plan/other documents. -Hunting in areas without trails—unfortunately most of Lapham Peak is covered with multi-use trails. There's no big area with lower visitor usage, unlike the separate hunting area at the Pike Lake Unit. -Reroute trails to stay in the deed-restricted, no-hunting area, or add new shortcuts to remain in the deed-restricted areas during hunting seasons—I understand this would depend on the area topography and other factors. Thank you for your consideration of my thoughts and suggestions.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>

671	<p>As a longtime resident of Waukesha, and a frequent year round user of Lapham Peak for trail running, hiking, and snow shoeing, I'm adamantly opposed to the proposed change to s. NR 45.13(18), Wis. Admin. Code, which would allow the WDNR to designate areas where hunting deer and turkeys with archery equipment, but not with firearms or airguns, is allowed. As one of many that cherish Lapham Peak State Park for its diversity of terrain, flora and fauna, and as a safe bastion to explore and commune with nature, the introduction of hunting would significantly diminish such attributes. The proposed encroachment of hunting in close proximity to current recreational uses threatens the tranquility for and the safety of those engaged in such activities. In due consideration of such factors and the fact that there are numerous areas open for hunting, I urge you to maintain the sanctity of Lapham Peak State Park as an area where one can continue to visit year round without the stress and concern for personal safety, which would otherwise accompany the allowance of hunting.</p>	<p>The department has removed rule language which would have established that archery hunting is allowed for deer and turkey, in response to significant feedback received during the public comment period. The department will pursue a separate process to determine the most appropriate measures for managing deer and turkey populations at Lapham Peak State Forest.</p>
672	<p>This letter is in strong opposition to the DNR's proposed administrative rule Section 37 NR 45.04(3) establishing a prohibition of going nude in public on department managed lands and further defining nudity. In my many years of using DNR controlled properties for outdoor recreation, ie. hiking, biking, canoeing, etc., I have never considered nor encountered nudity on public lands. While I appreciate your protecting me from such behavior, I feel that as a woman I can make my own decisions and take appropriate actions should I encounter such activity. I resent being "babysat" by Department of Natural Resources officials while I am recreating outdoors. Should Senate bills 477 and 478 become law with up to a \$10,000 fine for violations, I doubt this statute will prevent males and possibly females from exposing their genitalia, however briefly, to relieve themselves when nature calls. I take further offense at the rule's verbiage prohibiting only females from exposing their areolas (except for breastfeeding) while shirtless men can wander the forests and lakes without fear of breaking the law. As a feminist I find this clause (exception) to be sexist gender discrimination. I am certain there are males whose breasts and areolas would be more offensive than mine when publicly exposed. Seriously, are male rangers going to be lurking in the forests with binoculars to see if I am going to drop my pants to relieve myself? For years I have heard that the DNR is shorthanded on personnel to carry out their mission of protecting Wisconsin's lands, so why are you adding one more burden on an understaffed department? Another solution in search of a problem!</p>	<p>The proposed rule language has been reviewed in light of public comments received on this topic. A decision has been made by the department to retain the language as proposed.</p>

**Appendix 2**  
**Registrants of the December 5, 2023 Public Hearing on PR-03-20**

First Name	Last Name	State of Residence	Authorized Representative (of another person or an organization)?	Position on PR-03-20	Indicated at time of registration they wished to make an oral statement	Attended hearing?	Provided oral testimony at hearing?
Samuel	Anderson	WI		Undecided	Yes	No	No
Stephen	Anderson	WI		Undecided	Yes	Yes	Yes
Judy	Aughey	WI		As interest may appear	No	No	No
Ethan	Becker	WI		Undecided	No	No	No
Joshua	Blum	WI		Undecided	Yes	No	No
Michael	Braund	WI		Undecided	Yes	Yes	Yes
Joel	Brennan	WI	Greater Milwaukee Committee - President	Undecided	Yes	Yes	Yes
Jon	Bush	WI	Star Prairie Fish and Game - President	Undecided	Yes	No	No
Bryce	Coppersmith	WI		Undecided	No	No	No
Jim	Dickey	WI		In opposition	No	Yes	No
Peter	Diotte	WI		Undecided	No	No	No
Judy	Dollhausen	WI	President, Friends of Havenwoods State Forest	In support	Yes	Yes	Yes
John	Eberhardy	WI		Undecided	No	No	No
Paul	Edmonds	WI		Undecided	No	Yes	No
Jeff	Epping	WI		Undecided	No	No	No
William	Erbstoesser	WI		Undecided	No	Yes	No
Susan	Gaeddert	WI	1000 Friends of Wisconsin	As interest may appear	No	No	No
James	Gillett	WI		Undecided	No	Yes	No
Sue	Greenway	WI		Undecided	No	Yes	No
Kris	Haibeck	WI		In opposition	Yes	Yes	Yes
Carmen	Hamm	WI		In opposition	No	Yes	No
John	Hillmer	WI	Friends of Lapham Peak, President	In opposition	Yes	Yes	Yes
Nicky	Hoffman	WI		In opposition	No	No	No
Yuliang	Hu	MI		In opposition	No	Yes	No
Jason	Jacobs	WI		Undecided	Yes	Yes	No
Joe	Janek	IL		Undecided	No	Yes	No
Carson	Johnson	WI		As interest may appear	No	No	No
Alexander	Knoebel	WI		Undecided	No	Yes	No
Claire	Koenig	WI	VISIT Milwaukee	In opposition	Yes	Yes	No
Mike	Konczal	WI		Undecided	No	Yes	No
Jeffrey	Kratowicz	WI		Undecided	No	No	No
Greg	Krueger	WI		In opposition	No	Yes	No
Jeff	Kuderski	WI	Polish Fest - Executive Director	In opposition	Yes	Yes	Yes

Jodie	Kuklinski	WI		Undecided	No	No	No
Marion	Lovell	WI	President Southwest Wi Izaak Walton League of America	In support	No	Yes	No
Teresa	Mercado	WI	Mexican Fiesta / Executive Director	In opposition	Yes	Yes	No
Molly	Modlinski	WI	Milwaukee Irish Fest	In opposition	No	Yes	No
Barb	Molash	WI		Undecided	No	Yes	No
Christine	Morton	TX		In opposition	No	No	No
Robert	Morton	TX		In opposition	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bryan	Much	WI	President, Wisconsin Off-Highway Motorcycle Association	As interest may appear	No	Yes	No
Evan	Nix	CA		In opposition	No	Yes	No
Sarah	Pancheri	WI	President, Milwaukee World Festival, Inc.	In opposition	Yes	Yes	Yes
Jeff	Pereles	WI	Camo Manito-wish YMCA CEO	In opposition	No	Yes	No
Alex	Peric	WI		Undecided	Yes	No	No
Jim	Plaisted	WI	Historic Third Ward Association	In opposition	No	Yes	No
Jolene	Plautz	WI		In opposition	Yes	Yes	Yes
Eric	Radue	WI	German Fest, President	In opposition	Yes	Yes	Yes
John	Rice	WI		Undecided	No	No	No
Claudette	Richards	WI		In opposition	No	Yes	No
Glenn	Rieker	WI		In support	No	No	No
Anne	Riendl	WI		Undecided	No	Yes	No
Anitra	Riley	WI	Black Arts Fest MKE	In opposition	No	No	No
Jon	Rohr	WI		Undecided	No	No	No
Mary	Schanning	WI	Milwaukee World Festival, Inc., General Counsel	In opposition	No	Yes	No
Luana	Schneider	WI	Wisconsin Coalition of Four Wheel Drives	Undecided	Yes	Yes	Yes
Alexander	Schuett	WI		Undecided	No	Yes	No
Erich	Schuttauf	FL	American Association for Nude Recreation	In opposition	Yes	No	Yes
Maxwell	Schuttauf	FL	American Association for Nude Recreation	In opposition	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wes	Shaver	WI	Milwaukee Pride, Inc. President & CEO	In opposition	Yes	Yes	No
Tim	Sheehan	WI		In opposition	No	Yes	No
Sydney	Shimko	WI		Undecided	No	No	No
Melissa	Smith	WI	Great Lakes Wildlife Alliance	In opposition	Yes	No	No
Laura	Vazquez	WI	Mexican Fiesta	In opposition	No	Yes	No
Peggy	Williams-Smith	WI	VISIT Milwaukee	In opposition	Yes	Yes	Yes
Michael	Wolfe	WI		Undecided	No	No	No