

**1. Which ideas in each of the draft management approaches (options) do you feel strongly should be included in the Wisconsin Point Area Management Plan?**

Approach A	Approach B	Approach C	Approach D
This is the best approach	This is the worst approach! Abandon it! There should be no development!	This is the best approach.	Unnecessary expense.
Status Quo - keep the area as primitive as possible. Keep things as much as they currently are.	Bike trail is a possibility. Maybe picnic tables.	Preserve what can be preserved.	Respect the Indian burial grounds.
If possible to enact the public involvement in taking ownership. I believe the public would respond in tackling a lot of the known challenges - by giving the Tribe more ownership in the end of the Point they would take care of a lot of the challenges by themselves.	Costs too much money and giving up any control.	Way too many people and restrictions.	
	I do not want the DNR involved in any management like a State Park. The DNR should NOT be involved.	I prefer this approach with a blend of B & C.	
	Terrible plan!	Redirect human use and restore habitats to less degraded conditions. Needs restrooms. Spirituality and emotional impact of Point reason we and family use and consider WI Point the jewel of WI.	Less public use of sensitive areas should be primary!
Swimming beach.	Boardwalks.	Conserve Fon du Lac owned areas.	Emphasis on the harbor.
Failing in anything else being decided this approach may be safest.	Trying to use Wisconsin Point as a ??? Register is the wrong approach. The Point cannot support this approach in the long run and can cause problems to cultural resources more than what happens now.		Combining both C & D is the best approach since it will protect what we have and will keep it for our children as a treasure that we have enjoyed.
Keep substantial space open to the public (no heavy development, no private development)	Restrooms, waste management, new trails (biking!!) – connection to existing trails, camping.	Restoration in areas okay as long as it does not severely limit access to the public use of the beach area	Community connections, outdoor classrooms, some interpretive kiosks or combo visitor center/educational use, Emphasis on Harbor entry

Approach A	Approach B	Approach C	Approach D
Historically this approach has failed to protect the Point and develop its assets.	I feel strongly about the management authority being a State entity like the State Park System. I have always seen Big Bay State Park on Madeleine Island as a model for what Wisconsin Point could be. I think the limitations on access, the fee structure and potential for other sources of funding such as grants is a very good thing. I like the idea of enhancing the visitor experience and creating a marketable experience. Wisconsin Point could be a real attraction to the first time (or returning) visitor to Lake Superior and the Twin Ports.	I feel strongly about the protection of natural resources and restoration of habitat to a less degraded condition. I like the idea of creating boardwalks and redirecting human activities to protect sensitive areas.	I feel strongly about protecting and enhancing the cultural resources and assets of the Point. The history of the French and Indian families who lived there, the Ojibwe burial sites are important cultural assets worth protecting and respecting. I especially like the potential for intergovernmental cooperation—perhaps State and Tribal. Cultural ceremonies and observances could be part of the interpretive experience.
Preservation, maintaining bird habitat, funding to care for	Boardwalks, enhance visitor experience	More restrictive access, shore bird projects, desirable setting for research and education, off limits area, reduced facilities, boardwalks, habitat restoration	Identify resources present, increase knowledge base, formal designation, greater connection with community
Maintaining bird (and other natural) habitat, there should be trash bins, signs or other education to prompt users to value this special opportunity and resource, closure at night should be done for part of the point.	Not much to like with this plan except if the boardwalks were constructed to keep users out of sensitive vegetation, etc. Kiosks would be good along with other signs to highlight special features.	I mostly like this option however I realize the importance of allowing the public access so there will be an appreciation of this natural area and advocates for its protection (areas cordoned off for nesting birds need only be restricted for a short time).	I like increasing the knowledge base and fostering a greater connection with the community and also like the interpretive signage.
Include: preservation, bird habitat, impacts of climate change, funding, opportunities for research and education. Problems to be solved: pollution, invasive species, access to too much beach at night, TRASH!!!, lack of respect.	Include: connection on the North side of Moc. Mike Road to WI Point Road, small boardwalks to protect endangered plants, animals, kiosk??? Movable, seasonal 'kiosk' and displays like @ Hawk Ridge.	This option mirrors what WI Point is all about. Support almost all of this option. Great idea to consolidate parking, signage, restore habitat, etc. Like the idea of programs like the state parks - seasonal and outdoors.	This can be folded into 'C' very easily.

Approach A	Approach B	Approach C	Approach D
Approach A really would be a waste of all the time, effort and money put into this program. Thus to me is a no go.	Approach B-Recreation-based Management Approach-would be nice except the activities of building new trails, connecting to existing trails, boardwalks, camping area visitor centers would really not be feasible on the actual point due to it being a sandbar and any disturbance of the current ecosystem could end up destroying the whole. Again away from that area I believe these things may be an added benefit.	Approach C-Conservation-Preservation based Management Approach. I do like this approach for the area off of Peninsula Ave except for creating off-limit areas. I do believe there already are off-limit areas. Are you thinking about creating more? I definitely like the idea of creating educational signage throughout the whole project.	Approach D-Educational-Cultural Enhancement Management Approach. I also like this idea for the whole plan except again restricting access and monitoring activities. Would you restrict the area that is off of Peninsula Avenue?
Maintain the status quo, but maintain and do not expand current infrastructure, i.e. main roadway and public access areas. Prevent physical and biological impacts on the site.	Porta-Pit toilets would reduce human impact on site. To be placed at key access areas. Aggressive development would change the character of the point negatively.	This should be the 'primary' approach for managing and preserving the Points geological and biological character.	This approach can be met without any significant impact on the 'Points' natural character. It goes hand and hand with Approach C.
		I vote for approach C. It offers a compromise on improving the quality of the area but maintaining its natural beauty. If that one is not feasible, I would recommend leaving it the way it is but improve the road into the area.	

**2. Which ideas in each of the draft alternatives would you eliminate, or which alternatives would you eliminate entirely?**

Approach A	Approach B	Approach C	Approach D
This is the second best approach. More effort should be made to keep the area clean and litter free.	This is the WORST approach! Abandon it! Too expensive! Would destroy the naturalness of the area and draw too many people.	This is the best approach! Follow it as much as possible. Eradication of invasive species such as spotted knap weed and buckthorn is especially important.	Unnecessarily expensive.
	Eliminate entirely.	Eliminate entirely.	Too many restrictions...but besides 'A' this might be the next acceptable plan.
	NO STATE PARK OR DNR INVOLVEMENT!		

Approach A	Approach B	Approach C	Approach D
	<p>Strongly dislike this plan. Too much emphasis on over-development. Marking ideas??? Why should everything be about some developer making money? Have plenty of parks in the City that are managed. City has habit of planning trees and shrubs, etc. then cutting them down once they start growing. Really don't want City or County putting that means of control over the Point.</p>		
	All of them.	No boardwalks, designated trails.	
eliminate doing nothing different	Boating focus should be on kayak, canoe, small boat access, allowing the private sector to develop marinas and large boat access. If any large boat access is developed, it should be transient in nature, only.	not too many boardwalks that will eventually fall apart and be difficult to maintain, with only this approach public access would be too restrictive	May impose regulations that are too restrictive and inhibit public use and access too much. Needs to be a balanced approach.
Status Quo should be entirely eliminated as an alternative.	I would be cautious to keep the recreational activities limited to "low-impact" activities, like non-motorized activities such as birding, hiking, canoeing, kayaking, snowshoeing, photography, etc. I would not want to see 4-wheelers, snowmobiles or jet-skis on the Point. I would also be cautious not to over-develop the area. Keep development more inland and away from the fragile sand spit.	Too much restriction of access.	Too much restriction of access.
Eliminate status quo alternative	Expansion of trails, improved boat landings, camping area	All good	Emphasize harbor entry
I'm concerned that the designation of the point as 'open space' allows for mostly neglect.	I'm very cautious about building new trails. Boardwalks to connect the road to the beach are ok, but nothing winding through the dunes for bikes or blades.	A restriction on sensitive areas would also have to include an educational component so users will value and accept the off limits areas	There is an energy of renewal in the natural and wild nature of the Point. We want to use it, but don't want to lose it as primitive.

Approach A	Approach B	Approach C	Approach D
Address current concerns (see #1)	No tower! \$\$\$ and to see what??? No motorized recreation (get ATV's off the beach!). No roller blading trails or other urban sports. NOT what this area is about! No trails in sand dunes!	Would not support a permanent building! Too much money - too far from everything.	Does not favor any shipping/port emphasis; Duluth does this and does it well.
	Eliminate - this is not an appropriate goal for this land form.		

**3. List any important strategies, approaches, or elements that you feel have been missed or overlooked and should be considered in the general management plan.**

If the committee actually thinks of an 'A+' plan, I'm sure one can be implemented. Again, if you give City or groups more input, trails could be made and maintained.
I think you have looked comprehensively at the options
Don't overlook the potential for State/Tribal—or other intergovernmental--partnership in management authority.
What a rare treat to find a public place so wild and so close to Lake Superior so undeveloped and yet within a City. This place is a jewel, but it should be seen, used responsibly, appreciated and passed on to the next generation.
I do not support improving the road. This should not be an area where cars are driven at average or legal speeds. Do not cut down vegetation on sides of road - berries (Native Americans harvest them) and prime bird habitat! It is not necessary to put a bike trail on this road - it is just fine for slow cruising which is what you should be doing on the Point - not a racing area!
It is very important that the management plan be focused on the "preservation" of this site and only those infrastructural elements be done in such a way that they have minimal impact on the Point.

**4. Do you have any other comments or concerns you would like the steering committee to take into consideration?**

Leave areas as natural as possible.
How often does the committee go out there? Try a combination of A & D.
My concern is the boat launch that many duck hunters use every fall. Hopefully no restrictions on access.
Preservation of the history of the people who lived there.
I personally would like to see a blend of Recreational (60%), Conservation (20%), and Cultural (20%), and with that, I do not want the state to control that area, or any formal designation (WNDR/State Park/Recreation Area under State Authority). For the simple fact that the State is not to be trusted at all times. Along with the reason Why should we (the local authorities) wish to give up our control?

I am very concerned about the amount of crime that currently limits people's desire to use the area. Wi Point has a poor reputation in the Duluth/Superior area. I am concerned that Band-Aid approaches would be difficult to maintain and would not offer anything different than what you can find across the bridge, or up the shore. I am concerned that the city does not really have the funding to develop or maintain this resource. Perhaps capital funding drives could secure funding and interest in the management project – maybe some community members with resources would be willing to step up to the plate to support and donate to a plan that has some real excitement involved (and puts their names on the map somehow!). Or, maybe consideration of state park designation is needed to really manage this incredible resource appropriately. I think if people had to pay a fee to use the area, this would cut back on the criminal element. Perhaps a 24 hr. presence at the area would deter crime and mischief. State Park designation could give us a Park Ranger on site. Glad to know the ball has started rolling on a management plan, don't give up!

Wisconsin point is a beautiful place that offers natural beauty, abundant wildlife, local culture and history. It could—and should—make a very positive first impression to visitors to the area as it has so much to offer. Our management and stewardship of the point says a lot about who we are as a community.

Let me just say that I am a 30+ year resident of Superior, graduating from SSHS and UWS and a frequent visitor to Wisconsin Point. All year around, in all kinds of weather, the calming influence of the beach and the solitude it provides have been very valuable during some stressful life events, and also to just help unwind after a day at the office. I also enjoy taking photographs there. I really appreciate being able to drive 15 minutes and feel like I'm in a truly wild place. I've also hauled more than my share of garbage out of there, spending a good amount of time combing the beach for trash and hauling it home with me. From my perspective, the only changes I would make would be to: improve the road, bring back the dumpsters (I realize that people will dump garbage from home in them, but better there than along the road or on the beach. I remember seeing items like a burned-out box spring mattress on the beach.), increase police patrols, if feasible; perhaps install a few street lights? Other than that, I would advocate for keeping the Point as natural and wild as possible, instead of adding any kind of new development, aside from maybe some improvements to the boat landing on Allouez Bay. The Point sees a fair amount of traffic and use, but selfishly, what I appreciate most about it is being able to find solitude during a walk on the beach or an evening by a small campfire.

Though the plan is being developed locally, we should humbly remember that we are on an international body of water. The end plan should reflect that whatever is decided for the good of the local community in 2012 cannot be undone for the non-local community and future generations who have as much say as we do now. Thank you for all of your hard work!!!

I commend the committee for thinking of the Point within the context of wild nature, the human/natural heritage, the needs of the community and the fast approaching future.

Stick to what the Point is and what people love about it. Maintain it, fix the serious problems, add low impact improvements but don't change the character! Do not try to duplicate things already done well in Duluth. Nice summary, but not a well-designed comment form. People finding this confusing - and it is- will probably not fill it out - it was too long to fill out at the meeting - the 1st meeting gave everyone input. This "final" public meeting did not. What happens if you only get 10 responses? Will you base the entire plan on that? At the first meeting the responses were weighted with some receiving many more votes than others. In this document they are all presented as "equal" choices. Doesn't that negate the vies of the majority at the 1st meeting? VERY concerned about how this process could be manipulated to express the views of a few people with their own agenda - not the people who come to the two meetings.

I attended the meeting on April 30th. The people questioning at the meeting about the road and the garbage brought up two key areas that the locals want fixed and have been trying for years to bring up as important to them. The fact is that your committee has put in all this work on management plans that still does not fix these problems. Everyone I know wants those two things done. Mary Morgan stating that road funding isn't in the budget until 2014-2015 was extremely disappointing. My family and I do not want areas restricted unless a specific environmentally sensitive or endangered plant or animal is involved. Then fencing off areas and signage would be acceptable. Camping offsite is a nice idea. Increased signage to explain areas is a nice idea. Getting rid of a lot of the poison ivy would be nice. A visitor center off of the point would be nice. Protecting the Native American areas is important. Thank you.

My interest in this project is the Actual Wisconsin Point area. I know this project includes far more than the "Wisconsin Point" Peninsula of which is my concern. I appreciate being included in the process of this project, which is a very daunting undertaking. My question or comment is this. These approaches have to do with the entire area that is earmarked for this plan. Although some may work in one part of the plan area but not another. How can one comment on an entire approach which may be well and fine say for the area south of the Moccasin Mike Road but would not be viable for the land use off the Peninsula Road. Another question I have is: How does this affect the property owners. Will they be developing their own parcels to coincide with a united plan? Or will they end up losing control over their properties due to new regulations and restrictions. These are just a few comments I have. I am sorry I was unable to make it to the last open meeting. My health made it hard to attend. Again I do appreciate the effort your team has put into making this a viable plan. Although you will never please everyone I pray we don't destroy that which enhances our area. Thank you for listening.

Approaches A, C, D contain important and "preservation compatible" elements. Again, maintaining as much of the natural character of the Point will pay back the public better than monetary objectives and higher impact uses.