

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, March 11, 2026 12:50:17 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, March 11, 2026 1:24:58 PM
Time Spent: 00:34:40
IP Address: 65.131.202.140

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: Arlene Montgomery
City/Town: Swan Lake
State/Province: MT
Email Address: arlene@wildswan.org

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

As a resident of Swan Lake and a Montanan concerned about water quality I urge you to accept the petition and begin rulemaking. Swan Lake is listed on the DEQ's 303(d) list as water quality impaired due to excess particulate organic carbon (POC) loading and linkages to low dissolved oxygen conditions at the bottom of the lake. In 2004, a Water Quality Protection Plan and Total Maximum Daily Load allocation were completed to limit excess particulate organic carbon loading. There are linkages between POC, nutrient and sediment loading.

I was part of the watershed group that advocated for the current no wake zone to limit shoreline erosion. Since that time boats are bigger, motors are huge and their impacts are tremendous on this narrow lake. Increased sediment exacerbates the low dissolved oxygen conditions at the bottom of the lake. I fully support rulemaking to extend the no wake zone to 500 feet.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#2

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, March 13, 2026 8:52:05 AM
Last Modified: Friday, March 13, 2026 9:09:43 AM
Time Spent: 00:17:38
IP Address: 71.36.51.41

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: Keith Hammer
City/Town: Kalispell
State/Province: MT
Email Address: keith@swanview.org

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I was involved in advocating for the current no wake zone and I am now in support of expanding that zone to 500 feet. I support this petition for rule making. Boats, motors and wake-making abilities have grown much larger with time and must be limited or eliminated. Large wakes damage shorelines, disrupt the peace of those visiting and living along the lake (including wildlife), and contribute sediment and organic materials that are already creating low dissolved oxygen conditions at the bottom of the lake and have earned it a 303(d) "water quality impaired" rating from DEQ. This is an opportunity to set things right again.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#3

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, March 19, 2026 2:52:50 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, March 19, 2026 3:10:29 PM
Time Spent: 00:17:39
IP Address: 65.131.203.44

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: Anne Morley
City/Town: Swan Lake
State/Province: MT
Email Address: annetmorley@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

Very much in favor of this no wake zone for shoreline protection.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#4

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, March 19, 2026 3:11:02 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, March 19, 2026 3:13:13 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:10
IP Address: 65.131.203.44

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: Gregory Morley
City/Town: Swan Lake
State/Province: MT
Email Address: annetmorley@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

Definitely in favor of the no wake zone on Swan Lake - this is canoe country - not surf country!

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#5

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, March 23, 2026 1:32:46 PM
Last Modified: Monday, March 23, 2026 2:52:10 PM
Time Spent: 01:19:24
IP Address: 74.244.108.56

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Carrie Kintzler
City/Town:	Seeley Lake
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	carrie.blindmanmt@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

My name is Carrie Kintzler and I am a homeowner on Lake Inez, MT for the past 40 years. Lake Inez is part of a chain of lakes in the Swan Valley. I am supporting the petition being presented to the FWP Commission from the homeowners group, Sharing Swan Lake. As a homeowner on Inez Lake, I see the problems that have been created by the surf boats. Lake Inez is a 288 acre lake and half of the lake is less than 900 feet wide. Weekends will have 6-7 of the surf boats running at a time. They begin normally by 10 am and will run until dark. While the surf boats run, it limits who can use the lake. We have had our pontoon boat completely swamped, knocked a 70 year old man off his feet, knocked my experienced daughter off a paddleboard (which was close to shore), had surf waves come over the bow of our ski boat and I know most of my neighbors have complained of the same situations happening to them. So basically, none of the rest of the lake homeowners and campers can use the lake. We had to put our boats on boat lifts because of the damage that is being caused by the enormous waves putting our boats on top of our docks or into the banks. We have replaced our landing to our dock due to the erosion to the shoreline. Our shoreline has moved back at least 2-3 feet from where we started. The fishing used to be decent and now it doesn't seem to be. The lily pads are going wild and showing up in places that never had them before. The surf boats add thousands of pounds with their ballast to the back of their boats to create the huge wakes, plus have their passengers sit at the back of their boat for more weight to create an even bigger wake. This is a growing problem and there needs to be some kind of guidelines so everyone can use our Montana lakes. Lake Inez homeowners plan to petition the FWP Commission as well but are in the beginning stages of getting it submitted. I appreciate you allowing me to share my experiences with you as you consider the petition before you. Thank you, Carrie Kintzler

PO Box 643
Seeley Lake, MT 59868
carrie.blindmanmt@gmail.com
406-581-2607

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#6

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, March 24, 2026 9:02:58 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, March 24, 2026 9:09:51 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:52
IP Address: 97.133.31.84

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Dann Crist
City/Town:	Missoula
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	danncrist1@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I have uploaded a letter of support for the Swan Lake petition to initiate rule making.

Q3

Optional: Upload your comments

swan%20lake%20support%20letter.docx (14.6KB)

#7

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, March 25, 2026 10:18:12 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, March 25, 2026 10:23:08 AM
Time Spent: 00:04:56
IP Address: 216.14.231.10

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: Kevin Farron
City/Town: Missoula
State/Province: MT
Email Address: kevin@mtwf.org

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

On behalf of the Montana Wildlife Federation (MWF), Montana’s oldest and largest hunter and angler-based conservation group, please accept these comments in support of the Citizen Petition to Initiate Rulemaking re: the no-wake speed zone on Swan Lake.

We are sympathetic to the property owners who have initiated this process, and share their natural resource concerns. Swan Lake is home to eleven native fish species and offers productive angling opportunities for lake trout, Westslope Cutthroats and mountain whitefish, plus non-native species like Kokanee, yellow perch and northern pike, among others. The water body is also an important habitat for threatened Bull Trout.

It’s also a destination for motorized watercraft. Motor boats, specifically heavily weighted wakesurf and wakeboard boats specifically designed with ballasts to create the largest wake possible, are increasing in popularity and use. Due to this new era of watercraft, the no-wake speed zone that currently applies to 200 feet from the shoreline may no longer be sufficient to address resource, safety, and property damage concerns near shore. Hence the reasonable request to expand this no-wake speed zone to a distance of 500 feet from the shoreline.

As with our federal public lands that are managed under the multiple-use mandate, we must understand that not all uses are to be - or should be - permitted on all acres. In terms of our shared, public waterways, we can and should apply this same logic when setting recreational use regulations to ensure that all users - swimmers, anglers, sailors, and kayakers can enjoy Swan Lake at the same time as wakeboarders and wakesurfers.

Therefore, we ask that the Commission approve the petition and initiate rulemaking to amend the no wake speed zone on Swan Lake. Let’s keep this conversation going.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#8

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, March 25, 2026 10:28:41 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, March 25, 2026 10:54:02 AM
Time Spent: 00:25:20
IP Address: 97.121.192.232

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: sam campbell
City/Town: swan lake
State/Province: MT
Email Address: csamsplace@aol.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

To who it may concern, Of all the people who live on Swan Lake, it seems unreasonable that ten or20 or 30 people want to bring change to our Montana way of life. Are these people new to Montana? Spending the summers on Swan,even on july 4th., its hard pressed to see more than 20 or 30 boats. Most of the time 5 to 10. It seems to me after being on Swan for 26 years, that this whole ordeal is being pushed by a few to influence the many. Does this behavior have anything to do with the influx of out of staters moving into Montana? Lets keep Montana-- Montana. Yours truly, Sam Campbell of The Terrace Supper Club on Swan Lake

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#9

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, March 25, 2026 11:56:43 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, March 26, 2026 12:02:21 AM
Time Spent: 00:05:38
IP Address: 76.105.225.19

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Libby Langston
City/Town:	Missoula
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	libbylan61@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I believe it's essential to increase the wake zone at Swan Lake to protect the shore from erosion, negative impacts on fish, wildlife & aquatic species. The homeowners also deserve a calm and safe area near the shore.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#10

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, March 26, 2026 11:59:54 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, March 26, 2026 12:30:24 PM
Time Spent: 00:30:29
IP Address: 69.146.223.194

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Brett Haverlandt
City/Town:	Bigfork
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	brettotto406@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I strongly OPPOSE the petition to restrict wake boats on Swan Lake. As a Swan Lake resident for over 20 years, I can assure you that this is one of the least used lakes in Montana! The handful of petitioners do NOT represent the majority of lakefront homeowners! The petition makes several UNFOUNDED accusations without a shred of evidence. There is NO evidence of lake shore deterioration...in fact, most of the shoreline is rock. There is no evidence that ballast systems promote invasive species. In fact, most wakeboats are a newer style of watercraft that basically eliminate any harmful effects on lakes. I strongly urge you to NOT allow a few individuals to restrict the responsible enjoyment of Swan Lake for the other 300 who live along this slice of paradise!

Thank you.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#11

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, March 26, 2026 1:05:33 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, March 26, 2026 1:13:46 PM
Time Spent: 00:08:12
IP Address: 174.234.1.13

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: Michael dube
City/Town: Great falls
State/Province: MT
Email Address: micad@benefis.org

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I am completely against these proposals. To concentrate this activity in one area is poorly thought out. I live at the north end of the lake and that is a 9 mile drive by boat. Compared to other lakes such as Seeley or whitefish. Our traffic is minimal and the impact is minor. This would negatively affect our property values and our family experience on the lake. I have been on the lake for 21 years and surfing boats are not a problem

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#12

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, March 26, 2026 1:32:01 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, March 26, 2026 2:11:47 PM
Time Spent: 00:39:45
IP Address: 47.47.167.162

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Jeff Walla
City/Town:	Kalispell
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	genesis81@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I am a licensed engineer in the State of Montana and also spend a great deal of time at my sister's cabin on Swan Lake. I'm very familiar with Swan Lake and the nature of recreational uses that occur on the lake. I'm also familiar with the nature of the shoreline and with the area geology along the banks of the lake. The first issue I take from the information provided by the proponents of this petition is citing studies from lakes in Michigan, Minnesota, and Connecticut. These studies are from completely different areas of the country with significantly different aquatic environment and lakes with completely different geology. Most of the shoreline of Swan Lake consists of course sand to small cobble and rock outcroppings. Having directly witnessed the activity of wake boats for several years on this lake, I do not see any evidence suggesting negative impacts are occurring to the shoreline. Most wake boaters try to reasonably follow the current restrictions that are in place and maintain sufficient distance from the shoreline. I don't have any expertise on potential impacts to aquatic life however. A second issue that I see with additional restrictions to wake board activity on the lake is how it might impact this very popular recreational use. Swan Lake is a narrow, long lake in most locations and further restrictions on wake limitations could completely eliminate this recreational activity on Swan Lake. Many property owners on Swan Lake own wake boats and may have purchased their property for that recreational purpose. Any additional restrictions could severely limit or completely prohibit wake activities which would create a hardship on existing property owners who value this recreational use. I do not support this petition for additional wake restrictions on Swan Lake.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#13

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, March 26, 2026 12:49:14 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, March 26, 2026 2:42:14 PM
Time Spent: 01:52:59
IP Address: 72.174.202.56

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Jacob Andersen
City/Town:	Kalispell
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	jacob.andersen@launchwatersports.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

Please see my uploaded commentary and do not initiate rulemaking.

Q3

Optional: Upload your comments

Commentary%20on%20Citizen%20Petition%20to%20Initiate%20Rulemaking%20-%20Swan%20Lake%203.2026.pdf
(118.7KB)

#14

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, March 26, 2026 4:26:05 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, March 26, 2026 6:11:39 PM
Time Spent: 01:45:34
IP Address: 184.179.238.42

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	David Lee
City/Town:	Swan Lake
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	montanalees@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

See attached pdf file

Q3

Optional: Upload your comments

Swan%20Leke%20boating%20restrictions%20-%20pdf.pdf (33.1KB)

#15

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, March 27, 2026 9:42:08 AM
Last Modified: Friday, March 27, 2026 9:48:24 AM
Time Spent: 00:06:16
IP Address: 69.144.74.107

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: Roger Davis
City/Town: Helena
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

We are a Montana Family that enjoys all the wonderful lakes in Montana for boating recreation. We are very responsible boaters and teaching our kids the value responsibility of boating and recreating on lakes in Montana. We strongly oppose expanding the no-wake zone to 500 feet. We don't believe there is enough Montana specific evidence to justify this change. We own property on the lake and see wakes from boats hitting our shore all year and see no evidence of increase damage to the shore line. Decreasing the amount of the lake will create more congestion in the center of the lakes which will create more conflict with boats and people in the lake and safety for all users will be compromised.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#16

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, March 27, 2026 9:36:19 AM
Last Modified: Friday, March 27, 2026 10:06:43 AM
Time Spent: 00:30:23
IP Address: 69.144.3.82

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: Greg Dennee
City/Town: Bigfork
State/Province: MT
Email Address: gdennee@jlagroup.net

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

Hello Fish and Wildlife Commission-
This comment is in response to the Citizen Petition to Initiate Rulemaking on Swan Lake.

I am a resident at Swan Lake as well as a wakesurf boat owner. My family has been safely and respectfully using a surf boat for the last ten years. We also fish, paddleboard, swim and enjoy the scenic beauty and serenity of Swan Lake.

The proposed petition to increase the no wake zone from 200 feet to 500 feet ignores the unique character of Swan Lake. Large sections of the lake are an undeveloped, rocky/barren shoreline. These areas are the safest spots to use a boat with the least amount of impact on the shoreline, docks, and other lake users. To push boats to the center of the already narrow Swan Lake creates an unsafe traffic conflict.

Responsible wake surf boat users control their wake within reason and are respectful of docks and property. The additional distance creates an awkward and unenforceable boating pattern on a unique body of water.

Our family encourages the Commission to deny the petition and ask the petitioners to “share Swan Lake.”

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#17

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, March 27, 2026 10:40:56 AM
Last Modified: Friday, March 27, 2026 10:41:51 AM
Time Spent: 00:00:54
IP Address: 72.174.202.56

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Logan Troester
City/Town:	Kalispell
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	logan.j.troester@wmich.edu

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

No, absolutely not. Wakesurfing is not a crime.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#18

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, March 27, 2026 10:51:31 AM
Last Modified: Friday, March 27, 2026 10:57:29 AM
Time Spent: 00:05:57
IP Address: 209.52.88.83

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: R James
City/Town: Bigfork
State/Province: MT
Email Address: rjames@suncoastenclosures.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I oppose expanding the no-wake zone to 500 feet
I support responsible boating and existing regulations
I do not believe there is enough Montana-specific evidence to justify this change

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#19

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, March 27, 2026 10:54:02 AM
Last Modified: Friday, March 27, 2026 11:20:40 AM
Time Spent: 00:26:38
IP Address: 208.70.12.235

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: Sean Eisenhauer
City/Town: Great Falls
State/Province: MT
Email Address: seisenhauern2460a@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I disagree with expansion of no-wake zone to 500 feet from shore, that's almost 200 yards. This would make many areas with shoreline under 1000 feet apart unusable to boats.

Existing regulations for responsible boating are already in place and effective.

There is not enough evidence that montana lakes need this change. It is an infringement on the use of public waterways for the benefit of rich landowners with shorefront property.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#20

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, March 27, 2026 11:27:21 AM
Last Modified: Friday, March 27, 2026 11:30:27 AM
Time Spent: 00:03:05
IP Address: 174.198.134.222

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Brian Glenn
City/Town:	Corvallis
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	Glennconst@msn.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I oppose the extension of the proposed wakeless zones.

Limiting access is a dangerous precedent.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#21

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, March 27, 2026 11:32:44 AM
Last Modified: Friday, March 27, 2026 11:45:02 AM
Time Spent: 00:12:18
IP Address: 142.59.71.104

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Ryan James
City/Town:	Bigfork
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	ryantjames@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

To whom it may concern, I am a property owner and boat owner In Montana. With a large family and many friends, we thoroughly enjoy boating on Montana lakes. We are responsible boaters, and we respect the rules and other boaters on the lakes. We oppose any rules that would change the no-wake zone from 200 to 500 feet. We do not believe there is enough Montana specific evidence for this to support any changes in Montana. Respectfully Ryan James.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#22

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, March 27, 2026 1:07:46 PM
Last Modified: Friday, March 27, 2026 1:17:17 PM
Time Spent: 00:09:30
IP Address: 98.127.109.225

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Brad Longcake
City/Town:	Clancy
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	bradlongcake@longcakeconsulting.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

Please see attached letter on behalf of the National Marine Manufacturers Association

Q3

Optional: Upload your comments

Swan%20Lake%20Letter%203.26.26%20final..docx (9KB)

#23

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, March 27, 2026 3:08:23 PM
Last Modified: Friday, March 27, 2026 3:13:17 PM
Time Spent: 00:04:53
IP Address: 72.250.179.106

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Jarrod Kramer
City/Town:	Kalispell
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	nitetrucker@hotmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I agree wake boat should be moved out to 500 feet. The size of the wave they produce does not dissipate in 200 feet and slams shore lines. Wake boat need to be more in the middle of the lake> I feel this should happen on all the lakes around the state

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#24

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, March 27, 2026 3:24:10 PM
Last Modified: Friday, March 27, 2026 3:31:08 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:58
IP Address: 184.167.195.147

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: Andrew
City/Town: Missoula
State/Province: MT
Email Address: hyman989@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

There has been no proof by the people of swan lake of the amount of boats, waves and impacts they are seeing. Everyone has the same rules of 200 feet and if you were to subject wakeboats the same must be said for any big cabin cruiser. Additionally the documents provided don't refer to swam lake. The lake design, style and how it used and depth chart along with the bottom of the lake could be far different then the ones in Minnesota and Michigan where the data is pulled from. There has been no proof wakeboard boats vs any other boat like a regal cabin cruiser cause any more "waves" then other boats doing the same speed. When you add equal weight and prove the impacts then the fish and wildlife should take a clean look however until then there is no proof of this impacts to swan lake.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#25

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, March 27, 2026 3:09:32 PM
Last Modified: Friday, March 27, 2026 3:48:29 PM
Time Spent: 00:38:57
IP Address: 63.239.65.162

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Bryan Hall
City/Town:	Bozeman
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	bryan.hall1003@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

Good Afternoon,

My family and I are property owners on the SE end of Swan Lake. We purchased our cabin in 2017 and have loved all seasons on Swan Lake since. I read the article that was printed in the Missoulian and Independent Record regarding wake zones on Swan Lake.

I adamantly support any measure that promote responsible boating. I want to recreate on a safe lake for all water enthusiasts. And I respect the job that MT Fish & Wildlife Commission must perform to protect and regulate Montana's natural resources.

I believe that this specific decision should be made from actual data from Swan Lake, not the data that was cited by the group, Share Swan Lake. Expanding the no-wake zone without such data would unnecessarily restrict lake access and recreation without clear evidence that the current 150ft no-wake zone is insufficient.

Lakes are shared public spaces used for boating, fishing, water sports and wildlife enjoyment. The group named Share Swan Lake is trying to limit this shared public resource by prioritizing one group of recreators over another with an argument that lacks: insufficient data and evidence, a silent argument on the inevitable increased danger in navigating a smaller water zone, disregard for the recreational access that property owners expect to enjoy, and negative economic ties to businesses who provide goods and services to boating enthusiasts.

Before we upset the balance of all recreationists on Swan Lake, I would ask the commission to consider real data derived from Swan Lake as it pertains to any measurable shoreline damage beyond natural variation from the current 150 foot no-wake zone, a study of increased boating accidents if the no-wake zone were increased to 500ft adding to congestion, and if the water quality of Swan Lake has been degraded due to wake activity from the current 150 foot zone.

Thank you for your time in reading my comments.

Sincerely,

Bryan Hall

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#26

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, March 27, 2026 6:29:32 PM
Last Modified: Friday, March 27, 2026 6:30:47 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:15
IP Address: 174.45.122.79

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Jason Widaman
City/Town:	Missoula
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	jason.widaman@yahoo.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I oppose the proposed amendment to ARM 12.11.3106 because it imposes a broad, restrictive no-wake zone (500 feet from shoreline) that is not supported by Swan Lake-specific data, unfairly targets one user group, and ignores more effective, balanced management solutions.

The proposed rule applies a blanket 500-foot no-wake zone across the entire lake, regardless of:

- Water depth
- Operator behavior
- Actual impact conditions

The problem is not wake boats themselves—it is improper operation (too close to shore or in shallow water).

A rule that restricts everyone instead of targeting misuse is inefficient and excessive.

The petition relies on studies from:

- Michigan
- Minnesota (St. Anthony Falls Lab)
- Connecticut (Lake Waramaug)

These are not Swan Lake. Lakes vary significantly in:

- Depth
- Fetch (wind-driven wave energy)
- Shoreline composition
- Usage patterns

Policy should be based on localized, measurable impacts, not generalized findings from dissimilar water bodies.

There is no clear evidence presented that:

- Wake boats are the primary driver of shoreline damage on Swan Lake
- A 500-foot rule is necessary or proportional

On many lakes—including Swan Lake—imposing a 500-foot no-wake buffer around the entire shoreline would:

- Remove a significant portion of usable water
- Make wakesurfing impractical or impossible

This is not a “control” measure—it is a de facto ban on a specific recreational activity.

Public waters should remain accessible to multiple user groups, not managed to exclude one.

Thank you for your time

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#27

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, March 27, 2026 6:53:00 PM
Last Modified: Friday, March 27, 2026 7:01:05 PM
Time Spent: 00:08:05
IP Address: 98.127.243.164

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: mark vatcher
City/Town: bigfork
State/Province: MT
Email Address: bigforkmv@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I support this rule as it will allow peaceful fishing (including trolling at no-wake speeds) within the no-wake zone without being buffeted by waves and fast traffic.
I don't own waterfront property, I do fish, and can easily 'go fast' outside the no-wake zone to get to my chosen location then go slow to reach the desired distance closer to shore.....respects.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#28

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, March 26, 2026 12:50:16 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, March 28, 2026 8:01:05 AM
Time Spent: Over a day
IP Address: 98.127.229.160

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Braylen Sykes
City/Town:	Great Falls
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	braylen.sykes@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I am writing in strong opposition to the proposed amendment to ARM 12.11.3106 that would expand the no-wake zone on Swan Lake from 200 feet to 500 feet from shoreline.

This proposal is unreasonable given the physical characteristics of Swan Lake. As a long and relatively narrow lake, expanding the no-wake zone to 500 feet on both sides would, in many areas, leave only a narrow strip of usable water. This would force boaters into a confined corridor, increasing congestion and creating new safety risks, while severely limiting the ability of the public to use the lake as intended.

This petition is being driven by a very small group of shoreline property owners. While their concerns deserve to be heard, they do not have the right to fundamentally restrict access to a public waterway used by thousands of Montanans and visitors each year. Swan Lake is a public resource, not a private amenity, and regulations must reflect the interests of all users—not just a handful of individuals.

The petition also relies on exaggerated and misleading claims regarding wake boats. The assertion that these boats routinely generate damaging “3-foot waves” near shore ignores how these boats are actually designed and operated. Wake boats produce their largest wakes when operating at specific speeds and in deeper water, typically well away from shore. When operated responsibly and in compliance with existing no-wake regulations, their impact near shore is no different than other motorized watercraft.

Furthermore, the petition acknowledges that some operators already act responsibly. Expanding the no-wake zone to 500 feet will not change the behavior of those who currently disregard the rules. Instead, it will disproportionately impact responsible boaters who are already following existing regulations.

The studies referenced in the petition are broad and not specific to Swan Lake. Before imposing sweeping restrictions that would significantly reduce recreational access, there should be clear, localized evidence demonstrating that current regulations are inadequate. That standard has not been met.

A more effective and balanced approach would be to focus on education and enforcement of existing rules rather than implementing unnecessary and overly restrictive changes.

For these reasons, I strongly urge Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks and the Commission to reject this proposal and preserve fair and reasonable access to Swan Lake for all users.

Thank you for your consideration.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#29

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, March 28, 2026 10:55:44 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, March 28, 2026 10:58:09 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:25
IP Address: 206.127.121.238

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: April
State/Province: MT
Email Address: aprilandtraviscampbell@yahoo.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I oppose the proposed expansion of the no-wake zone on Swan Lake. This change lacks clear Montana-specific data and would unnecessarily restrict responsible recreational use.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#30

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, March 28, 2026 11:38:08 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, March 28, 2026 11:42:47 AM
Time Spent: 00:04:39
IP Address: 72.175.76.208

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: Jean Elizabeth Faure
City/Town: Great Falls
State/Province: MT
Email Address: jean@fhht.law

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

Please vote DENY the petition to expand the no-wake zone.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#31

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, March 28, 2026 12:06:06 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, March 28, 2026 12:12:19 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:13
IP Address: 12.75.204.28

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Tysen jorgensen
City/Town:	Butte
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	tysen.jorgensen@yahoo.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I oppose the decision to move the no wake zone from 200 to 500 feet. The rules that are in place have proved to be working. Just because people who choose to live on the lake don't like wake boats doesn't mean they should have the decision to take away our room to have fun on the water. They don't own the water.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#32

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, March 28, 2026 12:42:28 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, March 28, 2026 12:51:04 PM
Time Spent: 00:08:36
IP Address: 174.225.196.202

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Scott Bruner
City/Town:	Kalispell
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	scott@swankenterprises.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I have property on Swan Lake and I do not support this Petition.
Leave the 200' rule as is.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#33

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, March 28, 2026 12:59:25 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, March 28, 2026 1:05:50 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:24
IP Address: 172.110.140.5

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: Tyson schmity
City/Town: Sidney
State/Province: MT
Email Address: taz378@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

Changing rules like this will create a domino effect eventually ruling over all Montana waters. For some of us boating a water activities is our way of getting family together for weekends. There is many things people can do to help cabins on lakesides and lakeside cabin owners can take preventative measures if they really think stuff like wake surfing is affecting there shore. Natural waves crash into shore all day and have never been an issue. Is there any evidence of increased erosion rates simply from wake boats? Put out a message for wake boat owners to take into consideration of the shorelines and make it a conscious thought in each boat drivers mind. No reason to create laws in which will ruin the enjoyment of getting out in the water and spending quality time with friends and family.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#34

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, March 28, 2026 1:12:04 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, March 28, 2026 1:17:40 PM
Time Spent: 00:05:36
IP Address: 67.182.138.219

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Rod Quesnel
City/Town:	Swan Lake
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	rodq@wavecable.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I am all in favor of a 500 foot restriction. My only other comment is there are areas on the lake where there is no residence that this wouldn't need to apply to basically federal lands.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#35

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, March 28, 2026 1:12:03 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, March 28, 2026 1:19:22 PM
Time Spent: 00:07:19
IP Address: 174.252.185.217

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: Brian LaForest
City/Town: Missoula
State/Province: MT
Email Address: brib18@yahoo.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I oppose expanding the no wake zone.
I support responsible boating and existing regulation.
There is not enough montana specific or mt lake specific evidence to support making this change.
The proposed changes seem targeted and one sided.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#36

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, March 28, 2026 1:32:38 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, March 28, 2026 1:36:02 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:23
IP Address: 69.145.81.18

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: Elijah Arnlund
City/Town: Bigfork
State/Province: MT
Email Address: earnlund@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

This is ridiculous. A 500 ft no wake zone would shrink the usable size of that lake down to almost nothing. Especially on the north end of the lake. It doesn't make much sense. Taking away usage from people inhibits usage not expands it.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#37

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, March 28, 2026 3:55:44 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, March 28, 2026 4:03:59 PM
Time Spent: 00:08:14
IP Address: 107.115.213.40

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: Erica Quesnel
City/Town: Swan Lake
State/Province: MT
Email Address: ericaquesnel@hotmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

My family has had a cabin on Swan Lake since 1934. We live on a very narrow part of the center of the lake on Ross Point and wakeboats go by very close and cause damage to our dock and our boats. I support a 500 foot distance from the shore. Although if there is currently a 200 foot distance rule, it is not ever enforced. People come way too close for safety. I hope that the rules could be enforced.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#38

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, March 28, 2026 5:59:45 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, March 28, 2026 6:01:58 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:13
IP Address: 35.134.200.2

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: Cole Browning
City/Town: Kalispell
State/Province: MT
Email Address: cbrowning123@live.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

Do not change the "no wake" zone. 200' is adequate, do not allow this to set a precedent across the state, having different zones. They all need to be consistent and uniform across the the state, and it needs to stay at 200'

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#39

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, March 28, 2026 6:30:00 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, March 28, 2026 6:33:48 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:47
IP Address: 72.250.177.3

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Brian Spencer
City/Town:	Kalispell
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	bmspencer21@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I disagree with extending the no wake zone to 500 ft. There is no current MT evidence to support doing this. The current wake zone of 200 ft is appropriate for safe boating and protection of waterfront property.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#40

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, March 28, 2026 6:30:26 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, March 28, 2026 6:40:44 PM
Time Spent: 00:10:17
IP Address: 174.255.178.204

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Steve Spencer
City/Town:	Great Falls
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	sjspencerdds@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I'm a property owner on Echo Lake. A similar petition came up on our lake as is being done on Sean Lake. There is nothing that substantiates moving the no wake zone from 200 ft to 500ft. These are small lakes and it unfairly an unnecessarily imposes restriction on boaters. This was defeated on Echo Lake for these very reason. Please do the same on Swan Lake.

Thank you for your consideration

Steve Spencer.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#41

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, March 28, 2026 9:41:49 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, March 28, 2026 9:45:07 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:18
IP Address: 98.36.51.175

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Charles Kambourian
City/Town:	Billings
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	ckambourian@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I do not support this measure. No rules making on Swan please.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#42

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, March 28, 2026 10:25:50 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, March 28, 2026 10:30:16 PM
Time Spent: 00:04:26
IP Address: 184.166.42.236

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Daniel Gaugler
City/Town:	Bozeman
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	dgaugler@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I oppose this petition. There are already rules of in place and there is no evidence of damage when those rules are followed. Thank you.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#43

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, March 29, 2026 5:40:48 AM
Last Modified: Sunday, March 29, 2026 5:51:44 AM
Time Spent: 00:10:56
IP Address: 97.179.42.35

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: Kyle lindley
City/Town: 4 corners
State/Province: MT
Email Address: klindley209@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

The rules should stay the same as there is not enough research on this subject yet. There should be alternatives to moving the no wake zone like educating boaters with signs and education so they will comply with these rules with out enforcement or changes. All boats are capable of big wakes at certain speeds and it has been that way since boats were on the water. Education is key. Don't change the rules do a better job of letting boaters know.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#44

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, March 29, 2026 2:52:14 AM
Last Modified: Sunday, March 29, 2026 8:26:49 AM
Time Spent: 05:34:34
IP Address: 74.244.108.92

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Mark & Elaine Taylor
City/Town:	Bigfork
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	mark@taylorluthergroup.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

Pdf of letter provided.

Q3

Optional: Upload your comments

Swan%20Lake%20Petition%20Letter%20-%20Taylor.pdf (109.9KB)

#45

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, March 29, 2026 11:33:33 AM
Last Modified: Sunday, March 29, 2026 11:36:37 AM
Time Spent: 00:03:04
IP Address: 174.198.132.28

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: Karen Kropp
City/Town: Bigfork
State/Province: MT
Email Address: harte14@yahoo.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I do not agree with boating restrictions on Swan Lake. Our summer season is short and everyone on the lake should be able to enjoy all the boating activities.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#46

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, March 27, 2026 6:56:13 AM
Last Modified: Sunday, March 29, 2026 12:18:21 PM
Time Spent: Over a day
IP Address: 73.94.228.206

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: John Elizandro, Water Sports Industry Association
City/Town: Saint Paul
State/Province: MN
Email Address: john@wsia.net

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

Our written comments and some supporting documentation are attached and we plan to join the April meeting virtually to answer any questions Commission members may have. Thank you!

Q3

Optional: Upload your comments

2026.3.29%20WSIA%20Submission.pdf (4MB)

#47

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, March 29, 2026 1:43:14 PM
Last Modified: Sunday, March 29, 2026 1:47:00 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:46
IP Address: 129.222.71.37

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Julie & Dirk Sandefur
City/Town:	Swan Lake
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	dms2769@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

See Uploaded Written Objection (.pdf)

Q3

Optional: Upload your comments

Swan%20Lake%20WakeBoat%20Petition%20Objection%20(Sandefur).pdf (525.3KB)

#48

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, March 29, 2026 4:55:31 PM
Last Modified: Sunday, March 29, 2026 5:02:53 PM
Time Spent: 00:07:22
IP Address: 47.37.41.222

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name: Mac Regan
City/Town: Butte
State/Province: MT
Email Address: mac@reganfinancialservices.com

Q2

Please comment on Rulemaking - Citizen Petition, Swan Lake

I am against this rule as I believe boating is a part of the use on swan lake and other Montana lakes. I believe this is just a first step in trying to control motorized watercraft. How would it ever be enforced? That would be impossible.. The current rule of 100 feet is more than sufficient. I believe when individuals try to change things for their personal good and limit others who don't have the money to afford a lake home that's a problem. This precedent would soon be applied to other smaller lakes which would restrict use. For example a lake the size of Lake Mary Ronan would most likely eliminate boat traffic entirely. I am strongly against this rule change.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments