

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/22/2024 7:00:00 AM

First name: Craig

Last name: Nelson

Organization:

Title:

Comments: To: US Forest Service

From: Craig E. Nelson

Date: December 22, 2024

Subject: Integrated Management of Target Shooting on the Pike National Forest #57807 - Objection Addendum pursuant to 36 CFR 218, Subparts A and B.

Objector: Craig E. Nelson

Project: Integrated Management of Target Shooting on the Pike National Forest #57807

Responsible Official: Ryan Nehl, Forest and Grassland Supervisor

National Forest/Ranger District Where Project is Located: Pikes Peak, South Park, and South Platte Ranger Districts of the Pike-San Isabel National Forests & Cimarron and Comanche National Grasslands (PSICC). The project area stretches from Pikes Peak west of Colorado Springs, north and west to the US 285 corridor south and west of the Denver metropolitan area, and west to the Continental Divide outside of Fairplay, Colorado. The following counties are impacted: Clear Creek, Douglas, El Paso, Jefferson, Park and Teller.

Objector's Narrative:

I submitted my initial objection to the Integrated Management of Target Shooting on the Pike National Forest #57807 on November 21, 2024.

Following are my additional comments:

I feel the proposed ban on recreational shooting in the Pike National Forest as proposed by the USFS would contravene the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management and Recreation Act ([ldquo]Act[rdquo]) which, among other things, declared it a national policy that the USFS must consider hunting, fishing and recreational shooting as part of federal land, resource and travel management plans.

When balancing the public interest, the collective interest of recreational shooters in the project area significantly outweighs the perceived [ldquo]risks to public safety[rdquo] identified by the USFS. Accordingly, if the USFS gave proper weight to recreational shooting, as it is obligated to do under the Act, the USFS would not ban recreational shooting in the project area. To do otherwise would be a gross overreach of regulatory authority.

Thank you, again, for considering my objections and comments.