

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/27/2024 7:00:00 AM

First name: Russell

Last name: Zittlosen

Organization:

Title:

Comments: The attached letter is a followup to my earlier objection paper, posted Dec 4, 2024 in the Project Reading Room. It's purposes is to correct a formality and to simplify the language of my earlier, report format paper. The "report" is still valid and should be used as a reference to the attached letter.

The second document/report was submitted to Ms DeWoody between the Comment and Objection Periods. Since it was not posted as part of this project and contains valuable information in support of the dangers of the Turkey Tracks shooting range, I'm attaching it as an additional reference to the attached followup document.

Follow-up to my objection Posted on the Project Reading Room site December 4, 2024. This followup is to correct any Objection formalities that may exist in my earlier document and to offer a simpler narrative using my prior objection paper, and its references, as reference to this follow-up objection letter.

Lead Objector: Russell Zittlosen

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

Responsible Official: Ryan Nehl, Forest and Grassland Supervisor (prior posting had erroneously stated Jennifer DeWoody)

Summary Statement: The content of this paper only pertains to Turkey Tracks Shooting Range and is not to imply inferences to the other proposed sites. One of the ranges, Turkey Tracks, near the Teller and Douglas county border, is too dangerous to be considered or even to stay open. Some concerns of this decision are:

1. An estimated increase in the number of shooters to around 50,000 per year - about triple the current use.

1. An increase in wildfires with no practical plan to prevent them. As per the published Environmental Assessment (EA), the USFS denies a high risk of wildfires, even though they have admitted that there have been 81 wildfires at Turkey Tracks since inception, by far the most of any site in Colorado. There is no accounting for the 45+ mph winds frequently seen at the site. For the record, this site is the only proposed site in a designated [ldquo]High Risk[rdquo] Fireshed.

1. Several of the proposed shooting galleries are at the top of a ridge (the main site backstop), 400 ft. above the main ground level and aimed in the directions of neighboring Westcreek and Trout Creek. Expected increase in bullets entering these communities is very high, possibly 1000 or more rounds per year. Shooters will not see the communities beyond the next slightly higher backdrop/ridge so they will not know they are potentially shooting at residents. A gun aimed a mere 5 degrees above horizontal has the potential of bullets reaching private lands. Even today, with a much higher gun angle required, several stray bullets have been found in and near the two neighboring communities.

1. The EA denies a noise problem for residents, stating noise levels leaving the site are equivalent to a quiet library. With gunshots reaching 172 dB and testing done onsite, the stated results are questionable. Residents as far as 2.5 miles (as the bullet flies) from the site report loud impulse type sounds occurring nearly all day during heavy use. The sounds are louder than a [ldquo]quiet library[rdquo] at 2.5 miles distance. Noise is expected to increase dramatically with three times the number of shooters and about 20% of the shooters shooting towards populated communities.

1. No supervision is at the site now or planned for the future. Assumption is that all shooters will comply with the rules. Both TCSO and DCSO are expected to be the rules enforcers, but with no additional funding for extra patrols. DCSO is often 90 minutes out for each call.

1. Lead contamination will increase with an expected 5 million+ bullets fired per year. The whole lead contamination and required lead cleanup/recycling is little more than a brief mention and footnote in the project[rsquo]s Environmental Assessment. Lead is a RCRA metal and as such without a workable cleanup and recycling plan involving raking of bullets on steep 30% slopes, ravines, drainages and terraces on several hundred acres, this lead is considered [ldquo]hazardous waste[rdquo]. As the site stands today, it has a high likelihood of qualifying as a Superfund (SARA, CERCLA) site with an estimated over 10 million bullets fired to present.

1. The steep slopes and acidic soil present at Turkey Tracks enhance lead contamination entering surface and ground water. Any proposed cleanup plan will be cost prohibitive.

1. The Environmental Assessment considers the three-fold increase in traffic to the site to not be an issue. Consider hearing the occasional truck or motorcycle on SH67, Triple that! Consider the fairly frequent city driver, afraid of mountain roads, driving 45 mph in the 60 mph zone, Triple that! Also, not considered are the frequent deer and elk crossing the road, or worse yet, being spooked by incoming traffic and suddenly running across the road.

1. The 2009 shooting death at Rampart Range Shooting Range closed that range permanently, opening of Turkey Tracks being the apparent result of this closure. A July 2015 shooting death at Rainbow Falls campground, 1.5 miles distance, remains unresolved since the shooter was never identified. The victim was killed by a stray bullet while camping with his children and grandchildren. Whereas there's no evidence to indicate the bullet came from Turkey Tracks, the angle of the bullet and distance from Turkey Tracks makes it very possible. The proposed changes will not reduce the probability, quite the contrary, they will increase the probability of similar accidents.

As some folks in Westcreek have commented on Nextdoor, and I'm in agreement with, the Environmental

Assessment, required for a project like this, seems to have been written to justify expanding the Turkey

Tracks Range, not to accurately assess the prevailing conditions. For the EA to state a Finding of No Significant Impact is highly questionable considering the evidence to the contrary. My posted Dec. 2024 paper and the attached report (originally sent to Ms DeWoody around Sept. 25, 2024) present this evidence in more detail.

Dec. 27, 2024

Russell Zittlosen