

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/30/2021 11:47:46 PM

First name: Carol

Last name: Beckman

Organization:

Title:

Comments: On Table 1, pages 6 and 7:

Potential locations for designated target shooting sites:

Designated target shooting sites should be in locations that are already popular for shooting. These areas are already disturbed, so putting a shooting range there avoids disturbing another area. More importantly, shooters are already accustomed to going there, so it would be easier to direct shooters to the developed site, rather than continuing to shoot where they have been.

On page 6:

The proposed designated shooting site at 376.A is not a good location for a designated site. It is too close to Ring the Peak. Ring the Peak currently ends on 379 at 376. But the plan, which involved Forest Service, for completing Ring the Peak through the southwest gap in the Ring envisions a trail continuing west from 379 and 376. Obviously, further planning and work, not the least of which is requirements under NEPA, are needed. But a shooting range here unduly constrains possibilities for continuing the Ring. Also, once a trail for Ring the Peak west of 376 is developed, the area will become much more popular for hiking and biking. 376 also has quite a bit of dispersed camping and OHV use. The area also gets traffic to South Slope, both CS Utilities staff and recreational users.

Further, the table indicates that shooting use in this area is currently low, so a shooting range would be unnecessary disturbance.

Overall, the 376 site is not a good location for a designated shooting range.

On page 9:

In the list of areas determined to be inappropriate for target shooting, the distance from a Forest Service road should be at least 1/4 mile for all types of roads, and the distance from a trail should be at least 1/4 mile for all trails.

Given the range of some guns, 150 yards is just not enough distance for safety.

Whether a trail is highly visible or not, people could be on the trail.

Shooters should know where they are in the forest and should know their surroundings, so requiring shooters to be at least 1/4 mile from all system trails and roads is not an undue burden. Increasing the distance from 150 yards to 1/4 mile would make even more areas off-limits to shooting, but increasing safety, as well as reducing environmental damage and trash, are more important.

On Table 3, page 23:

For desired condition:

Range size and capacity is appropriate for average number of users

Management action:

Expand the area designated for target shooting to reflect use patterns (up to the maximum area described in site designs)

should be higher up in the list.

If the shooting range is often busy, or often busy on weekends, expanding the area to accommodate more users would be better than actions that would restrict or reduce access. If shooters arrive at a shooting range and it is too crowded for them to be able to shoot there, they are unlikely to simply decide not to shoot. They are more likely to go somewhere where shooting is less desirable, or even prohibited. Encouraging use at the shooting range is better.

Enforcement is essential.

Without increased enforcement, illegal, dangerous shooting will continue. Damage and trash from shooting

occurs in areas where shooting is already prohibited. Prohibiting shooting without increased enforcement won't improve the situation.

Thanks for working on this problem. As you well know, the damage and trash from shooting is appalling, along with wildfires started by shooting, and the real danger to other Forest users. This plan is a good approach.