

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/18/2021 7:11:39 PM

First name: Jordan

Last name: Ward

Organization:

Title:

Comments: This project seems very broad and sweeping. The general consensus of the project proposal seems to follow this approach:

- 1) propose substitute ranges
- 2) close unauthorized ranges
- 3) build the ranges deemed acceptable at a convenient time.

The miscommunication comes between step 2 and 3. It will be left to the specific Ranger's integrity to determine which land is acceptable to continue the practice of firearms since no specific land has been outline in the proposal.

This would put Rangers in doubt of their obligation to uphold the proposal and allow for a blanket statement of no more shooting within the proximity of the districts indicated.

What further worries me is that a proposal of regulated shooting ranges involves money/time to implement. It was not easy to find where the funding allocated to those projects is listed in the proposal.

Due to the above concerns I would request this proposal was appealed and re-written to allow firearm enthusiasts to re-evaluate minor changes to the proposal.

A lot can be improved upon the current proposal. Similar to OHV trail maintenance, shooting lands can be seasonally set to allow for regrowth and mitigation of fire concerns, personal safety can be addressed by building a bigger backstop etc...

On a further more personal note, the reason any shooter prefers to use the public land they pay tax for, is to escape the control and regulation of a designated shooting range. The great outdoors should remain a place where all can coexist. Alienation of shooting enthusiasts in the mountains is a fairly new push that should be addressed by rescinding this proposal until it can be adequately evaluated by the enthusiasts it will hurt.

Thanks for reading.