

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/20/2021 5:44:35 PM

First name: Robert

Last name: Moore

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I moved to Teller County Colorado a little over 27 years ago. At that time I was struck by the freedom allowed for shooting in the national forest, something that wasn't a well known "feature" in the state I came from. Over the years I've watched as my favorite shooting areas were taken over by OHV riders and concurrently trashed beyond recognition. At the same time I've seen areas closed to shooting (silently implemented) and at this point in time I have very few choices remaining that are reasonable dispersed shooting locations nearby. I am very conscientious of safety and preventing damage to the forest and nearby private property. I always clean up my shell casing and remove my targets, never shoot trees or anything other than targets that I supply or collect at the shooting site (e.g. empty cans ,etc) and try to always have trash bags with me to remove some of the trash others have left behind.

Now this proposal is very sweeping and appears to close a very large number of areas while really not providing much in the way of easily accessible shooting ranges for me. And hidden in the proposal I see how things could be interpreted in a way that could easily be abused by authorities to ultimately just do away with target shooting all together. The bottom, right-most action (i.e. closure of area to shooting) could easily be the de facto action taken. Based on these things I am opposed to the proposal as it currently exists.

A much larger number of areas need to be recognized as dispersed shooting locations. People who build a house on private property near such areas need to be aware of this before they build and their decision to build there shouldn't change the classification of said area as open to shooting. Basically the immigration of people to this area has changed the quality of life here and created these conflicts of usage of public land near private land. I'm not sure how to deal with preexisting houses/buildings adjacent to areas open to shooting although those areas are probably open to shooting already.

A much larger number of areas need to be developed as shooting ranges. I have no real problem with minimal usage fees to help support the maintenance of the ranges. I think that as this proposal takes effect the very small number of ranges will become overrun and unusable due to crowds, especially just prior to the big games seasons as people want to sight-in and practice. Then people will resort to shooting wherever they want again. Nobody wants to have to drive 1-2 hours to then wait in line for 1-2 hours for their "turn" on the range which will probably be limited to 1 hour max.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide my opinion and feedback.