

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/29/2023 6:38:49 PM

First name: Bryan

Last name: Scott

Organization:

Title:

Comments: To whom it may concern:

3 multi-faceted comments:

1. When I saw the size of the documents that paper this issue, I nearly fell over. This "project" is typical of just about anything done by a governmental agency; expansive, complicated and expensive. What problem are you trying to solve with this? To begin with, is there a problem now?

If not, opt for alternative 1 (embrace the "KISS" principle) and leave it alone.

2. If the problem being solved is the direct result of upset land owners, hit the easy button and just close all target shooting that impacts private property owners. If the issue is exclusive to Forest Service land, then there is no problem. In this case, refer to item 1 above and KISS.

3. Before the Forest Service spends more time crafting capital and operating budgets and putting infrastructure in place to "manage" target shooting for those of us who would actually use Forest Service built target shooting ranges, how about staying in your own lane, out of the private sector business and work with private enterprise to solve this issue via memberships.

I get that this is a very likely a lot more simplistic than your project intends, but some things just don't need to be complicated. I worked for a Fortune 200 company for many years as a senior manager and learned this well.

I appreciate your patience in reading this. Sincerely, Bryan Scott.