

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 8/14/2024 10:57:00 PM

First name: Carol

Last name: Beckman

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thanks for working on this plan to improve public safety and reduce environmental damage, while still allowing for recreational target shooting.

Alternative 2, considering communicating closures to the public and enforcement, is the best option. It's important that people can tell where they should not shoot and where it is allowed. So considering that is important. Enforcement is also key. This plan would not be necessary if everyone obeyed current shooting regulations. That indicates that enforcement will be needed. Also, the population in Colorado Springs and the Denver area will only continue to increase. So closing all the areas near the large population centers makes sense.

Some more specific comments:

Designated dispersed campsites should also have a 1/4 mile buffer, just as for developed campsites. Designated dispersed campsites were included in the 1/4 mile buffer, for all designated campsites, dispersed and developed, in the November 2023 version. The protection for designated dispersed campsites should be restored. Camping has become increasingly popular. That's why the South Platte ranger district had to go to dispersed camping in designated sites only, and the South Park, Pikes Peak, Leadville, and Salida ranger districts have all started the NEPA process to manage dispersed camping. Designated dispersed campsites are likely to be occupied late spring through early fall, especially on weekends, and are known sites, so can be included just like developed campsites. Please include designated dispersed campsites with developed campsites with a 1/4 mile buffer.

Adding a buffer for historic sites is good, but 50 feet is too small. An historic site 50 feet away is a tempting target, with old cans, etc. Allowing shooting 50 feet from historic sites just seems to be inviting shooting, and also fairly closely pinpoints their locations. It seems often archaeological sites, paleontological sites, etc., are protected through obscurity, not revealing their exact location. A 150 yard buffer does not really reveal the location of the site and keeps shooters at a reasonable distance. Please increase the buffer for culturally important sites.

Trails that are not highly visible need more protection than highly visible trails, not less. People could be on system trails that are not highly visible, just as for highly visible trails, but be less visible. Likewise for system roads. Please use a 1/4 mile buffer for all system trails and system roads.

Another step to add in adaptive management actions, after increased patrols by law enforcement or forest protection officers, should be ticketing and fining all offenders. Just the presence of officers helps with compliance, and education and warnings from officers also help. But when compliance is still an issue, another step to take, should be ticketing and fines, and other legal consequences. Please add ticketing, fines, and legal consequences for offenders to management actions to all the items where it is appropriate.

For the adaptive management indicator measures, how they will be monitored and how often they'll be checked is important. Will only staff reports count, or will reports from the public be included in the measurements? Since Forest Service staff is limited, including reports from the public is important for monitoring. Reports from the public should be included in indicator measures, for most, if not all, of the measures.

The management action points don't seem to indicate any time frame. Are they x number of occurrences within y months, or just any occurrence? The management action says recurrent damage to signs, but I don't think

recurrent damage to signs should be tolerated like that. Shooting signs should be treated like leaving trash or shooting trees. Shooters know they are not supposed to shoot signs, but do it anyway. It should not take repeatedly replacing signs before action is taken.

The desired conditions and indicator measures don't seem to include instances of shooting in areas where it would now be prohibited. Maybe it is there and I just did not realize it, but a desired condition should be no shooting in areas where shooting is prohibited, with an indicator of shooting in prohibited areas. That also needs to trigger action. Following safe shooting rules is included, compliance with established USFS regulations for target shooting, but that does not seem to include restricted areas. Evidence of shooting in areas where it is prohibited, people hearing shooting in prohibited areas, etc. should all trigger management action. An item should be added in the adaptive management tables for no shooting in areas where shooting is prohibited.

Since one indicator measure for adaptive management is public reports of problems, there should be an easy and readily available way for the public to report problems with shooting. Should they call the district office? E-mail someone? Fill out an online form? The public also needs to know what types of problems to report. An easy method for public reports of problems from shooting should be established, then well publicized. Please consider how the public should report problems and let people know how to report.

Finding a balance for all the demands and different uses is always difficult. Thanks for working to deal with this difficult problem.