

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/2/2024 8:16:24 PM

First name: Jeff

Last name: Scott

Organization:

Title:

Comments: With regard to the 3 Alternatives to Dispersed Shooting in the Pikes Peak Forest areas, alternative 2 is the only one that satisfies the most of the true objectives. Alternatives 1 and 3 are very poor. A few comments about Alternative 3 follow:

On the map that shows the dispersed shooting areas in yellow, and specifically the area north of Divide off of forest service road 357.C, this proposed area is roughly 650 yds from my property and home, although it's difficult to be precise due to your map program which doesn't show homes or outbuildings. It's difficult for the public to be specific in comments when the forest service doesn't use a detail capable map program. 650 yds from anyone's home is unacceptable for both noise and safety. The concentration of shooters in this area would likely increase from current regulations, and it would be an unmanaged shooting area where shooters could and will fire in any direction. The one district Ranger for the Pikes Peak forest area here simply would not be able to manage safety, as it is now under Alternative 1. These yellow identified areas are simply too close to private land and dwellings, and I speak from experience when I say the shooters WILL NOT use an app to understand where private structures are located, and the app certainly won't identify livestock. Shooters now are generally not aware that they are within 150 yds of a private residence, or that they are firing in the direction of that residence. An elk rifle bullet is lethal out to 1200-1300 yds, and the noise is deafening. I've not seen anywhere that ballistics information was reviewed before deciding on the proposed alternatives. Where are those facts in relation to any of the shooting areas proposed?

I am completely against alternatives 1 and 3. The idea that the forest service is changing things to improve safety, noise, litter, vegetation destruction, or landowner conflict under alternatives 1 and 3 are simply not factual. Thank you for the consideration of my comments and let's work to truly solve the objectives of this project, which only alternative 2 has any hope of doing.