<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Home county</th>
<th>County map of</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Gifford</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Greetings- I live on Porter Ranch Road, off of Magnolia near the 5 mile marker. Our neighborhood of approximately 12 homes wraps around so that we are closer to Forest Service Road 321 than from the Magnolia Road route. As such, we have shooters closer to our homes than should be, and are bombarded with regular, semi-automatic and the occasional illegal automatic gun shots on a regular basis, and often after dark as well. When we moved to our home nearly 7 years ago I felt safe hiking in the FS 321 area, but now because of the errant shooting, coupled with itinerant campers virtually living for months at a time in the FS 321 area, it’s become frightening to even be on my own property at times. This summer there were shooters encroaching onto neighbors property, and I confronted a group trespassing onto my own property, who ran away after I yelled at them. Not only should shooters be banned from FS321 permanently—as there have been documented discoveries of trees shot to pieces, lighters hung from trees and shot to pieces, as well as the ubiquitous tv’s and computer monitors shot to smithereens—the shooters themselves seem to have no concept of boundaries, and venture onto private property, emboldened with their weapons. I believe FS321 should be closed permanently to keep both shooters and campers out, as they all endanger the houses bordering FS321—from the NW sides—as they cause noise pollution, potentially endanger us with fires caused by exploding bullets &amp; the fires they build, and they make us that live here feel unsafe to walk our own properties or the area around our neighborhood. Lastly, and more importantly, the shooters disrupt the wildlife in this area—which is filled with bears, cats, coyotes, foxes, elk, moose, and the many varieties of birds, squirrels, etc. The shooters leave garbage that can endanger the wildlife, and these animals are disrupted from their natural hunting grounds. Please, consider banning any and all shooting from FS321 off of Magnolia Road in Boulder County permanently. Many thanks!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hello, I’d first like to thank everyone involved with the Rec. Shooting Project for taking the time to move this process forward and to make the shooting community and the other outdoor recreational activity communities happy and safe. I am an avid rec. shooter since I moved to Boulder county in the late 90s, especially at the Lefthand Canyon OHV area. I was extremely saddened by the devastating floods in our county in 2013 and the resulting closure of the shooting area in Lefthand Canyon. Throughout the years, rec. shooters in the Lefthand area would be stopped by sheriffs and rangers in the area because of noise complaints, shooting after dusk, trash, etc. However, it was a place close to Boulder city limits and a great containment area. It kept dispersed shooting down compared to now where we have shooters dispersed all over National Forest areas in the county. After the floods, I was forced to go into Boulder County National Forest to continue my rec. shooting hobby. Many, many times I was confronted in my shooting area by other recreational hobbyists in the area (hiking, mountain biking, horseback riding, etc) because they basically didn’t like me shooting there and/or didn’t understand the laws about shooting; they thought National Forest was like National Parks and that I was absolutely wrong about my shooting knowledge on laws and regulations. The area (which I haven’t been to in almost a year now) was off of East Magnolia Road specifically on forest road 357.1 which I discussed at the Rangers office and was told this spot is excellent for recreational shooting, since they said they are not allowed to tell me where to go, I had to show them a spot and they would yea or nay it. I contacted the Rangers office in Boulder on many occasions throughout 2014-2016 in regard to people approaching me in the woods and demanding that I stop shooting before they call the rangers or sheriffs. Once, I reported how 2 hippies and one Inuit looking gentleman approached me and said they owned all the land I was on and that they would not tolerate my shooting anymore (there happened to be a group of about 20 CU students shooting...)

See next page for full comment.
Hello, I’d first like to thank everyone involved with the Rec. Shooting Project for taking the time to move this process forward and to make the shooting community and the other outdoor recreational activity communities happy and safe. I am an avid rec. shooter since I moved to Boulder county in the late 90s, especially at the Lefthand Canyon OHV area. I was extremely saddened by the devastating floods in our county in 2013 and the resulting closure of the shooting area in Lefthand Canyon. Throughout the years, rec. shooters in the Lefthand area would be stopped by sheriffs and rangers in the area because of noise complaints, shooting after dusk, trash, etc. However, it was a place close to Boulder city limits and a great containment area. It kept dispersed shooting down compared to now where we have shooters dispersed all over National Forest areas in the county. After the floods, I was forced to go into Boulder County National Forest to continue my rec. shooting hobby. Many, many times I was confronted in my shooting area by other recreational hobbyists in the area (hiking, mountain biking, horseback riding, etc) because they basically didn’t like me shooting there and/or didn’t understand the laws about shooting; they thought National Forest was like National Parks and that I was absolutely wrong about my shooting knowledge on laws and regulations. The area (which I haven't been to in almost a year now) was off of East Magnolia Road specifically on forest road 357.1 which I discussed at the Rangers office and was told this spot is excellent for recreational shooting, since they said they are not allowed to tell me where to go, I had to show them a spot and they would yea or nay it. I contacted the Rangers office in Boulder on many occasions throughout 2014-2016 in regard to people approaching me in the woods and demanding that I stop shooting before they call the rangers or sheriffs. Once, I reported how 2 hippies and one Inuit looking gentleman approached me and said they owned all the land I was on and that they would not tolerate my shooting anymore (there happened to be a group of about 20 CU students shooting there as well that day). Well, we were all on National Forest land and within regulations. I left the area regardless and went straight to the Rangers office. All of the occasions I was approached by outdoor hobbyists and Nederland residents and was well within my rights and shooting very safely (backstop, 1/4 mile from the parking lot on road 357.1, only paper targets, etc.) The people in the area just don't want dispersed shooting in their areas, plain and simple. I also gave thought on joining a Boulder County shooting range. Ha!! Yeah, sure. As I was told by Boulder Rifle Club, I have a better chance of raising money and getting the permits to open my own range than to get a membership at their club (10 year waiting list). Then, I was told by the Erie rifle range that they have a 26-28 year waiting list to join!! But, I understand. These clubs/ranges are like private golf country clubs. They put ridiculous waiting lists, member fees, etc to keep the general bourgeoisie public out. I also know that local law enforcement, sheriffs, rangers and others use these ranges (listed above) and it would be a safety issues to combine the general public with these officers when dealing with recreational shooting when they are training. I hope in your decisions on the future rec shooting areas that you also try to educate other outdoor hobbyists about shooting in National Forests. Continuing to post shooting regulation charts on bulletin boards in parking lots in the mountains and maybe letters mailed to mountain communities to help them understand the shooting areas in forests close to their residence or hobby areas. My "dream" would be another shooting area in Lefthand Canyon, but that looks nearly impossible since we can’t even park or even turn around on that road anymore. No parking signage everywhere ever since the floods. I also hope you consider a shooting area in the "plains" area of Boulder County. All the future areas in discussion are great, but they are far away, closer to nature and wildlife that shouldn’t be disturbed, and will require patrol and enforcement by officer/rangers at the utmost edges of the county. I understand that these areas are good to keep the general public away from the dangerous sport of shooting, but I feel there are closer locations that would work just as good. Thanks for your time and consideration. Todd Cipri toddcipri@gmail.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Bertram</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>Barber</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Drevescraft</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Larimer</td>
<td>Larimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharyn</td>
<td>Larimer</td>
<td>Larimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Larimer</td>
<td>Larimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Clear Creek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for your efforts to seek ways to manage recreational shooting in our wild areas. Alternative 4 is the only option I can support. There is no way to mix loud gunfire with recreationalists (and animals) seeking peace and quiet. Restrict shooters to known areas/shooting ranges - except during hunting season. I want to know where people will be shooting so that I can avoid them. My family and I travel on forest roads high into the mountains. It is getting harder and harder to find places of solitude and quiet. (I can't drive my camper into wilderness areas). Time and again we'll find a sweet spot only to have our respite shattered by the sound of gunfire. The sound can travel for a mile or more. On one occasion, we feared for our lives. A group had been shooting the day before. We camped as far away from them as possible, but the trail we intended to hike curved behind the area where they were shooting. We figured if we got on the trail early, we could escape gunfire. Not so. As we were walking on the marked, established trail, all of a sudden we felt like we were being fired upon. We couldn't tell where the shooters were, but we knew that the bullets could well be coming our way given where we had seen the shooters the day before. We screamed at the top of our lungs and blew our safety whistles and the shooting finally stopped, but without eye contact, we had no idea how soon they'd resume shooting. We beat a hasty retreat and returned home early. Instead of being refreshed, we were traumatized. The minimal rules governing recreational shooting do not ensure the safety of others in the woods. I can't believe a backdrop isn't required, and I further can't believe it's lawful to shoot over trails. I have seen people throwing objects into the air and shooting at them. God only knows where the bullets are landing. We're not talking about .22's anymore. The noise from the type of firearms used today is deafening. (The shooters wear ear protection but apparently don't give a damn about how their noise is affecting those around them.) And the bullets can travel over a mile. Incendiary devices are being blown up and starting forest fires. I'm also totally sickened by the trash and damage left by so many unethical shooters. There are bits of bright orange shards all over, signs are shot through, and trees are oozing sap because they've been riddled with bullets. Oftentimes, campsites where shooters stay (and too many others) are left with household trash, broken glass, used toilet paper, and even human feces on the surface. Laura Page

The Summit County Shooting Range shown on each of the four Alternative Maps in the October 27, 2017 email notice is shown as a "Private" range according to the map key. This range is a fee-free facility open to the public and hosts a substantial number of visitors who visit from the Front Range. Thank you for making this correction.
Hello- We own 5 acres with our home at the eastern edge of the rectangle of private land surrounding Glacier Lake. We are in Section 30, T1N, 72W. Although map proposal #4 is obviously the most preferred by mountain landowners / residents, I would guess that it is not a fair choice as a balanced decision taking into consideration all points of view is obviously necessary. Map proposal #1 and #3 both seem intelligent and acceptable options to the different stakeholders involved. Our strong concern with map proposal #2 is that, while closing down some of the sites currently experiencing heavy gunfire, it would push shooters into quite small areas immediately adjacent to houses such as ours and our neighbors. We and folks we have spoken to would much rather leave the current areas of dispersed recreational shooting as they are then force all recreational shooting into very close proximity to houses and to the Switzerland Trail. The Switzerland Trail, CR 120J, is experiencing a large increase in the use of runners, hikers, mountain bikers as well as dirt bikes, ATVs and vehicles of all sorts. Thank you for your time and attention to these issues, Jeff Maclachlan and Venice Kelly
I am writing to oppose the proposed recreational sport shooting range near Beaver Reservoir. My family has had a cabin near Stapp’s Lakes since 1923. This area is fairly remote with many recreational cabins on the west side of Beaver Reservoir and the road into the proposed site goes through a Boy Scout camp on its way to access public lands. I know this area is used extensively by hikers, bikers, off road enthusiast accessing the Coney Creek Road, and by day-users and backpackers accessing the nearby Indian Peaks Wilderness Area. Although fairly remote, this area gets lots of scattered use by the public. Therefore it does not seem to be a good place, in my opinion, to have shooting going on with high powered rifles. Our cabin is less than two miles from the proposed shooting range. Other cabins and private lands are closer, and the Boy Scout camp is much closer. What safety measures are anticipated for cabin owners and the general public? Unsupervised shooters can shoot in random directions and could possibly end up shooting in the direction of cabins, and inadvertently towards other forest users. What can be done to reduce the sound impacts of the shooting range to cabins and recreational users? This is a serene location in the shadow of the majestic Indian Peaks, managed for their wilderness attributes, at nearly 9,000 feet in elevation. A public shooting range does not enhance these wilderness attributes. This area around Beaver Reservoir has significant wildlife habitat and large populations of big game whose presence would be impacted by a developed shooting range. Further, the forests have historically been impacted by mountain pine beetle and other forest insects creating a very real wildfire hazard. Again, not a good prescription for a shooting range. This location, as well, has severe winter weather which can limit access from fall to late spring. And, it’s not particularly convenient to access for more urban populations.

How are the Forest Service and Sport Shooting Management Partnership going to manage, clean-up, and supervise users at this site? Do this use of shrinking budgets what is going to be the
I am writing to oppose the proposed recreational sport shooting range near Beaver Reservoir. My family has had a cabin near Stapp’s Lakes since 1923. This area is fairly remote with many recreational cabins on the west side of Beaver Reservoir and the road into the proposed site goes through a Boy Scout camp on its way to access public lands. I know this area is used extensively by hikers, bikers, off road enthusiast accessing the Coney Creek Road, and by day-users and backpackers accessing the nearby Indian Peaks Wilderness Area. Although fairly remote, this area gets lots of scattered use by the public. Therefore is does not seem to be a good place, in my opinion, to have shooting going on with high powered rifles. Our cabin is less than two miles from the proposed shooting range. Other cabins and private lands are closer, and the Boy Scout camp is much closer. What safety measures are anticipated for cabin owners and the general public? Unsupervised shooters can shoot in random directions and could possibly end up shooting in the direction of cabins, and inadvertently towards other forest users. What can be done to reduce the sound impacts of the shooting range to cabins and recreational users? This is a serene location in the shadow of the majestic Indian Peaks, managed for their wilderness attributes, at nearly 9,000 feet in elevation. A public shooting range does not enhance these wilderness attributes. This area around Beaver Reservoir has significant wildlife habitat and large populations of big game whose presence would be impacted by a developed shooting range. Further, the forests have historically been impacted by mountain pine beetle and other forest insects creating a very real wildfire hazard. Again, not a good prescription for a shooting range. This location, as well, has severe winter weather which can limit access from fall to late spring. And, it’s not particularly convenient to access for more urban populations. How are the Forest Service and Sport Shooting Management Partnership going to manage, clean-up, and supervise users at this site. In this era of shrinking budgets what is going to be the reality of managing this shooting range in a fairly remote location? This could be a big job and sustainable resources would need to be dedicated to this effort. Is that really going to happen? Since I live in Montana, I have only become aware of this proposed shooting range in the last week (my fault!). However I am intimately familiar with Beaver Reservoir and the surrounding area having grown up using this area with my family over many generations. I know this letter comes late in the process, but because of all the constraints mentioned, and more, I don’t think locating a recreational shooting range near Beaver Reservoir makes sense. I appreciate the need and desire of the public to have developed sport shooting opportunities, but this does not seem to be the right location. Thank you for the opportunity to respond. Sincerely, Chris Phelps
Jeff Smith Larimer County Other combination of counties

Closing a large area to shooting on Public Lands makes no sense to me. Areas with low density populations should have common sense solutions. Backstops, no trails, homes or private residences in designated shooting areas. Allow carve out for private ranges to reduce the cost to the public to build and maintain ranges. If they want to limit shooting then they should also limit areas for hiking, mountain biking and back backing to reduce pedestrian density. To affect one without affecting another is wrong. If they force shooters to ranges then they need to require hikers and bikers to pay a trail fees for maintenance and upkeep. Same as the bike lanes should be paid by bikers, roadways without shoulders should not allow bikes at all. I have lots of rules for those that want to limit my shooting. Dangerous situations caused by bikes on roadways are an easy fix. Outlaw them on roadways.

R Glenn Other Larimer County

#1 UNACCEPTABLE looks like what you proposed 2 years ago, with many roads closed within either a quarter or half mile from the road. This allows you to _claim_ the most of the forest is open to shooting, but is a virtual ban on shooting as we now have to carry all our supplies 1/2 mile to a shooting location.  #2 ACCEPTABLE ! looks good to me. You're either are changing anything and may be actually opening up some areas currently closed. You should act on this proposal.  #3 UNACCEPTABLE Well, your link doesn't work but I think I found the pertinent map: http://www.sportshootingpartners.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Alt3_LocalFactors.pdf This closes virtually all shooting in Larimer County by closing it near almost ALL the roads in the forest, then many roads are closed within either a quarter or half mile from the road. This allows you to _claim_ the most of the forest is open to shooting, but is a virtual ban on shooting as we now have to carry all our supplies 1/2 mile to a shooting location. This proposal   #4 UNACCEPTABLE This proposal closes the entire forest to shooting. No! I will be interested to see if you actually listen to the shooting public, and am left to hope you will.
I am very glad to see there is action to close dispersed shooting in areas near homes and recreational areas. I am very disturbed to see that there is still a proposed shooting range (on all alternative maps) next to the Nederland High School. This area is entirely unsuitable for a shooting range. It is in a recreational trail system! Also, our children have been traumatized enough with mass shootings without having to listen to rapid gunfire all day while attending classes. The sound of gunfire carries, as I can attest, and can still be loud and disturbing a half mile to a mile away (depends on topography and weather). This site should be removed from all alternatives. Of the alternatives, only alternative 4 truly addresses the problems of dispersed shooting near populated areas and wilderness. The FS has undoubtedly included in order to reject it, as with their usual no action alternatives. I support this alternative. Otherwise, Alternative 1 is my preferred option, as it removes dispersed shooting from more areas near homes and recreation areas than the other alternatives. Alternative 2 maintains dispersed shooting near Front Range Trails and Gross Reservoir, both of which are recreational areas and already have problems with dispersed shooting. It also only addresses the problem in one area, which will undoubtedly lead to another long process later to address other areas. I do not believe this will adequately address the current problem and will continue to lead to conflict. Alternative 3 is better than two, as it covers a broader area. Unfortunately, it still maintains a dispersed shooting area next to Front Range Trails (emphasize trails), which is inappropriate and already a problem. This alternative might be tenable if that area was removed from “lands suitable for dispersed shooting”, although I cannot personally attest to whether there are still problem areas in other locations. Although maintaining dispersed shooting in Wilderness areas is probably a little safer than next to homes and trail systems, it does seem to contradict the ethos of Wilderness. Why would the FS allow target shooting in an area where bicycles, chainsaws, and other...
I am very glad to see there is action to close dispersed shooting in areas near homes and recreational areas. I am very disturbed to see that there is still a proposed shooting range (on all alternative maps) next to the Nederland High School. This area is entirely unsuitable for a shooting range. It is in a recreational trail system! Also, our children have been traumatized enough with mass shootings without having to listen to rapid gunfire all day while attending classes. The sound of gunfire carries, as I can attest, and can still be loud and disturbing a half mile to a mile away (depends on topography and weather). This site should be removed from all alternatives. Of the alternatives, only alternative 4 truly addresses the problems of dispersed shooting near populated areas and wilderness. The FS has undoubtedly included in order to reject it, as with their usual no action alternatives. I support this alternative. Otherwise, Alternative 1 is my preferred option, as it removes dispersed shooting from more areas near homes and recreation areas than the other alternatives. Alternative 2 maintains dispersed shooting near Front Range Trails and Gross Reservoir, both of which are recreational areas and already have problems with dispersed shooting. It also only addresses the problem in one area, which will undoubtedly lead to another long process later to address other areas. I do not believe this will adequately address the current problem and will continue to lead to conflict. Alternative 3 is better than two, as it covers a broader area. Unfortunately, it still maintains a dispersed shooting area next to Front Range Trails (emphasize trails), which is inappropriate and already a problem. This alternative might be tenable if that area was removed from “lands suitable for dispersed shooting”, although I cannot personally attest to whether there are still problem areas in other locations. Although maintaining dispersed shooting in Wilderness areas is probably a little safer than next to homes and trail systems, it does seem to contradict the ethos of Wilderness. Why would the FS allow target shooting in an area where bicycles, chainsaws, and other mechanized equipment are NOT allowed; where dogs have to be on leashes; and where people are supposed to be able to experience the wilderness? People have complained that jet flyways disturb the Wilderness experience, so certainly listening to and seeing people shooting rapid fire guns is antithetical to that experience as well. I know the FS service is trying to find alternatives that will accommodate different interests. While I understand the NF lands cater to many forms of recreation, there are certain activities that are incompatible with each other. People wandering around in the woods, while others set up targets (or not) to shoot at oblivious to the position of trails, houses, or the range of their bullets that miss the target are incompatible uses. Hunters are not a problem. Their objective is to shoot an animal without scaring it away first. Shooting ranges in appropriate locations are the answer in all but the most remote areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>monica tymcio</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>After studying all 4 maps: If we consider the front range fast growing population, the best answer is #4. As a home owner with property adjacent to Gorden Gulch, I have on numerous occasions been sitting outside at my patio and have had bullets pass by my head, land at my feet and hit my home and barn. Dangerous and devastating to experience to say the least. #1 is an acceptable solution. #2 completely not acceptable. How can you protect some home owners but then leave areas surrounding others such as my home with pockets where sport shooting will be concentrated intensely into our homes. This is not an acceptable solution. This will only make the problem worst for those of us that have property and homes adjacent to these areas. #3 this is also acceptable, but why leave a few small pockets at all. This is not looking towards the future growth. #4 this plan is really the best solution, it will protect all property owners and tourist enjoying our beautiful front range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Van Bogaert</td>
<td>Larimer County</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alternative 2 is preferable. Alternative 1 eliminates all recreational shooting in the front range, despite the fact that there are many areas therein which are more than suitable for target shooting. Hunters need to practice in areas where they can set up realistic hunting scenarios such as differences in elevation between the rifle and the target, etc., while retaining a safe backstop. This cannot be done on a rifle range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burtniehaus</td>
<td>Other combination of counties</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I highly object to any closer for any of the Recreational shooting sports Owner of Thin Air Firearms Burt Loudenslager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celeste Niehaus</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I would like to see recreational shooting banned from all National Forests. I have had too many experiences where I felt unsafe when I should have felt at peace and safe in the wild lands. Once I felt I was being shot at because the shooters were too close to a trail. I almost always see trash from shooters in dispersed campsites. There are shooting ranges for people to practice if they must.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Ebert</td>
<td>Other Larimer County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I support Alternative 3 and believe this is a reasonable compromise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Weis</td>
<td>Larimer</td>
<td>Landscape-wide</td>
<td>The problem is simple. Dispersed Recreational Sport Shooting (DRSS) poses a real safety hazard to all other users of public lands. In 2015, Glenn Martin was sitting in a Pike National Forest campground when shooters killed him. Just last month another innocent man was murdered by DRSS shooters in the Florida everglades. Twice, while hiking on official USFS trails, I have come close to being shot. How many people have to die before we simply implement Map number 4? When I visited the Sam Houston National Forest in Texas, I learned that they had already tried all the ideas that this group is talking about. None of it worked. They implemented a total ban and it works. I suggest a system of ranges on public and private land, provided for a fee, with onsite personnel, managed by private companies. Utilize a model similar to what is used for ski areas. A universal ban on recreational shooting except at designated ranges makes privatization economically viable. A universal ban of DRSS is the only way to protect public safety. Other recreational users travel everywhere throughout the public lands. Consequently, there is no place where dispersed, open shooting is safe. The ban must be strictly enforced, zero tolerance, with stiff penalties; dangerous rogue shooters will respond to nothing less severe. Again, How many people have to die before we simply implement Map number 4?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Traylor</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>I have lived off of Magnolia Road for 37 years and have watched this area grow from a wilderness to a neighborhood. I do not think that hunters and shooters should be allowed in the national forest around here any more. Just yesterday, there was a hunter less then 100 feet from my house pointing his rifle towards a neighbor's house because there were some elk near the house. Last week I ran into some hunters near my house who thought they were in the wilderness because they drove 1 1/2 hours from their house in Denver. There will be a tragic hunting accident around here soon unless something is done about hunting and shooting near all these houses and people. Thank you for your time. Susan Traylor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK MOLL</td>
<td>Boulder County, Boulder County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The website would not bring up Map#3. All the others ban recreational shooting far, far too much, shooting opportunities should be restored and expanded, not closed more. All of the proposed developed shooting ranges should be developed to accommodate the high demand/need for recreational shooting. Living in Nederland, I would be most interested in those close-by, West Magnolia, and several north of Nederland. That is it for right now, thank you, Mark Moll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clear Creek County

Did you bother to read my letter (see below)? Alternatives A & B will endanger lives of homeowners and hikers in the Beaver Brook Watershed and Beaver Brook Canyon. Alternative C is blank. I think Alternative D is OK.

August 25, 2015 Arapaho & Roosevelt National Forests  Attn:  RSS Proposal 2150 Centre Avenue, Building E Ft. Collins, CO 80526  Dear U.S. Forest Service  Recreational Shooting designated areas Planners  After reading the USFS proposal as well as attending an informational meeting at the Bergen Park Fire Station on July 23, I would like to express my concerns with the Beaver Brook Watershed (BBW) being designated as suitable for recreational sport shooting. My husband and I have lived on Floyd Hill in Clear Creek County for 9 years. We value this pristine mountain area that we share with 1,000 other residents in 4 subdivisions*: Floyd Hill (aka Hyland Hills subdivision**), Beaver Brook, SaddleBack, and the Preserve. We all enjoy the close proximity our homes share with the BBW for taking hikes with our families and pets. It is very concerning that the Forest Service is considering recreational sport shooting (RSS) or a designated shooting area (DSA) in an area adjacent to such a large mountain community and in a highly used recreational area. The U.S. Forest Service has the responsibility to protect public health and safety and with the size of Denver and the I-70 corridor expected to double in size by 2024, adding recreational sports shooting to mix use U.S. forest areas is of great concern to those living in the urban interface. 1. The proposed Forest Plan Goals and Objectives clearly establish Public Health and Safety as their #1 concern. The highly populated 4 mountain communities adjacent to the BBW plus those on Squaw Pass's safety as well as hikers in this highly trafficked area are endangered by the likelihood of stray bullets able to injure or kill hikers or pets legally using the same open space for recreation. Note Park County shooting killing a citizen sharing the same area as a recreational shooter. *** a. Planning recreational shooting within 1,000 feet of homes is a safety issue since

See next page for full comment.
Did you bother to read my letter (see below)? Alternatives A & B will endanger lives of homeowners and hikers in the Beaver Brook Watershed and Beaver Brook Canyon. Alternative C is blank. I think Alternative D is OK. August 25, 2015 Arapaho & Roosevelt National Forests Attn: RSS Proposal 2150 Centre Avenue, Building E Ft. Collins, CO 80526 Dear U.S. Forest Service Recreational Shooting designated areas Planners After reading the USFS proposal as well as attending an informational meeting at the Bergen Park Fire Station on July 23, I would like to express my concerns with the Beaver Brook Watershed (BBW) being designated as suitable for recreational sport shooting. My husband and I have lived on Floyd Hill in Clear Creek County for 9 years. We value this pristine mountain area that we share with 1,000 other residents in 4 subdivisions*: Floyd Hill (aka Hyland Hills subdivision**), Beaver Brook, SaddleBack, and the Preserve. We all enjoy the close proximity our homes share with the BBW for taking hikes with our families and pets. It is very concerning that the Forest Service is considering recreational sport shooting (RSS) or a designated shooting area (DSA) in an area adjacent to such a large mountain community and in a highly used recreational area. The U.S. Forest Service has the responsibility to protect public health and safety and with the size of Denver and the I-70 corridor expected to double in size by 2024, adding recreational sports shooting to mix use U.S. forest areas is of great concern to those living in the urban interface. 1. The proposed Forest Plan Goals and Objectives clearly establish Public Health and Safety as their #1 concern. The highly populated 4 mountain communities adjacent to the BBW plus those on Squaw Pass’s safety as well as hikers in this highly trafficked area are endangered by the likelihood of stray bullets able to injure or kill hikers or pets legally using the same open space for recreation. Note Park County shooting killing a citizen sharing the same area as a recreational shooter. *** a. Planning recreational shooting within 1,000 feet of homes is a safety issue since .22 bullets travel up to 1 mile and 30.06 bullets travel as far as 2.5 miles!**** If your principal concern is public safety as stated in your proposal, this is a serious flaw which affects the safety of all who pass through this high usage watershed. b. Our subdivision has been designated has an "extreme fire risk" by the Evergreen Fire/Rescue's CWPIP. Documented wildfires started by recreational sport shooting impose an added risk of starting fires which risk the lives and property of the 1,000+ individuals living west of BBW. Our emergency egress routes are nowhere near the capacity needed to evacuate the 1000 residents in 4 subdivisions in a timely manner in case of a wildfire. Our lives and homes would be put at risk if shooting were allowed in the BBW. 2. The proposed Forest Plan Objective #4 proposes to identify at least one designated shooting area within each of the 5 counties inside or adjacent to the Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests. Clear Creek County has designated 3 RSS, whereas Boulder and Gilpin Counties have not identified even one. Perhaps the other 2 Clear Creek areas designated suitable for DRSS are safe (Devil's Nose and expansion of the Dumont Shooting Club), but the BBW is not. Only one is required. How many designated areas have been identified by the other 2 counties in the plan? How can this disparity be tolerated based on equal taxation of residents of all 5 counties? 3. Some U.S. forest lands have limitations on their use (non motorized, no horses, bicycles on designated days only, etc.). The Clear Creek Open Space Commission originally designated BBW as non-motorized and no target shooting. When/Why was this changed? Sport shooting is too dangerous to be allowed in a high-usage hiking/ picnicking/ skiing area in close proximity to residences. Even one injury is too many to risk. 4. How can shooting regulations be enforced for the parts of the BBW which are not designated for recreational shooting (on the mix adjacent of private land, State Land Board land, and Lookout Mountain Water District lands)? How will the perimeter be clearly marked? If shooting is not allowed within 150 yards of a designated public trail or across the 2 reservoirs located in the BWW, practically, how can this be monitored in such a large area, especially if dispersed shooting is approved? Exposed high pressure gas lines occur in the BBW (see photo). How can these areas be protected from explosions/fire if hit by errant bullets? How will the litter created from shell casings, broken glass, and clay disks at an outdoor shooting area be collected and removed from U.S. Forest land? While I am generally in agreement with multiple use of our forest lands, since U.S. citizens all pay
taxes to support the maintenance of these shared resources, recreational shooting should be limited to safe areas (such as box canyons with totally isolated backstops) and distant from major population areas where the danger of accidental shooting of humans or pets is high, as is the chance of starting a fire on these pristine lands the U.S. Forest Service has pledged to protect. If the BBW is designated as a recreational sport shooting area, I will no longer walk along it's designated paths, even with a fluorescent vest on, I will be terrified to risk my life walking in such a dangerous area. I will likely move out of this area, due to fear of wildfires started by RSS. Such fears with affect other neighbors, visitors, and ultimately the economy of Colorado. Mike Weege, Fire Chief of Evergreen Fire/Rescue, e-mailed me his opinion on recreational sports shooting in the BBW area: "I, personally, do not like the idea of recreational shooting in the Beaver Brook area." As a resident of eastern Clear Creek County who is a frequent user of U.S. Forest Service Resources, I emphatically feel Beaver Brook Watershed is unsuitable for any type of recreational sports shooting, but in particular, dispersed shooting. *see Floyd Hill 2009 Sub-regional Master Plan and 2011 Floyd Hill Colorado Wildfire Protection Implementation Plan. ** Per Hyland Hills first filing Covenants, Book 270, page 129 7/31/81. ***note 7/10/15 death of Glenn Martin in Pike National Forest by errant bullet from recreational sport shooter, and 2009 injury of Otis Freisen at Rampart Range Road in Pike National Forest in El Paso County. ****Per Northern Front Range Recreational Sport Shooting Management Partnership. Linda G. Berteau 957 Aspen Drive Evergreen, CO 80439 musicats420@ecentral.com 303-679-3025
A 25-year-old man was shot and killed at a shooting range in Colorado Springs.

Otis Freison of Aurora, Colo., was killed Saturday. Authorities said Freison was shot in the chest while shooting with friends at the Rampart Range Road shooting area, which is on U.S. Forest Service land. The range is in the Pike National Forest, near the Garden of the Gods park.

A spokeswoman for the El Paso County Sheriff’s office told 7NEWS the man was accidentally shot by a friend as he was unloading the 9mm handgun. “The person was trying to clear their weapon when the gun fired,” said Lt. Lari Sevene.

"As a general rule, everyone is on the line parallel to each other and their firearms are pointed down range, but this is a public range so there is no oversight," Sevene said.

That lack of oversight should lead officials to close the range, according to the victim's father.

Freison's father, also named Otis Freison, told 7NEWS reporter Lane Lyon, “This is something that was preventable.”

Freison said he believes the shooting area should be closed, based on large crowds he saw Sunday when he visited where his son died.

“IT was pretty disturbing,” he said. “I took pictures of toddlers running up the hill where their parents were shooting. It was like a carnival.” Freison said.

“Individuals are responsible for their actions, but this situation doesn’t allow for people to be responsible,” Freison said.

“If it’s not closed, there needs to be some type of supervision or safety zone,” he said.

The area, known as South Rampart Shooting Range, sees 40,000 visitors a year, said Brent Botts, District Ranger for the US Forest Service.”

Botts stressed responsibility falling upon users of the range.

“I compare it to being on a beach with out a life guard,” Botts said.

A National Rifle Association-sponsored shooting range adviser inspected the trash-strewn site in April 2007, according to a decision memo on the Forest Service Web site.

The adviser "recommended that supervision on site was needed immediately," the memo said.

In 2006, an article in The (Colorado Springs) Gazette described the range as chaotic and full of trash, from beer cans to computer monitors and refrigerators.

Botts told 7NEWS large dumpsters filled with trash are taken from the area six times a year. The decision not to have a range master on site has come down to available resources.
When asked what changes were implemented since recommendations were made in 2007, Botts said berms were built down below to prevent lead contamination, a perimeter was established behind the shooting range to make sure visitors don't go where people are shooting, and large signs were posted in lieu of a range manager.

The president of the state association for the NRA argued the shooting area should not be shut down.

“Where this occurred is immaterial,” said Tony Fabian, of the Colorado State Shooters Association.

"What's important to focus on is what happened here. And what happened here was a complete irresponsibility of handling a firearm and in violation of safety rules," Fabian said.

The El Paso County District Attorney's Office will review the shooting to determine if charges should be filed.

There are similar impromptu shooting ranges on national forest land in Jefferson and Park counties. Another Rampart Range shooting area in Douglas County was used by Dylan Klebold and Eric Harris to practice using their weapons before the Columbine massacre.

Frieson said he planned to visit with El Paso County sheriff’s officials on Tuesday. He declined to give too many details about the incident until is meeting.

Frieson said his son and the person who shot him had taken gun safety courses. “They knew they’re supposed to point their gun down range,” he added.

“I don’t believe in accidents,” Freison said. “I believe in carelessness, and that’s what happened here.”

Report a typo or inaccuracyCopyright 2009 by TheDenverChannel.com. The Associated Press contributed to this report. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed.

CASTLE ROCK — Glenn Martin was roasting marshmallows with his family during a holiday weekend camping trip when suddenly he "just went down" in his chair and said, "Ow."

Through tears and nostalgic smiles, Martin's daughters and son-in-law on Monday remembered the man killed Friday by what authorities believe was an errant bullet, and they recalled the tragic event.

Martin, 60, of Monument was shot in Pike National Forest while sitting by a campfire in the Rainbow Falls Park area, which is north of Woodland Park and popular among recreational shooters.
Martin's daughter Carlie, who asked that her last name not be used for privacy's sake, burst into tears when asked how it happened.

"What happened was that I lost my best friend," she said Monday afternoon during a news conference at the Douglas County Sheriff's Office. "I lost the role model for our boys. Now we just have to have the memory."

Sgt. Ron Hanavan, spokesman for the sheriff's office, said the area in which Martin was shot had "No shooting" signs posted.

Martin was the quintessential family man, Carlie said. He went to every one of his grandsons' school events, games and milestones.

"Sunshine. That's what he was," Carlie said.

Having grown up camping, Carlie said it was her idea to gather the family for a trip over the Fourth of July weekend.

After talking Martin into taking a day off work as a machinist — a profession she said fit her "engineering genius" father — they headed up to a secluded campground about three miles up into the park area with her husband, Chris, and her sons.

"It was a perfect camping spot," she said. "We felt it would be very safe."

The family had just finished eating dinner and was roasting marshmallows, Carlie said. Nobody realized that Martin was shot. Authorities have not said where the bullet hit Martin.

"We thought he was stung by a bee or having a heart attack," Carlie said. "Then it just happened very quickly, very graphically and in front of my sons."

The family had been hearing shots fired in the area throughout the day, and Martin reported it to forestry services, who said they would check into it.

"We assumed it would be taken care of," Carlie said.

After Martin was struck, Carlie and Chris loaded him into the back of their vehicle with their children and dogs and raced down the mountain.

"I thought if I just kept giving CPR, as soon as we got to the paramedic, they could fix him," she said. "We just couldn't get down the mountain fast enough."

With so many gun enthusiasts in the Rainbow Falls Park area, stray bullets have raised concern and have been blamed for a number of close calls, especially within the past year.
In August, the U.S. Forest Service banned recreational shooting on land near Mount Herman between Monument and Woodland Park, east of where Martin was killed. In one of the incidents that prompted the ban, a couple told authorities their Jeep was hit by a bullet as they sat in it eating lunch.

The ruling was met with disapproval among shooters, and The Gazette reported that several "No shooting" signs in the banned area were peppered with gunfire.

"It's an issue that some of our Front Range forests are working through," Chris Strebig, spokesman for the forest service's Rocky Mountain Regional Office, said Monday afternoon.

Firing a gun in the forest is not allowed within 150 yards of a residence, building, campsite, developed recreational site or other occupied area, or in any circumstance in which a person could be injured or property damaged, according firearms rules for the forest.

"Forests are generally open to target shooting, but you can't shoot across roadways or near recreation sites," Strebig said. "You need to have a backdrop."

The Douglas County Sheriff's Office said Martin's death remains under investigation. Officials said the shooting is not believed to be an intentional act, although "that has not been ruled out."

Investigators are asking anyone who was shooting a high-powered rifle in the area or saw someone shooting such a long gun at the time of the shooting to call law enforcement.

Carlie called whoever shot her father an "irresponsible person" who probably doesn't even realize what happened.

"They know they weren't supposed to have guns there," she said. "It's not a shooting range."

Son-in-law Chris said he hopes that anyone who was shooting in that area or has information on the incident comes forward.

"Man up," he said. "So we can have some peace of mind and closure."
Man killed by errant bullet in Pike National Forest highlights growing problem

The Douglas County killing of Glenn Martin has implications for a decades-old debate

By Jesse Paul
The Denver Post
Posted: 07/10/2015 03:45:33 PM MDT 174 Comments | Updated: 13 days ago

Camper Porsche Carey, 14, left, and her brother Ryu, 12, right, check out a tree that is filled with bullet holes in their campsite at Rainbow Falls Park campground near Woodland Park, Colorado on July 8, 2015. The kids and their grandfather Larry Smith, say they hear gunfire every single day while camping. (THE DENVER POST | Helen H. Richardson)

- Jul 14: Douglas County investigators: 2 more guns slated for testing in forest death, 1 ruled out
- Jul 13: Douglas County investigators: 1 gun turned in for testing in forest death
- Jul 9: Douglas County sheriff to test rifles in slaying of man by apparently errant bullet
- Jul 6: Family remembers man killed by apparently errant bullet while camping in Douglas County

RAINBOW FALLS PARK — Spent shell casings and trees chewed raw by bullets litter campgrounds where families have come for decades in search of wilderness.

It was here, in the shadows of land scarred by the Hayman fire, that Glenn Martin, a 60-year-old Monument man enjoying the holiday with his family, was killed last week by an apparently errant shot as he waited to roast marshmallows.

Down the U.S. Forest Service road from where he died, a "No shooting" sign greets all who enter the secluded Douglas County campground about 50 miles southwest of Castle Rock.

"It's a scary thought," Larry Smith, of Peyton, said at his campsite as his three grandchildren fumbled over discarded bullet casings. "We don't want to stop coming. We could wear a helmet and pads."

The forest service has been systematically closing areas such as Rainbow Falls Park, inside Pike National Forest, to shooters for years. But gun enthusiasts say doing so has only pushed
whizzing bullets into closer quarters. Many times, the bans are ignored.

"We know that closing areas doesn't deter people from shooting their gun," forest supervisor Erin Connelly said. "It doesn't mean that the population of the Front Range area will not increase and the interest in shooting guns won't increase."

Connelly called the problem a "large one" that her officers have been trying to tackle since the 1980s. Shooting on the land where Martin was killed July 3 was banned last summer, she said, after a 2008 analysis highlighted the dangers.

"We certainly didn't want this to happen and don't want anything else to happen in the future," Connelly said. "Most people will comply. Most people will understand the reason. And there's some that don't."

In the forest district where Martin was killed, the number of firearms-related incidents, warnings and citations jumped from 65 over a 12-month period starting in July 2013 to 324 over the comparable period ending this week, according to the forest service.

But patrolling such a vast space — more than 1.1 million acres — is difficult, even with the help of county sheriff's offices and other law enforcement agencies. Shooting is generally legal on national forest land except in marked areas, across roadways, near recreation sites and without a backstop.

"The more places you close down, the more concentrated you make the places where people can go shoot," said Anthony Fabian, president of the Colorado State Shooting Association. "These competing-use issues have really only come to the forefront in the last decade."

**While Martin's death is a rare occurrence there, illegal shooting is rampant at Pike National Forest. The National Forest Service recorded 324 shooting violations last year. Compare that to 65 the year before.**

**End of Linda Bertreau's Comments**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Gilpin County</td>
<td>We live in Missouri Lakes II, off HWY 119 and Juniper Ln.----EVERY weekend (and I mean EVERY) is open range target practice. The noise and shooting is immense, and certainly ruins the peace and quiet of living-----it disturbs animals, it disturbs us. While I appreciate the history and tradition of open space and rec shooting, the time when you can &quot;walk the earth&quot; and shoot what you want, where you want----is well past. There are simply too many people on too few acres (closer together) to allow this to happen, anymore. We simply don't have the space to do this, in modern times---not to mention the safety aspects and risks. I served 21+ yrs in the United States Air Force, and I believe in the right to bear arms--------but, sit on my deck on the weekends and listen to the constant barrage of shots being fired--------those are not for self defense, but for recreational shooting. The loud, continuous &quot;pops&quot; and bursts are simply irresponsible. Build an indoor shooting range, and allow these sports and hunters to pay for it. I believe in the 2nd Amendment, but I do NOT believe we can allow rec sports shooting, anymore. John N. Bryan, 247 Lodgepole Ln.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Mann</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Map 4 indicates my preference for excluded rec shooting. Rec shooting should be done in designated, monitored areas in which safety is an utmost priority. Thank you for presenting these maps. Katherine Mann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Bowman</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Breed</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Rush</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Katja Friedrich Boulder County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Katja Friedrich</th>
<th>Boulder County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed shooting has been a long-time concern at the Mountain Research Station, for safety (a grad student was shot several decades ago), research quality (e.g. animal behavior), and educational reasons (who wants to take students when there is a constant shooting of guns). Therefore, I encourage the prohibition of dispersed shooting on the lands adjacent to the U. of Colorado Mountain Research Station.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Laura Emerson Larimer County Larimer County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laura Emerson</th>
<th>Larimer County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It doesn't look like the Estes Park Gun &amp; Archery Club at Noels Draw in the Big Thompson Canyon (Hwy 34) is shown on the maps - unless it's represented by that &quot;private&quot; dot that looks like it is on Hwy 7. They have been having some days when it's open to the public. <a href="http://www.epgunarchery.com">http://www.epgunarchery.com</a> There is a USFS area above my home on the top of a ridge, and shooters frequent it - we can hear the guns nearly every weekend and quite often during the week. They have left a lot of trash behind and not everyone who goes up there respects fences that are in place - some have been torn down. The only reason I'm not upset about the risk to us caused by the shooting (not saying it's the shooters who are trespassing) is the elevation of that area is probably high enough that stray bullets are not going to find their way to where we live. I support Alternative 3 because if shooters are totally kept out, they will come and do it anyway - difficult to enforce. As a landowner I'd like to see some reasonable buffers around my property so if there were problems caused by shooters outside the authorized areas, I might have some legal recourse to do something about it, but they still have reasonable access to the USFS land. It would be nice if there was a way to put educational kiosks in the most-frequented shooting areas cautioning against exploding targets and other factors causing wildfires and talking about stewardship of the land. Maybe there already is an educational project to use gun shops to distribute information. If not, it could be paid for via a tax on ammunition. Thanks for you hard work on this project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Hermes</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifford Miller</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Peterson</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Acott</td>
<td>Fort Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Manley</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Combs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Seastedt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Mutuc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Ray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RALPH NELMS</td>
<td>Gilpin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Campbell</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See next page for full comment from Ralph Nelms
I would support Alternative 1 and Alternative 4 which would not allow any sport shooting in Gilpin County. I oppose Alternative 2 and 3. I have a home at 1094 Pisgah Lake Road and have experienced severe consequences from sport shooters long NFS 1751 for years. I have had bullets hitting 50' from my home and just over my head. I have confronted shooter shooting directly toward my house. Sport shooters set off tannerite on a regular basis near my home and sport shooters regularly shoot during NFS fire restrictions. Sport shooting anywhere along NFS 1751 where I live is completely out of control. I have had sport shooters break down my gates, shoot skeet on my land when I was at work on a week day and leave piles of trash, shot gun shell casings, and the skeet all over 1-2 acres of which I had to clean up. The neighbors heard them shooting on my land but were afraid to investigate since the did not know the direction they were shooting from. I live one mile West of the Columbine camp ground and had had people shooting directly toward my home just West of the Campground. I have call both the NFS, Gilpin County and Clear Creek County Sheriffs and none of them will come up to my area and investigate any complaints. I have also complained to the Gilpin County Commissioners about tannerite usage but they only responded to report it to the Gilpin County Sheriffs Department which take no action. There seems to be no consequences or controls on any sport shooters on NFS 1751 by Pisgah Lakes and it sounds like being in a war zone on weekends. If it continues as it is I am sure if is just a matter of time someone is going to get shot or killed from indiscriminate careless shooters. I would be happy to discuss in person what has been going up in my area. My phone number is 303-917-2707. Many of my neighbors are afraid to go outside on weekends and have had bullets hit their homes or on the ground right next to where they are standing outside there homes. I have confronted sport shooters shooting on the road on 1751 during fire bans and have been told in no uncertain terms that they have the right to shoot anywhere they wanted and in any direction into the forest with homes behind the trees and they simply did not care. it was my fault I decided to purchase a home in the National Forest. Their right to shoot indiscriminately out weighed any risk of creating a fire and burning down the adjacent homes in their opinion when asked. This is the type of mentality the sport shooters have in my area. We have people shooting automatic and semiautomatic weapons from 5:00 am in the morning to 2:00 am at night sometimes non-stop in the spring, summer and fall. I and my neighbors have had nothing but bad and unsafe experiences with sport shooter where I live and believe there is no justification for allowing a high risk recreation activity like sport shooting to continue near my home on NFS 1751 and Pisgah Lake road. We have placed signs on NFS 1751 notifying sport shooters on NFS 1751 of homes directly adjacent to the road which could not be seen. The NFS personnel removed all these signs that would warn shooters not to shoot in the direction of our homes. I strongly urge the Partnership to ban any recreational sport shooting in all of Gilpin County if possible but if no especially the areas from Central City area West to the James Peak Wilderness area and in the Clear Creek County north of I-70 to Rollinsville.
<p>| Jeff Van Lanen | Boulder County | The maps are zoomed out so far the true location of the proposed shooting ranges can not be determined. Looks like there could be one or two on my house. Maybe you can use gps coordinates to put a point on a google map link. As an anti-gun parent of a 10 year old boy who plays in the woods around our house, I would like to make an informed decision. Not in my back yard applies. Maybe you could establish setbacks from shooting ranges (law). eg no shooting ranges within the range of a bullet from the highest power riffle, allowed by law, to a residence, hiking trail, or any identifiable established public use area. We deserve not to get hit by a bullet before someone gets the right to shoot a gun by our house. We live near the boy scout camp. Every year people go there to shoot semi-automatic guns. Not how I remember the boy scouts. They shoot as fast as they can pull the trigger, as if losing all self control. Faster and faster and faster, until they realize the $ cost of such a spree. Getting ready for hunting? Our house is easily within the range of these guns. Then there are the neighbors who drink beer in a party atmosphere before firing their pistols with kids in tow. We are surrounded by guns! I am stunned at the lack of humanity, respect, and backbone to confront this issue as Australia so admirably has. Can this issue be decided by referendum (county by county) or will it be special interest groups who decide? |
| Andrew Sleeper | Other | Boulder County | Upon initial review of the 4 alternatives proposed and their maps, I find the maps to be so lacking in detail when zoomed in to an exact, specific location as to be unusable and therefore irrelevant. Where is Ward? Where is Gold Lake Road? Where is FR372? Without zoomed in detail, it is impossible to determine if a specific proposed alternative addresses site specific concerns. Typo: Alternative 3 text criteria description has two #2s. Also, if this is an October 2017 release, why is Nehalem Clark listed as Arap. and Roos. NF planner for the project instead of Sarah Beck? Update required on that? Based on all current info available for review and comment, my opinion is that it lacks thoroughness and detail required to make a decision on a preferred alternative. Which is disappointing. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philip Williamon</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
<td>Landscape-wide</td>
<td>No further closures desired. This initiative is more liberal agenda disguised as public safety and will be pushed through the environmental protection pipeline. The existing laws need to be enforced with extreme prejudice. If the resources to do this are not available, then any further legislation is a moot point. Any one who is against RSS needs to move (back) to California.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Burke</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>I believe the Wilderness areas, as National Parks, should be excluded from Dispersed Recreational Sports Shooting. That leaves me with Alternative 4. That would be unfair. What about an alternative 3.5 with wilderness excluded, or even 2.5 with wilderness excluded? My interests included unroped climbing, hiking, and biking. Highways 7, 72, and perhaps Left Hand Canyon might be unnecessarily exciting for a bicyclist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Arguments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Hage</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>I propose some of the ranges being developed restrict their use to low noise firearms and weapons. For example, the proposed range on West Magnolia road would not be appropriate for high power rifles due to all the recreational bicycle use, the nearby residences, campsites and YMCA camp. However, I do think an archery range and/or course could be safely accommodated at that location. I suggest that 3 categories of shooting ranges be established such that siting criteria can differ according to the impacts of each type of use. 1. Low impact range; Limited to low noise and energy projectiles. 2. Medium impact range; Allows for non-repetitive firearms use. 3. High impact range. Allows high rate fire, large caliber arms and explosive targets. I suggest at least half of the public ranges be restricted to weapons that emit less than 80dB at 10ft when discharged. Ranges for compressed gas arms, archery, knife and ax throwing, etc should and can be developed in the most convenient locations. Ranges which restrict use to low rate fire of shooting (greater than 1 second between rounds) with &quot;fire safe&quot; ammunition at a target should be established in more remote locations. High impact (unrestricted and unsupervised) ranges should only be developed in the most remote and contained sites, such as quarries or box canyons. There's a need for the governing bodies to differentiate between those people learning how to safely use a firearm and improve their skills (sport shooting) and those whose goal is maximum noise, destruction and excitement (entertainment shooting).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Rupe</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
<td>As a resident of Clear Creek county and mother who loves to hike and enjoy the outdoors with her child, I feel all shooting should be done in designated shooting areas for the safety of everyone. I would know to avoid these zones with my family. Given the vast area for proposed dispersed shooting on some of these maps (alternative 2 in particular), I would have no where safe to go. While I understand shooters’ desire to use public lands for their hobby, other public activities such as hiking, snowshoeing, etc. do not interfere with the safety of others. Containing this highly dangerous activity to ranges or enclosed zones seems to be the only logical and reasonable path for the safety of all. Thank you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Reigles</td>
<td>Clear Creek</td>
<td>Clear Creek</td>
<td>I support either alternative 4 or alternative 1 with a much larger buffer (more than 1 mile). I live near a SWA used by hikers &amp; shooting so close to both my land &amp; within half a mile from the trail is very concerning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Cipri</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Hello, I filled out a comment form a week ago, I am now continuing my comments based on the ALT Maps posted recently. My Synopsis: ALT MAP #1: -5 Closure areas (2 Large areas); EXCEPT for HUNTERS -9 ranges (7 in Boulder County) ALT MAP #2: -1 Large closure area taking the place of approximately 2.5 areas in Map #1; EXCEPT for HUNTERS -9 ranges (7 in Boulder County) ALT MAP #3: -5 Closure areas (2 Large); EXCEPT for HUNTERS -9 ranges (7 in Boulder County) ALT MAP #4: -An outright ban on dispersed Shooting, period. EXCEPT for HUNTERS, and hunting on Rabbit Mountain in Open Space lands. -9 ranges (7 in Boulder County) My Questions: 1. Are ALL 7 proposed ranges in Boulder County a definite? Or, are only some viable? If only some areas will eventually be turned to ranges... this is not enough. 2. As I can see it looks like there is going to be a dispersed shooting ban in most if not all of Boulder County mountain areas. But, hunting is going to be allowed? 3. Private land owners will be allowed to disperse shoot on their lands in closure areas? 4. Is keeping an area for dispersed shooting even an option at this point? Maybe have the areas smaller than what they are now but bigger than a proposed range? 5. Ever consider to keep an area in Boulder County open to dispersed shooting and having county citizens who shoot pay a permit fee to shoot in the mountains? (if money is an issue to patrol ranges/areas) As my final input, I'm really sad that my hobby of (dispersed) sport shooting in the mountains is probably coming to an end. I moved to Colorado not only for its beauty, but for its lax gun laws and freedom to shoot in the mountains. I also realize that many people have moved here that partake in activities in the mountains and shooting is dangerous. But, the areas we are talking about are MASSIVE and big enough to accommodate everyone and their hobby of choice. I find it funny that some people driving past the old Lefthand Canyon shooting areas complained for years about that area and the shooting and the off-road machines tearing up the area. The area flooded and they got what they wanted, it closed in 2013. As a result, the shooters &quot;dispersed&quot; dramatically all over the county and those same people that complained about Lefthand Canyon now saw the amount of shooters who used that old range area. A perfect spot of containment. Remember, this is Colorado. It's not Chicago, or Manhattan, or South Central Los Angeles. We live in the boonies of the USA and have country boys and girls everywhere. Sport shooting is a pastime of our state and region. Thanks for your time and consideration. Todd Cipri <a href="mailto:toddcipri@gmail.com">toddcipri@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Neuman</td>
<td>Clear Creek</td>
<td>Clear Creek</td>
<td>I would go with Alternative 4 - no shooting at all in clear creek county. If people want to shoot they should go to the already established areas. We don't need any more places for shooting!!!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Noon</td>
<td>Larimer County</td>
<td>Larimer County</td>
<td>Larimer County</td>
<td>My family and I have a cabin ~13 miles up the Pingree Park Road (287 Apache Court). We are regularly disturbed by the sounds of gun fire, often of semi-automatic weapons. These sounds greatly detract from our enjoyment of the National Forest and put us all at risk. Would you tolerate gun fire around your home? All humans have an involuntary response to gun fire—a startle response followed by an increase in stress hormones. This is followed by an emotional response of fear and worry. When more than 33,000 deaths occur annually in the US from gun fire, our fear response is understandable. This fear and concern is particularly pronounced in our children and grandchildren. The Pingree Park Road has far too many campers and hikers, and hundreds of students at the CSU Mountain Campus, to justify any level of shooting. This also includes the adjacent Buckhorn Road area. Outside of hunting season, practice shooting should be restricted to fire ranges where no one's quality of life, health and safety is compromised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Manwarren</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
<td>Other combination of counties</td>
<td>Other combination of counties</td>
<td>What does &quot;Proposed Closure Zone&quot; mean? It is on the legend of the maps but not defined anywhere that I found on the website. Also as I said in my prior Comments in this proceeding, our neighborhood of 100+ homes (and growing) is not on your map at all. Your narrative describes how much work was put into considering impact on residential communities impacted, but I remain confused how you do that when you do not even know where all of the homes/communities are. Perhaps you can focus on finding all of the homes/communities and then reissue correct maps. Thanks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Kaushansky</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>I support Alternatives 1 and 4. Alternatives 2 and 3 look to allow disbursed shooting in the east Magnolia area which is where I live. It is incomprehensible to me to understand why disbursed shooting would be allowed anywhere in the east Magnolia area given the population density and the high use of the area for recreation. In all 4 alternative maps disbursed shooting looks to be closed in west Magnolia and Sugarloaf. East Magnolia has the same or more resident density and recreational visitors. I strongly support the alternatives in either Maps 1 or 4 and cannot voice my objection strongly enough to the alternatives in Maps 2 and 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Concerns</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Chase</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>TWIMC, We very much appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Forest Service Recreational Sport Shooting Management Project Alternative Mapped areas. Our area of concern is the Magnolia corridor (personal safety and noise) and the Sugarloaf area (noise - yes, the high caliber reports do travel across the canyon and through our walls and closed windows). We are most in favor of alternative 4, but seeing as how shooters will be outraged, alternative 1 makes the most sense to allow shooters a place to go in the high country within the county but put an end to the dangerous situations that have come about as a result of close proximity to houses, hiking trails and high use areas. Alternative 2 doesn't seem to take any of this into consideration and will not alleviate our concerns. And 3 allows the only close in site that will bring many more shooters right to our area since they would have to go considerably further away to find a spot otherwise - so even though it removes more areas near populations, we are vehemently opposed to that option, since this is a BIG problem area already. We (us and neighbors) already call in complaints almost weekly. That has to be a strain on enforcement. Thank you for taking steps to makes us all safer and saner! Sincerely, John Chase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Char Atwater</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
<td>We do not want or need shooting ranges in the map 4 area. We are outdoor residents with dogs and fear of being shot taking a normal daily hike. I don't understand the need for it. Please protect our county and our ability to enjoy the freedom of walking without fear of being shot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constanc e Platt</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Alternative 1 looks good to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Liebert</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Alternative map no. 2 is completely unacceptable given the high density of residences in the Magnolia Road area. Alternative maps no. 2 and 3 appear to allow dispersed shooting in the established Front Range Mountain Bike Trails area. Unacceptable!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am opposed to a shooting range on the Front Range trail as well as west Magnolia. I live on PineGlade Rd. We often use the trail to hike with our dogs as well as for personal walks to enjoy the beauty of the mountains, as well as for meditation. But more so, the sound of guns travels all the way to our home like it is in our backyard. I have called several times to report gun noise from this area thinking it was a mile or so away. It is deceptive. that while it is several miles away from us, the sound carries through the mountains very easily. We have often sat on our outdoor deck to have a quiet breakfast or dinner in the summer to enjoy the beauty and the quiet of the mountains. Instead we have to endure the sounds of shooting in the background! Why? I am also concerned about the effect on the wildlife up here. We have lived here for 25 years, and the amount of wildlife trying to find refuge from the increased activities and sounds has also increased around our area: deer, moose, elk, bobcats, mt.lions, bears, coyotes and the great horned owls plus..... Some of their behaviors have become more aggressive as they are driven out of their territories. I feel strongly that the mountains are NOT a place for shooting practice. Thank you.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fran</td>
<td>Bauer</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>Hi Gary, Thanks for all you are doing for this project. The need is great and the emotions are so high. Boulder County definitely will benefit by getting Recreational Sport Shooting site(s) developed so that people do not feel the need to shoot on their property and scaring/upsetting their neighbors. Due to all the closures of shooting sites in Boulder County over the past several years, shooting on your own property has definitely increased. There isn't many other options for outdoor shooting. I see a double cone on the Peak to Peak Highway going to Allenspark. I assume that there are two site options up there. This area is my second choice. My first choice would be the site on the way to Eldora. The increase in people shooting on their property or just up in the Forested areas became significantly increased after the closure of the Magnolia site. I believe many recreational shooters don't speak out on these issue, rather they just get angry and start shooting more elsewhere. Sort of a &quot;I will show them&quot; attitude which is counter productive, I agree, but is reality. This site would be close to the vicinity they were used to and central in distance from Boulder and Gilpin. If I am in town on the 13th, I intend to be at the meeting. Thanks again, Fran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Kubichek</td>
<td>Larimer</td>
<td>I live in Crystal Lakes and am a firefighter on the Crystal Lakes VFD. My favorite alternative map is # 3. I would also highly recommend that 73C east from Crystal Lakes to 67J (as is listed on Alt. map #1) be also included. This is a heavily used road on the weekends with dispersed camping. It is quite rugged in areas and if target shooting is permitted the risk of a fire starting from a ricochet spark is increased. A fire like this was started near Lost Lake a couple of years ago due to target shooting. Thanks for the opportunity for input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Smith</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
<td>Alternative 3 map is a positive step in the right direction. I would add that it is vital to ensure the recreational shooting boundary needs to have a minimum of 1 mile buffer to any residential area. The simple fact is that some gunfire travels great distances and the resultant annoying noise associated with recreational shooting decreases home values and most importantly interrupts the peace that brought most of us to the foothills and mountains. Clear Creek County will have a viable practice range for recreational shooting and this should enable our county to protect our residences from the hassle of recreational gunfire. It disturbs animals, including horses and potentially introduces undesired effects including trash, alcohol abuse and disregard for the welfare of those that live nearby. Simply put, Clear Creek does not have the resources to patrol recreational shooting and the abuses of the past will continue unless we design a reasonable and enforceable system. Alternative 4 is an overreach - but there ought to be a compromise that is between proposal 3 and proposal 4. Thanks for listening, Dave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I'll keep my comments mostly specific to the only area under consideration I am intimately familiar with - the Beaver Brook Watershed (BBW). I've used this area nearly daily all year for the last 17 years I have lived adjacent to it. I mountain bike, XC ski, hike and walk my dogs in the BBW. As Clear Creek County detailed in its response to the original RSS management map (Alternative 1 I believe), the surrounding community provided great support for making the BBW public with the understanding that target shooting would not be part of the allowed recreational activities. Clear Creek County also correctly identified the entirety of BBW as a high use area. Over the years since the BBW has been open to the public I have witnessed a steady increase of users. 2017 brought the biggest increase, possibly due to the closing of the Evergreen dog park. Although the number of users has steadily increased, there has been no official development of a trail system. Trails in the BBW are a combination of old logging/ranch roads, unofficial trails made by local users, and game trails. Many of the BBW users (especially dog walkers and mushroom pickers) simply disperse throughout the area without using trails. Additionally, the BBW is bound on all 4 sides by residential areas that insert people into every part of the area. For this reason I think allowing RSS anywhere in the BBW will be putting people in danger. To be a bit more dramatic - if the USFS allows RSS in the BBW I sincerely believe there will be a fatal accident. There is no way a shooter can know for sure where someone on foot, horse or bike will be coming from. Another consideration I hope the USFS will consider is the noise involved with RSS. The neighborhood to the south of BBW is called Echo Hills for a reason. One RSS user anywhere in the BBW destroys the experience of all other users throughout the area, and very negatively impacts much of the surrounding residential areas. Because maps 1 and 2 allow RSS in the BBW, I strongly oppose both. In the spirit of compromise I can support map 3 that appears to keep the BBW free of RSS as the original terms of its acquisition promised. However, as the...
I'll keep my comments mostly specific to the only area under consideration I am intimately familiar with - the Beaver Brook Watershed (BBW). I've used this area nearly daily all year for the last 17 years I have lived adjacent to it. I mountain bike, XC ski, hike and walk my dogs in the BBW. As Clear Creek County detailed in its response to the original RSS management map (Alternative 1 I believe), the surrounding community provided great support for making the BBW public with the understanding that target shooting would not be part of the allowed recreational activities. Clear Creek County also correctly identified the entirety of BBW as a high use area. Over the years since the BBW has been open to the public I have witnessed a steady increase of users. 2017 brought the biggest increase, possibly due to the closing of the Evergreen dog park. Although the number of users has steadily increased, there has been no official development of a trail system. Trails in the BBW are a combination of old logging/ranch roads, unofficial trails made by local users, and game trails. Many of the BBW users (especially dog walkers and mushroom pickers) simply disperse throughout the area without using trails. Additionally, the BBW is bound on all 4 sides by residential areas that insert people into every part of the area. For this reason I think allowing RSS anywhere in the BBW will be putting people in danger. To be a bit more dramatic - if the USFS allows RSS in the BBW I sincerely believe there will be a fatal accident. There is no way a shooter can know for sure where someone on foot, horse or bike will be coming from. Another consideration I hope the USFS will consider is the noise involved with RSS. The neighborhood to the south of BBW is called Echo Hills for a reason. One RSS user anywhere in the BBW destroys the experience of all other users throughout the area, and very negatively impacts much of the surrounding residential areas. Because maps 1 and 2 allow RSS in the BBW, I strongly oppose both. In the spirit of compromise I can support map 3 that appears to keep the BBW free of RSS as the original terms of its acquisition promised. However, as the Front Range grows sending more users into the areas being considered and more residential areas are developed, this issue is only going to continue to be a problem for the USFS. I think map 4 is what we will end up with eventually. It might be 10, 20 or 30 years, but eventually the only choice will be a series of official shooting areas and an end to RSS in dispersed locations. For that reason I like getting on with the future and going forward with map 4 now. Also, I realize there are rules regarding shooting trees, leaving behind trash, using exploding targets, distance from roads/trails etc in place for RSS. However, reality is every dispersed RSS site I've encountered is a temple of irresponsible gun behavior. I own guns and would never consider using any of the many dispersed sites I've encountered. The USFS needs to get real with admitting it can't enforce the rules, people are becoming less responsible with guns, and dispersed RSS causes significant safety risks. People (including me) need places to shoot, but open forests along the Front Range are simply not suitable. I strongly support the development or more places like the Devils Nose facility and hope the USFS will consider safety and being a good neighbor to surrounding residential areas by closing significant areas (all) of the Front Range forests to RSS. Back to BBW- Clear Creek County and large majority of the surrounding residents don't want RSS in BBW. The USFS should put that local input at the front of its priorities when making a decision.
I live on the northern edge of Empire and have noticed a significant increase in LOUD shooting over the past few years. The total number of recreational shooters has increased (like everywhere else apparently), but even more damaging to the surrounding peace and quiet I invested in with my home is the nearby rapid fire of high-caliber intense weaponry. I live next to a national forest, not Mosul; the situation is now intimidating, aggravating, and fundamentally disrespectful. I fully support the second amendment and our great heritage of hunting on public lands, but those are not the shooting values that I hear from my house on a regular basis. I hear over-used modern weapons that disallow my enjoyment of the land. Certainly the local wildlife (for which the Forest Service has been spending money on habitat improvement nearby) and other forest users feel the same way. You have a right to bear arms, not destroy my peace. My specific request is to have map 2 and 3 include orange no shooting from Empire right up to the James Peak Wilderness boundary. We are fortunate to be distant from I-70 and other noise factors up here. It is a little slice of quiet heaven but the shooters are increasingly taking that away. We already have a problem, don't let these maps encourage it to get worse. On a larger note, I would suggest that developing large shooting ranges down on the plains would be the best community-scale solution to the increased interest in guns. Along C-470 between the drag strip and motocross track for example. The guns are simply getting too loud and rapid-fire for the forest. Keep the forest quiet.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt Francis</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
<td>This is a follow up to my previous comment. I've attached a picture I took from one of many RSS locations I have encountered in Clear Creek County. This picture demonstrates what I meant by a decline in responsible gun behavior by the RSS community. At this site there was clear evidence of shooting toward and over HWY 103. If people can't be trusted to not shoot over a road there is no way they can be trusted to pick an appropriately safe place to shoot in a high use area full of unmapped trails like the Beaver Brook Watershed. I agree that people need a place to shoot, but it should be limited to areas specifically designated and designed for safe shooting and minimal impact to surrounding residences (both current and future). Please keep RSS out of the Beaver Brook Watershed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Umlauf</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
<td>My wife and I have been on Pisgah Mountain trail several times in the last 13yrs when someone starts shooting at the bottom of the trail head. This has happen to my neighbors as well. I have filed a report in the past at the Forest Service office in Idaho Springs. The problem has gotten worse in the last couple years. I can see the trail head from our home. If my wife hikes it by herself, I watch for shooters pulling up to the trail head until she returns.. Read that last sentence again! Countless times shooters come from the Front Range via Bald Mountain road and shoot towards our home, having no clue there are homes to the south of them. Not following the very simple gun safety rule, &quot;Know your targets and what's behind it.&quot; It's been a few years ago... Two of my neighbors and I met with a Forest Service reps and showed them these two areas and others, voiced our concerns. Clearly see signs of shooting, spent brass, broken glass, shot signs, trash.... Nothing has changed since then. Map #1 is our choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanette Reimer</td>
<td>Gilpin County</td>
<td>Gilpin County</td>
<td>I support the Alternative 1 Map for Gilpin County, and the Alternative 4 Map for Clear Creek County. Having recently moved to Gilpin from Clear Creek County, the sound of gunfire is on going on the weekends and evenings in both counties. There is NO reason to provide a place for recreational shooting, dispersed or otherwise, so close to private homes. If people want to shoot their weapons for recreation, they can go to an official range, or drive further away from populated areas. I have seen first hand the damage careless sport shooters cause. I have seen trees that have been leveled at the trunks from shooting in &quot;dispersed&quot; areas, not to mention the bullet casings and trash all over the place. While I know not all recreational shooters behave this way, its the bad apples that drive the rules, unfortunately. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Lopez</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
<td>Thank you for providing a place to comment. As a resident and property owner in the north Empire area for over 25 years, the shooting above North Empire has gotten way out of control. We use this area to hike with our children and we constantly find shells and trash. The noise echoes down our valley and we feel this is extremely destructive to our quiet enjoyment, property values, and indeed our safety. Please consider only enacting maps one or four, at least for the north Empire area. Thank you, Mike Lopez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Cornelissen</td>
<td>Gilpin</td>
<td>Gilpin County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Haggerty</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Eppelheimer</td>
<td>Gilpin County</td>
<td>Gilpin County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Peyrouse</td>
<td>Gilpin County</td>
<td>Gilpin County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td>Clear Creek</td>
<td>Clear Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>Gilpin County</td>
<td>Gilpin County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>Gilpin County</td>
<td>Gilpin County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don</td>
<td>simpson</td>
<td>Larimer County</td>
<td>Larimer County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recreational Shooting Comments

We want to thank the Forest Service for taking on the issue of appropriate locations for recreational shooting on the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest. It is very timely and significant. We own guns and have enjoyed hunting and shooting so we have no ill will towards responsible shooters. We have always chosen to find locations far from homes and the recreating public. We appreciate the multiple use management of the national forests and as a multiple use agency you have the unenviable chore of making all users of the forest safe and happy. Shooting, however, is one of the uses that has a ripple effect far beyond the actual location of the individual with the firearm. Bullets travel well over a mile directly or via ricochet. Sound travels for several more miles if the shooting is not done in the proper location. These issues can affect many other forest users and adjacent private land owners. There is also the danger of fire from many types of bullets when they hit rock and spark.

We own a home in Crystal Lakes on Taos Ct. Our home was hit by a bullet several summers ago. We are also aware of people walking on Tesuque Road just below our house nearly being hit by a bullet late last summer. Another homeowner near us on Neosho Road had bullets fly by them while they were sitting on their deck. The situation has progressively worsened over the last several years. It sounds like a war zone at times with shooting at all hours of the day and night. Our enjoyment of our home is dwindling and the safety of the residents in filing 9 of Crystal Lakes is in jeopardy. This is happening because of irresponsible people shooting in an area on the National Forest that is unsafe and inappropriate for shooting.

The area of the shooting that most directly impacts us is on Forest lands located along Deadman Road and accessed from Forest Road 502 and other pull offs in Section 25 and 30. Forest Road 502 becomes Tiny Bob Road in Crystal Lakes. There is a fence located at the Forest Boundary and much of the shooting occurs just above the fence on lands administered by the Forest Service. Crystal Lakes is closed to shooting but the current management on the adjacent Forest Service lands is open for shooting with the standard 150 yard buffer from homes, campsites, etc., not shooting across a road, and in a manner so as to not harm people or property. If you look at a topo map or aerial photo of this area you will see there is nowhere practical to shoot. The reality is at any given location a shooter will always be less than a quarter of a mile from a home, a forest road, Deadman Road, a Crystal Lakes road, campers, or other recreating publics. The topography is relatively flat with rocky outcrops, providing little to no backstop or noise suppression.

A second area where shooting occurs on Forest Service lands that impacts Crystal Lakes filing 9 residents is located along Tiny Bob Road in about the center of Section 24. The situation is the same with people shooting within a quarter of a mile of the road and homes.
The front range communities are growing and people are looking for places to recreate and buy mountain homes. We have reached the point where additional requirements are needed to ensure a safe and quality experience for all. The area around Red Feather Lakes and Crystal Lakes is extremely popular for the recreating public who enjoy biking, hiking, fishing, camping, 4 wheeling, and shooting. We, unfortunately, see the irresponsible members of the recreational shooting community having a significant impact on the other users and private property owners. Shooting near homes, adjacent to roads, and in close proximity to those pursuing other recreational pursuits is happening on a more frequent basis creating a recipe for disaster.

The proposed action does not resolve this issue and will just promote more of the same user conflicts. I can not speak about other areas but the no shooting buffer in the proposed action is not sufficient in the area around filing 9 of Crystal Lakes. My home is about a half mile from where frequent shooting occurs and I have a bullet deeply embedded in my window trim. Had this bullet hit a person it would have resulted in serious injury or death. We have neighbors that are much closer to the shooting area and I understand they have similar issues and concerns.

The alternative titled, “Local Factors” developed with the sports shooting partnership is the most appropriate approach as it recognizes the area between Deadman Road and the border with Crystal Lakes along with the area along Tiny Bob Road in section 24 as unsuitable for shooting. Please, at a minimum, select this “Local Factors” alternative in the area bordering filing 9 of Crystal Lakes. These lands shown as unsuitable for shooting need to be closed and signed as soon as possible. Another summer of this situation could prove catastrophic if some of these near misses result in additional property damage, personal injury, or loss of life. As you consider the final management scenario please consider buffers that are commensurate with the distance that bullets travel, mitigating the impacts of the sound to nearby forest users and private land owners, and the fire potential associated with shooting in inappropriate locations.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment. We would be glad to provide more information.

Don and Kathy Simpson
901 Skipping Stone Ct
Timnath, CO  80547

(Crystal Lakes Property address is 50 Taos Ct.)

End of comments by Don Simpson
Thanks to the team that is considering alternatives for RSS. My chief concerns are 1) people danger and 2) fire danger. I live in unincorporated Boulder County, a few miles west of Boulder, and appreciate that there is no RSS activity in the vicinity of my home. I also frequently visit my son, who lives two miles up Bunce School Road, outside of Allenspark, where currently there is frequent RSS. Although I've never had a bullet whiz past me, I am often uncomfortable walking Bunce Rd to his house because of nearby shooting. We had a family gathering there this summer for several days shortly after the Fourth of July, and were unwilling to venture out into the woods, either on my son's private 29 acres or adjacent National Forest, because of the shooting. This shooting continued even during the Fire Ban enacted by Sheriff Joe Pelle in July. We called Dispatch two or three times to report the illegal shooting. As a member of my local volunteer fire department's board of directors, I am all too aware of the ability of a bullet to start a forest fire. It has happened several times in Boulder county, and with our increasingly dry forests, the danger only increases. Given, as noted in your report, that the increasing Front Range population is increasingly recreating in the national forests, and given the ever-increasing fire danger, it seems reasonable to restrict RSS to specifically developed shooting ranges to serve that purpose. Therefore I am most in favor of Alternative 4. I am not as familiar with the area to the west, and possibly Alternative 1 would be acceptable, but I do not really have enough information to know. Alternatives 2 and 3 seem irresponsible, to me, given the danger to people and the danger of fire in the WUI, as noted. Thank you for your time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Ippolito</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
<td>I live in the area you propose to totally cut off from dispersed shooting in clear creek alt 1 up on brook forest road. I am totally opposed to this plan. Your trying to cut off shooting near maxwell falls trail which had been no problem meanwhile the explosion of day use on the maxwell falls trail for hiking and the explosion of dispersed camping is destroying the area. I have personally put out three abandoned campfires along that trail this year! The thousands of hikers drawn by social media touting this hike has created parking issues at the trailhead litter, human and dog waste in unprecedented and unhealthy amounts along the trail. Forget you unconstitutional attempt to infringe on our civil rights to shoot and direct your attention to closing down the maxwell falls trail to all camping and fires and temporarily closing the trail entirely until the lemmings following trip advisor disperse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Truscheit</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
<td>Many of the map alternatives show shooting in areas of Arapahoe forest WHICH DIRECTLY BOARDER MY PROPERTY. We have invested much in the Colorado State Forest Management Plan to implement wildfire protection in areas directly adjacent to proposed shooting areas. I believe all areas within at least 1/2 to 1 mile of residents SHOULD BE EXCLUDED from the Forest Service Plan. This is currently not the case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Bentrott</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
<td>I live on Squaw Mountain. There are numerous homes on this mountain and even more people who come up to hike, bike, camp and do other recreational activities. Shooting has taken place all over Squaw Mountain both on private and federal land. Our next door neighbor had a bullet fly by his head while he was out hiking on private land on Squaw Mountain. We hear constant automatic fire and explosions from the people shooting at the range below the fire tower. We came to the mountains to live in peace and now we have so many shooters that it sounds like a war zone up here and we are worried about 3 children playing outside due to stray bullets. Move the shooting range away from Squaw Mountain!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shere</td>
<td>Kahn</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin</td>
<td>Morrison</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Map Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Mohr</td>
<td>Gilpin County</td>
<td>Alt 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Ashby</td>
<td>Larimer County</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseanna Kellett</td>
<td>Gilpin County</td>
<td>Gilpin County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From an enforcability standpoint, as much as I prefer the ability to shoot where I please within proper limits and using good judgement (as seen in Alternative Map 2, which is what most shooters currently comply with anyways), just make it closed to shooting period except for at the designated shooting range. There are not enough rangers for the area to truly enforce this properly and local law enforcement should not be faced with this burden. Either hire more rangers and have them working much more often in each county (ex: a ranger on duty in each county from 0700-2100 on every weekend day through summer and from 1600-2100 every weeknight) or just close down shooting. You're creating an unenforceable scenario in which people will be breaking the law but never cited and therefore nothing will change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have lived on Glacier Lake, a half mile east of the Peak to Peak and six miles north of Nederland, for 21 years. I am writing to beseech the Commissioners to ASK THE USFS TO ADOPT Map Alternative #4, which would close 100% of the USFS lands to dispersed shooting. Alternatives #3 and #1 would also meet my primary interest in seeing that the USFS land surrounding Glacier Lake and abutting most of the Peak to Peak is closed to dispersed shooting. Map Alternative #2 is ABSOLUTELY UNACCEPTABLE as it would not close areas all along the Peak to Peak where people constantly camp, shoot, leave unattended campfires, toss their cigarettes and otherwise desecrate and endanger our public lands. The intensity and frequency of people shooting their weapons has increased multifold in the time we have lived here. And in the past year, I have called the sheriff multiple times to report what sounded like automatic weapons, shooting while a fire ban is in effect, or shooting at night - all of which is illegal even where dispersed shooting is allowed. I have felt personally unsafe and deeply unsettled by the prospect of a wildfire caused by bullets sparking or poor respect for the natural environment by irresponsible shooters. With regard to the proposed designated shooting ranges, I am dismayed that the County has apparently made no progress in identifying a potential range NOT IN THE MOUNTAINS. The five (six if you count both Ruby Gulch sites) sites that were proposed well over a year ago are still all inappropriate. In particular, I do not support the County placing a shooting range on the Ruby Gulch sites for the following reasons: 1) Increased chance of catastrophic wildfire due to fire caused by bullets sparking flames (has happened at a number of other ranges nationally) and due to increased likelihood of humans concentrating there and proving inattentive to their campfires (humans are the #1 source of wildfires far outpacing natural causes like lightning). 2) Immediate adjacency to University of Colorado Mountain Research Center lands endangers wildlife and ongoing wilderness research studies. 3) The proven inability of the
I have lived on Glacier Lake, a half mile east of the Peak to Peak and six miles north of Nederland, for 21 years. I am writing to beseech the Commissioners to ASK THE USFS TO ADOPT Map Alternative #4, which would close 100% of the USFS lands to dispersed shooting. Alternatives #3 and #1 would also meet my primary interest in seeing that the USFS land surrounding Glacier Lake and abutting most of the Peak to Peak is closed to dispersed shooting. Map Alternative #2 is ABSOLUTELY UNACCEPTABLE as it would not close areas all along the Peak to Peak where people constantly camp, shoot, leave untended campfires, toss their cigarettes and otherwise desecrate and endanger our public lands. The intensity and frequency of people shooting their weapons has increased multifold in the time we have lived here. And in the past year, I have called the sheriff multiple times to report what sounded like automatic weapons, shooting while a fire ban is in effect, or shooting at night - all of which is illegal even where dispersed shooting is allowed. I have felt personally unsafe and deeply unsettled by the prospect of a wildfire caused by bullets sparking or poor respect for the natural environment by irresponsible shooters. With regard to the proposed designated shooting ranges, I am dismayed that the County has apparently made no progress in identifying a potential range NOT IN THE MOUNTAINS. The five (six if you count both Ruby Gulch sites) sites that were proposed well over a year ago are still all inappropriate. In particular, I do not support the County placing a shooting range on the Ruby Gulch sites for the following reasons: 1) Increased chance of catastrophic wildfire due to fire caused by bullets sparking flames (has happened at a number of other ranges nationally) and due to increased likelihood of humans concentrating there and proving inattentive to their campfires (humans are the #1 source of wildfires far outpacing natural causes like lightning). 2) Immediate adjacency to University of Colorado Mountain Research Center lands endangers wildlife and ongoing wilderness research studies. 3) The proven inability of the County to properly construct and monitor a designated shooting range for safety, cleanliness, and noise pollution and lack of funding in County or within the Forest Service to enforce rules and regulations. 4) The presence of a waterway through Ruby Gulch will mean that lead from bullets will seep into the soils and water headed downstream. Just over a year ago, inattentive campers set off the costly and damaging Cold Spring wildfire outside of Nederland. I attended the previous Commissioner's meeting that addressed updated rules for designated shooting ranges. At that time, it seemed that the Commissioners understood that recreational shooters DO pose personal safety and catastrophic wildfire threats. Data was provided by speakers showing links to individuals being killed/injured by stray bullets (an event that happened again a few weeks ago in Florida) and to wildfires being caused by bullets sparking off rocks and by human activity. The newly published and authoritative book, Land on Fire, makes it clear that Climate change has already dried out our Colorado mountain forests making them prime for catastrophic fires. The book also is clear that humans cause these fires far more than lightning or natural forces. I understand that the USFS is requiring that Boulder County provide at least one designated shooting range before it will institute any dispersed shooting ban let alone the 100% ban shown on Map Alternative #4. PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE Commissioners, keep looking for a shooting range down in the plains to the east, north and south of the city of Boulder, where the risks of a catastrophic wildfire or of stray bullets harming unseen recreationalists are demonstrably reduced. At the last meeting, it seemed to me that the commissioners should put the money it has to build a designated shooting range into buying land adjacent to the Boulder Rifle Club and expanding the shooting range possibilities there. That would be safer for the dry mountain forests, more efficient to patrol and enforce, and faster to build. Thank you.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virginia</th>
<th>Wasilawski</th>
<th>Clear Creek County</th>
<th>Clear Creek County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After looking closely at all 4 map alternatives, I believe Alternative 4 is the best option for Clear Creek County and the safety of our neighborhood. My husband and I have been residents and have owned a home in the county for over 30 years. The amount of people participating in recreational shooting near our home has been increasing annually. We have a home on S. Spring Gulch Rd. which leads into 4-wheel drive roads to Georgetown and surrounding areas. We've heard people shooting during fire bans when they should not be. The sheriff department's response time to get here is too long to typically reach these individuals so this area would be very difficult to monitor and enforce if recreational shooting was to still be allowed. Many of us are hikers and don't feel that it's safe to hike on the weekends in this area anymore because of the shooting we hear. Some people shot a deer in a residential area from inside their car, on lower S. Spring Gulch Rd. just last week. I realize &quot;Area 39&quot; above our home, is a legal area for hunting game during deer/elk season, but when hunters are in the designated area, we don't hear the gun shots. We hear shots from recreational shooters who are too close to our home. These people have no boundaries and sense of safety for residents. These are people who don't live in our county. Please seriously consider Alternative 4 as your choice for Clear Creek County. It's the best choice for the safety of all residents here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug McKenna</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Enclosed are the comments I made on May 2nd to the county commissioners with respect to the dangers of shooting ranges/areas being responsible for a great many fires. The attached PDF file contains clickable links to the many news stories in the last couple of years alone around Colorado and elsewhere regarding fires sparked by stray bullets at dedicated shooting ranges. The comments been updated with more clickable links to news stories that I've found since last May. Boulder County cannot afford more forest fires in the mountains. And why is the government in the business of building shooting ranges in the first place, Let the private market solve the problem once dispersed shooting is properly curtailed to protect forest users and forest neighbors. Given that the government now claims it's quite safe, why not build a magnificent 100-person shooting range in the Rocky Flats refuge. Problem solved for both Boulder and Jefferson Counties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Curtis</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>The constant target practice shooting of blowing up trees, bullets flying over one's head and basic disregard for the forest, is a known fact to the Forest Service from myself and many others who have written and spoken to the Forest Service personnel and Boulder County Commissioners over the past several years. What rights do we as home owners and Boulder County tax payers have? Or is it just the second amendment rights of the shooters that are being considered? I live within one mile of FS357 and cannot enjoy the trails because of the above-mentioned behavior. FS357 wraps behind our house and you can't sit outside without constant noise, animals freaking out, and I certainly cannot enjoy what my tax dollars pay for -- the nearby trails. I am asking again that RSS be banned from trails that are up and down Magnolia Road in these populated, could-be heavily used trails. There is plenty of open space that Boulder County has; put a range on that land, or better yet, build one down where the majority of shooters live. And decrease the carbon footprint, a goal of the County's.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Boulder County Commissioners
Re: Comments for DC 15-0003 [Updated with new info, Nov. 2017]

My comments here are on behalf of Silver Spruce Ranch, which my extended family owns between the Peak to Peak Highway and Beaver Reservoir in western Boulder County. I believe I also speak for hundreds of property owners and recreational use stakeholders calling themselves the Peak to Peak Scenic Byway Coalition.

The peaceful and quiet enjoyment of our property and its supposedly forever preserved conservation values, which include County-designated wildlife migration corridors and spawning grounds, are under direct threat. The Northern Front Range Sport Shooting Partnership—using incorrect and purposely uncorrected county maps that ignored all privately conserved properties—has proposed a possible shooting range located directly only a few hundred feet from our western property line, on a stream that feeds our wetlands.

I’d like to address the near-certainty of a forest fire destroying our property and buildings. Indeed, my comments are representative of anyone downwind of any outdoor shooting range, whether in the plains or in the mountains of Boulder County.

The notes in this docket contain county staff’s statement, “Fires are of greater concern with dispersed shooting.” This unfortunately discounts the significant evidence that dedicated, open-air shooting ranges are just as responsible for costly, destructive fires as unregulated dispersed shooting is.

Last July near Reno, Nevada, the aptly named “Shooting Range Fire” started on a windy day at a dedicated shooting range. 40 acres burned in the first 40 minutes, 800 acres after four more hours, nearly two square miles be-
fore containment two days later. [click here for news story 1][1] [news story 2].

In Colorado, a year earlier in August 2015, at the dedicated Byers Canyon Shooting Range in Grand County, a stray bullet ignited a fire that burned close to a square mile and caused evacuations and highway closures. [news story].

Earlier this year, a 100-acre fire near Fort Carson was started at the Cheyenne Mountain Shooting Complex [news story].

Two weeks ago, a fire in Douglas County, is believed to have started at the Turkey Track shooting range. It was the seventh such fire to have started there [news story].

Last November, at a private shooting range near Falcon in El Paso County, Colorado, a ricochet bullet sparked a 214-acre fire [news story].

In 2012, a fire started at the Basalt Shooting Range [news story].

Similar events regularly occur in other states. One month ago on April 5, in Edmunson, Kentucky, a fire started at a shooting range [news story].

In Benton City, Washington, a ricochet bullet at the Rattlesnake Mountain Shooting Range appears to have sparked a 500-acre fire [news story].

In 2013, a fire erupted at a BLM-managed shooting range in Keswick, California. It was the fourth such fire to ignite at that dedicated shooting range in the previous two years [news story].

In 2011, a 50-acre fire started at a Kern County California shooting range. It was the second such fire in a year [news story].

In Clayton California in 2015, a fire was started by shooters training at the sheriff’s own gun range [news story].

In 2016, near Monterey California, a 50-acre fire was ignited by a “bad shot” at a shooting range [news story].

Last summer, near Azusa California, a fire in the Los Angeles Forest was ignited at the nearby Burro Canyon shooting range [news story 1] [news story 2].

A large brush fire started in the summer of 2016 at a dedicated shooting range in Taylor County, West Virginia [news story].

In Oregon this past summer in the Three Rivers area, another aptly named “Rifle Range Fire” started at a rifle shooting range [news story].

These examples—and there are many more—are from just the past couple of years.

rattlesnake-mountain-shooting-range

14http://www.montereyherald.com/article/NF/20150830/NEWS/150839983
16http://www.redmondnewstoday.com/archives/139907
[Note: Since the date of these comments, it was determined that the large fire in 2017 near Yosemite National Park in California, which burned half the summer and torched about 82,000 acres while destroying 63 residences and another 68 structures, was caused by shooters [news story]. A reward has been issued for information leading to their arrest and conviction [official announcement].

Also, a BLM wildland fire investigator for their land near Reno, Nevada, near where the above-mentioned “Shooting Range Fire” occurred, stated that between ten and fifteen fires start on just that BLM land every year, and that about five of them (one half to one third) are caused by everyday, standard lead ammunition (as opposed to tracer or steel-jacketed bullets, or exploding targets) [video interview here].

It is untenable to hope or posit that dedicated shooting ranges—even ones that are manned or patrolled—won’t be ignition points for fires, especially in fire-prone Boulder County, which just this past February suffered a destructive fire in the plains started by shooters determined to have not been negligent [news story]. Think about that. Apparently, it’s perfectly acceptable, indeed expected, for shooters to start fires, no matter what the collateral damage!

Regardless, a slightly lesser risk for one of two ignition scenarios merely means that the near certainty of a catastrophic fire will be the same probability as the other scenario, just over a slightly longer time. Every Front Range forest fire takes some 50 years to recover from.

To the extent that a dedicated shooting range in the mountains is remote or outside of cellphone coverage, or down in a mountain valley outside of radio contact, it will be difficult or impossible for any underfunded, small-mountain-town-based fire department to prevent a fire from catastrophically blowing up before firefighters arrive. The chances of a few on-premises fire

18https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/detwiler-fire-yosemite-gunfire_us_59873247e4b08b75dce7972b
19http://cdfdata.fire.ca.gov/pub/cdf/images/incidentfile1672_2574.pdf
21http://www.denverpost.com/2017/03/02/boulder-county-fire-target-shooters-no-charges/
extinguishers being useful in stopping a forest fire ignited by an overheated bullet ricocheting into the forest—out of sight of the shooter and very far away—are slim to none. These proposed regulations do not address fire danger in any substantive way, other than to say “we’ll think about it later during site review.”

The already cash-strapped Forest Service is now facing an enormous proposed cut to its budget under the current federal administration. Will there be any substantive county or federal enforcement of any regulations regarding either dispersed shooting or dedicated shooting ranges? No. As someone who last summer identified and reported an illegal shooter in the national forest next to our property, only to see the authorities unable to do anything in a timely manner, I have no hope that building a dedicated range will decrease the illegal use of the forest by dispersed shooters.

All new shooting ranges anywhere in Boulder County should be enclosed or underground. Put a roof over a rock quarry somewhere. Find an abandoned coal mine. Surely there are creative ways to find somewhere for shooters to play and practice safely. Such a requirement would solve nearly every problem complained of in these proceedings, from noise, to the cost of land, to fires, to harms to conservation values, water pollution, traffic, lack of safe fire egress, etc.

The serious harms and risks of a recreational activity desired by the few should not blatantly violate the rights of—or risk the near certain property destruction of—so many others.

Thank you.
End of comments by Doug McKenna
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Tengler</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>Gilpin</td>
<td>In the Gilpin county maps, why is my cabin and Tomas Galloways cabin not indicated in the Elk Park/Nugget proposed sight? Does the number of identified cabins/homes around a proposed sight effect the feasibility criteria? The Nugget sight is surrounded by private land. Have the local owners been made aware of this proposed sight? I haul truckloads of shooting trash each year from elk park and would be a strong proponent of all no dispersed shooting. Alt 4. That is whole point of localizing a shooting range. In addition to the trash. Shooters are threatening century old limber pines on and near my property by shooting with ak47’s. This causes the trees to snap. These same people park cars on the tundra and are shooting less than 50 from the roads. Often shots crossing over the roads. Bullet holes exiting the front facing &quot;no trespass signs are testament to this problem. Kind Regards Robert Tengler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betina</td>
<td>Mattesen</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>I am concerned that you will be directing dispersed sport shooting into more sensitive high elevation areas important to wildlife and recreation (these locations have popular trail heads likely used by shooters because of easy access and parking). Is Wilderness compatible with this use? I know that you are trying to keep lower elevation residents safe but are you just moving the problem to an area with greater impact to the public at large? I would like you to address the carbon footprint of more driving to reach these elevations and impact to the ecology and quiet enjoyment of our special alpine areas. Thanks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Kroll</td>
<td>Clear Creek</td>
<td>I have lived in the floyd hill area for over 20 years. It is a very peaceful place for my family as we look south over the watershed between beaver brook canyon and hwy 103. Literally the only thing that breaks our quiet weekends is the sound of shooting guns. From as far away as Montaigne park and hwy 103. Thousands of people are impacted by these individuals making noise in the forest. That ratio of one person affecting thousands of people is not ok. If I were to stand on my porch and make noise of some kind equal to a gun shot, I would be cited for disturbing the peace. The safety distance of 450' is FAR too close for safety. The watershed is used by hikers/bikers/dog walkers and they should not have to fear for their safety when on a walk...let alone the affect the noise has on ones experience in the outdoors. NOISE HAS TO BE A FACTOR WHEN CONSIDERING THESE PROPOSALS!!!!!!! Map 3 or 4 is acceptable for me and my family. Steve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bette</td>
<td>Blinde</td>
<td>Larimer County</td>
<td>Hello, I would like to encourage you to set map 4 as your guide to shooting in the forests of Larimer County. I would like to see you set up specific shooting ranges within the forest so folks can shoot in restricted areas. The other maps provide too much area for shooting. I ride the Canyon Lakes district and there isn't much of the area that people aren't riding, hiking, ATVing, biking, etc. Too often we have been riding and people start shooting, we have no idea if they know there is a trail with people on it near them. We also have spent hours picking up clay pigeons and shot gun shell casing because sport shooters are very good at picking up after themselves. Perhaps confining them to a few areas will make clean up easier and it would sure be safer for other folks trying to enjoy the forest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Blinde</td>
<td>Larimer County</td>
<td>Larimer</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>I am a recreational area user: hiking and horseback riding primarily within the Canyon Lakes Ranger District. While I embrace the concept of multiple use of public lands, Alternative 4 is my selection for RSS. Safety is the major concern; best use of public lands is another concern. It is impossible to locate the source of shooting when traveling in mountainous areas unless you are within sight range. If you are on foot or on horseback, being in sight range is too close to someone shooting. Shooters use ear protection and cannot hear your arrival. Too many times, we have found shooting sites located near trails. Which direction are the shooters shooting? Shooting occurring within hearing distance of a trail head is a discouraging experience. Where are the shooters? If I take this trail will I encounter the shooters? What is their state-of-mind? Am I or my hiking/riding partners in danger? There are more reasons...all along the same line. Designated shooting areas located outside the forest makes so much more sense. Shooters can shoot knowing they are unlikely to hit a person or animal they cannot see. I will happily be excluded from using the area! Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Gail Blinde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Meschia</td>
<td>Gilpin County</td>
<td>Gilpin</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>My family and I are in full support of option 4, then option 1. The mountains are riddled with gun fire. It isn't safe to walk on trails as people often buy and gun and go shooting in a new place. In the 1980's, the mountains were quite. A nice place to visit. Now there is the constant noise from gun fire starting at daylight and going through the dusk hours. It would be a miracle to go into the mountains and not hear gun fire. Gilpin county has no hunting yet the gun fire never seems to stop on the weekends. If people want to own guns, that is their personal decision. Where they go shoot is our decision because it affects the whole community. The prolific open and unregulated shooting has gotten out of control. I had a city dweller drive up, get out of his car and start shooting because it was allowed in the forest. We were just over the nearest dirt berm and he never checked the area. Brought his whole family to watch him shoot his new gun. National forest and park land must be free from gunfire for the safety of all our families. Shooting ranges are a good idea for a very good reason.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Campbell</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>To whom it may concern, The Alternative Map #2 is the only fair proposal to all users of public lands taking into consideration actual risk and not perceived risk. There are very few viable places for a hunter to practice and zero-in rifles any where other than on the public lands. To put the burden of this pre-season activity into the game unit on the first day of one's license draw will ruin the hunting opportunities for every one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ig Petersen</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other combination of counties</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shooting should be prohibited on public lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Meyer</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>As a property owner along the Peak to Peak scenic corridor I am concerned about dispersed shooting along the Peak to Peak. Considering the terrible damage from the fire recently at Ridge Rd, dispersed shooting should not be allowed because of the danger of wildfires caused by shooting. The same issue comes up when considering the Ruby Gulch location. Shooting in the mountains is a dangerous proposition. Wildfires in areas of such elevation spread at such an alarming rate. Shooting ranges should be in the plains or located such that they do not pose a risk for starting more forest fires. We have enough to worry about with natural causes without deliberately adding more risk from bullets, people congregating (and leaving fires), and threatening our forests and wildlife. There is a CU research center nearby Ruby Gulch and this would also threaten that site and work. Please consider Alternative #4. Close the land to dispersed shooting. Thank you for considering my comments. Erica Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Clifton</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>My family has owned property at Glacier Lake since 1955. I would like to encourage the Commissioners to ASK THE USFS TO ADOPT Map Alternative #4, which would close 100% of the USFS lands to dispersed shooting. I am in complete agreement with the well stated comments of Trina Peterson, a full time Glacier Lake resident. Map Alternative #2 is ABSOLUTELY UNACCEPTABLE as it would not close areas all along the Peak to Peak where people constantly camp, shoot, leave untended campfires, toss their cigarettes and otherwise desecrate and endanger our public lands. Thank You</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


My name is Nick Apel. I support Gilpin County Alternative Maps 1, 3 and 4. I am very much against Gilpin County Alternative Map 2. In September of 2017 I purchased a home located at 144 Del Monte Pl, Central City, CO 80427. The Home is located just past Bald Mountain Cemetery on Bald Mountain Lane in Gilpin County. Our property is within a mile of Clear Creek County as well. When purchasing the home we were thrilled to find a property that is surrounded by national forest land and we’re looking forward to our dream of enjoying the serenity of the mountains. Since moving in, we hear gunshots nearly every day. When hiking around the home on well defined hiking trails we often run into groups of people sport shooting. Usually, people are shooting just off of Bald Mountain Lane within a half mile to mile from our house. In our most recent run in this weekend, the group had created a bonfire to stay warm which was also disappointing to see considering the proximity to our home. While I support sport shooting I do not feel Bald Mountain and the surrounding area should allow such activities. The area is populated by homes like ours. Ourselves and our neighbors and others wanting to enjoy the peace of hiking in the mountains should not need to carry air horns and seek out shooters in the area to make shooters aware there are people in the area where they are shooting. We should not have to be concerned about stray bullets when walking around our property. We should not need to be worried about the added risk of fires caused by recreational shooters. Please consider this feedback as part of the recreational sport shooting partnership project and as input to community development and planning for Gilpin County, Clear Creek County and the Bald Mountain area.
If I am reading your maps correctly, areas suitable for sport shooting in Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 are in the Indian Peaks Wilderness Area and the James Peak Wilderness Area. In your Proposed action, the only areas considered suitable for sport shooting are in the Wilderness Areas! Dispersed sport shooting is in direct conflict with the criteria for Wilderness Areas, defined as: (c) "A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. An area of wilderness is further defined to mean in this Act an area of undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable; (2) has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation;" (Wilderness Act, 1964) The only Alternative that does not recommend sport shooting in Wilderness Areas is Alternative 4, so that would be my choice. As for the proposed sites for possible shooting ranges, it is hard to believe that the West Magnolia site is still under consideration. It is a very heavily used area for recreation, mostly mountain biking, and for dispersed camping. Forest fires are an ongoing problem there and a shooting range would only add to that. Also, gunfire from a range there would be easily heard within the Town of Nederland. The Town spent years getting the shooting range on the end of Magnolia Road shut down. It would be ludicrous to open another one. It is hard to believe that anyone did onsite research for the shooting areas, if they did, the Wilderness Areas and the West Mag area would be immediately rejected. Thank you for considering my comments. Bill Ikler
I was originally very supportive of this project thinking that the purpose was to identify areas in the National Forest where shooting ranges could be built. What I see on Alt. 1, 3 and 4 is a huge land grab, taking away 10’s of thousands of acres that currently meet recreational shooting guidelines and giving back to shooters a couple of acres of an undefined and unconstructed range. The proposed ranges are on poorly developed roads and will be difficult to access. One range in all of Gilpin County miles from a main road is a poor trade for the thousands of acres given up to dispersed shooting. There are many areas in Gilpin County where I have shot pistols and shotguns that are now being proposed to be closed. These areas are safe to shoot and are kept clean by myself and other shooters that have used them for short range purposes. Alt. #2 is the only alternative that I can support. It identifies areas where one could scout an area that could be used for safe shooting. But with mine claims, not being allowed to park on county roads etc. one must put the time in to find safe places. After seeing 3 out of the 4 alternatives, I doubt that anyone really cares about providing for recreational shooting, it seems the process is being driven by anti gun and people that live near the National Forest that believe that it belongs only to them and want to limit access to the rest of the population. I hope I am wrong, Alternative #2 is the only acceptable map to me if this process remains fair. My concern about shooting ranges is how cleanliness and safety will be addressed. The cleanliness of shooting areas has closed areas in some of these county’s. The remoteness of these ranges will be a issue for keeping them clean. A small number of shooters can ruin it for many. This can result in shutdown of the range, then what, with dispersed shooting areas closed. The difficulty in finding places for ranges as has been documented in this group’s progress reports over the past few years, it does not give me confidence that if a range is closed that another would open and with dispersed shooting eliminated, responsible shooters are left without a National Forest to enjoy and practice their sport.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eric Moutz</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>I live off of sugarloaf road in Boulder County. I am deeply troubled by the amount of recreational shooting in this area. Many of the well known sites are in popular recreation areas and endanger people and pets. Furthermore, many of the shooters are hunting illegally and using target practice as an excuse to carry and discharge weapons in the area. Add to this the noise created in the mountain canyons (I heard shooting several times a week during the summer). I favor a complete ban of recreational shooting in Boulder County national forest. I will add that I am a gun owner and advocate. However, what I am witnessing here is unsafe and unsustainable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy Lopez</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>I own a home on Hwy 72 close to the intersection of CR 96. Since retiring 4 years ago, my wife and I have spent extensive time at the cabin. In prior years we would be there a few weeks in the summer, plus every weekend. Unless you live there or spend time there, you can't understand how stressful it is to listen to the sound of military style weapons going on all week, especially weekends. This area is used extensively by mountain bikers, campers and hikers. Not to mention the Boys Scout camp, residences and American Legion sites. On several occasions, while hiking the Sourdough trail, we have had to scream and whistle to let the shooters know that they were firing towards the trail. In order to have something to shoot at, they bring microwaves, mannequins, old refrigerators, etc. which they leave in Forest Service land. More than once we have hiked through the proposed area and found smoldering camp fires left by the shooters. I believe that setting up a shooting range at this location would be an accident or fire waiting to happen. For the record, we have called the BOCO Sheriff department many, many times to complain. Respectfully submitted, Percy D Lopez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Turechek</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>I have owned property at the junction of the Peak to Peak Hwy and the road to Beaver Reservoir for 40 years. This area abuts a 600-acre Boy Scout Camp, the 900-acre Silver Spruce Ranch with its wildlife conservation easement, two subdivisions as well as the 120 American Legion trailer sites at Beaver Reservoir, the trail heads for the South St. Vrain and Sour Dough hikes, and many campsites along Beaver Road, CR 96. This heavy human and wildlife population does not mix well with steady gunfire. Over the past 5 years in particular, the frequency of shooting, gauge of the weaponry, and distance the bullets travel have increased significantly. The potential for injury and wildfire also increases with this heavy artillery bombardment of the forest. I do not support using the Beaver Road location, just a mile and a half from the scenic highway, for a shooting site at all. Diane Turechek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talli Piekarski</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>I can't believe that a proposal for a shooting area is being considered at Beaver Road. This has got to be a mistake and great oversight by the proposers. This sight hosts many hikers, homes, wildlife, and a boy scout camp! There is also a major highway in the proximity of the proposed area. The proposed range is an accident waiting to happen. Please do not select this area!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Vida</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>Tengler</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Emery</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>6583 Magnolia Rd</td>
<td>I support the Alternative 1 map for dispersed shooting. I think it restricts shooting in the areas of high residential density and high visitor use. Both residential density and visitor volume will continue to grow in the region and thus my feeling it is makes sense to regulate shooting as indicated in Map 1 for current and future safety concerns. If Map 1 is adopted, I think it should be done in conjunction with the county developing at least two shooting ranges in the foothills, one in the norther part of the district and one in the southern. Secondly, I would support map 3 if map 1 was not adopted. But, I expect as residential density and visitor use increase, you will see complaints mounting from any shooting that is within a mile of residences and higher use trails. The bullets and the sound travel just too far in the mountain environment. There was a section along Magnolia that looked like it would still be open to shooting on Map 3 and I suggest that be closed. Magnolia has too much resident, traffic and visitor density to be safe for any dispersed shooting. If you adopt map 3, I think one range in the mountain district would be sufficient. I don't think map 4 is workable as it does not allow any shooting, even in more remote areas. I also support the concept of &quot;adaptive&quot; regulation that was mentioned at the meeting. I think this would be an extremely important part of any final plan that is adopted. It's just too hard to anticipate which areas might be impacted and how. I had not heard that this process was going to be available, so I am encouraged to hear that the Forest Service would be using a flexible approach as the population changes and interests change. I think it will reduce the amount of stress and conflict between the multiple interest groups. Charlie Farrell 6583 Magnolia Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hudak</td>
<td>Gilpin County</td>
<td>I have lived in Gilpin county for 16 years. My home is about 1 mile from Pisgah Lake. The sport shooting is out of control. My family and I consistently have bullets flying over our heads or ricocheting off of the ground by our feet. My shed has been hit. My cars have been hit and my son was nearly hit last summer as a bullet bounced off the ground just 2 feet from where he was standing. This was 5 feet from the front door of the house. Our kids refuse to allow our grandkids to visit us on the weekends due to the danger. We do not go outside on the weekends and try to be gone if possible. It is so dangerous. My neighbors are all afraid of the stray bullets that constantly fly around our homes. In September, bullets were once again hitting my yard and whizzing by our heads. I hiked up and confronted the shooters. They told me that the Forest Service told them to shoot there. They were respectful and seemed very believable. This spot was surrounded by roads and homes. I was amazed that the Forest Service was not aware of this. I have called Clear Creek and Gilpin Sheriffs departments and the story is always the same. &quot;We are under funded and understaffed&quot;. No one will help. We get huge Tannerite explosions at all hours of the night. Shooting at all hours including fully automatic weapons. I love to shoot myself. I hate writing in like this. But if something isn't done, someone is going to get killed. It just keeps getting worse and worse. Of the alternative maps, I believe that alternative#1 is the best choice for my area. #3 is good but it doesn't go far enough to protect my family, neighbors or outdoor minded people. Thank you for looking into this. Jim Hudak. 303-570-9774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrina Petenro</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Knowing that staff often truncate longer comments, I am attaching a file of the comments I submitted on November 12, 2017. I ask that the Commissioners and the USFS folks be given a copy of my full comments in favor of Map Alternative #4 and placing a designated shooting range down in the plains of Boulder County rather than choosing any of the proposed mountain sites. The threat of catastrophic wildfire and personal injury due to errant/careless bullets far, far outweighs the recreational shooting interests of a small number of people. It is my understanding that neither the USFS nor Boulder County even knows the most basic information about the number of people who currently engage in dispersed shooting. The USFS should close the tinder dry forest to dispersed shooting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Clear Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Larimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Clear Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlene</td>
<td>Apel</td>
<td>Gilpin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Apel</td>
<td>Gilpin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Gauthier</td>
<td>Larimer County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td>Holan</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Deutsch</td>
<td>Gilpin County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>david nitsch</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>The option with NO dispersed shooting is best. Dispersed shooting is not appropriate ANYwhere in Boulder County. Open a shooting range in the quarry in Lyons, the sound does not travel far and there is little chance of a fire getting started and spreading into the forest. Plus, that is closer to where high populations live- do not force the flatlands overpopulation problem onto us mountain folk!!! Any shooting range established must be opened only when dispersed shooting is BANNED. I would prefer no shooting range, but we have to compromise. Do not, under any circumstances, allow a shooting range to open before dispersed shooting is banned and an ENFORCEMENT system is set up. Those gunshot-detection triangulation systems they use in Baltimore, Philly and DC should be set up so law enforcement can quickly respond to dispersed shooting in places like Gordons Gulch until bad behavior is snuffed out. Do not set up a shooting range up in the mountains, or a very costly wildfire will inevitably result. A shooting range should be very close to fire hydrants and rapid response capability. I live near Gordond Gulch. Much of time, it sounds like Vietnam over there, and I mean in 1971. It was so peaceful when there was a fire ban that included a shooting ban, you could actually sit outside and enjoy the mountains, not cringing with every gun shot and wondering where the shooter was, if they were drunk, if they knew where houses were. Dispersed shooting in BoCo must stop, and you really don’t need to study this for 4 more years, do it now and end the danger that we all face, all the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne Short</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Having lived for 31 yrs. within easy earshot of two popular sports shooting areas off of Magnolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Donahue</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>All of the maps show me that the shooting would be too close to areas of population and therefore not only unsafe, but a serious disturbance to the residents of those areas. Thank-you ~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tedd Beegle</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Alternatives 2 and 3 of the four alternatives show a large area of continued disbursed shooting on the north side of Magnolia road, just north of the Boy Scout / Front Range trailhead and north of the trail access at the 9 mile marker where the bend in Magnolia is after Reynolds Ranch. This is the same area the Forest Service plans to put their expanded trail system. This area is very heavily used by mountain bikers and hikers. The whole length of Magnolia Road is used by runners. Only alternatives 1 and 4 show closure of east Magnolia. Given the heavy recreational use, as well as density of resident homes, I urge adoption of one of these alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Hartman</td>
<td>Gilpin County</td>
<td>It’s extremely discouraging that in 5 years no one thinks there’s any site that would be appropriate for shooting in Gilpin County. The 1 site that was recently posted is truly no viable! I only hope that should you &quot;close&quot; the public lands to recreational shooting you sick with your word, that won’t happen until locations are designated, which doesn't seem likely since nothing has been found in Gilpin County?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Melamed</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>My name is Paul Melamed. I’ve lived at 15344 Gold Hill Road, six miles west of Gold Hill and 1 mile east of the Peak to Peak since 1971 (46 years). My daughter Megan Melamed Larson (who grew up at our house) and her husband Elliott Larson live 1/4 mile west of our house at 15927 Gold Hill Road. 1/4 mile west of their house is a undesignated “road” that leads into a concentrated dispersed shooting site that has seen dramatic increase in usage over the last ten years. The site is approximately 200 yards in from the Gold Hill Road. The site is on numerous social media sites and people come from counties all along the Front Range. There have been numerous times we have had to call the Boulder County Sheriff’s Office to report illegal shooting such as shooting across FS roads or during fire bans. In reviewing the four Alternative Maps our concern is with Alternative Maps 2 &amp; 3. Two years ago we were presented with a plan that was a compromise to stop dispersed shooting in areas where homes exist that we felt was a workable solution to an out of control problem. The original Proposed Map (Alternative 1) shows no dispersed shooting in most of Boulder County with areas limited to well west of the Peak to Peak. Now, Alternative Maps 2 &amp; 3 show dispersed shooting allowed right up to both of our houses. Our houses were pretty much hidden on the map because the Ruby Gulch ID Flag was overlapping our location. The problem goes beyond the much discussed points of health and safety, environmental degradation, noise pollution and target/shell casing pollution. We have seen numerous acts of vandalism aimed at shooters. The major concern is this vandalism will lead to shooters seeking revenge and targeting our homes which both are visible from the Gold Hill Road. We have had one incident where a shooters passenger’s side back window was blown out by some type of projectile. The shooters then drove down my daughter’s driveway to her house to confront her. Fortunately, her response was to have them call the sheriff and they calmed down immediately. What would have happened if she was not at home or if the shooters were not “reasonable” people?! We are highly opposed to dispersed shooting in Boulder County but we are law abiding people and oppose any and all illegal retaliatory actions against those shooters. However, allowing dispersed shooting off of county roads that are populated with homes creates a potential crisis of innocent people being held accountable for illegal acts of vandalism and suffering consequences that could be deadly. Please remove consideration of Alternative Maps 2 and 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My name is Paul Melamed. I’ve lived at 15344 Gold Hill Road, six miles west of Gold Hill and 1 mile east of the Peak to Peak since 1971 (46 years). My daughter Megan Melamed Larson (who grew up at our house) and her husband Elliott Larson live 1/4 mile west of our house at 15927 Gold Hill Road. 1/4 mile west of their house is a undesignated “road” that leads into a concentrated dispersed shooting site that has seen dramatic increase in usage over the last ten years. The site is approximately 200 yards in from the Gold Hill Road. The site is on numerous social media sites and people come from counties all along the Front Range. There have been numerous times we have had to call the Boulder County Sheriff’s Office to report illegal shooting such as shooting across FS roads or during fire bans.

In reviewing the four Alternative Maps our concern is with Alternative Maps 2 & 3. Two years ago we were presented with a plan that was a compromise to stop dispersed shooting in areas where homes exist that we felt was a workable solution to an out of control problem. The original Proposed Map (Alternative 1) shows no dispersed shooting in most of Boulder County with areas limited to well west of the Peak to Peak. Now, Alternative Maps 2 & 3 show dispersed shooting allowed right up to both of our houses. Our houses were pretty much hidden on the map because the Ruby Gulch ID Flag was overlapping our location.

The problem goes beyond the much discussed points of health and safety, environmental degradation, noise pollution and target/shell casing pollution. We have seen numerous acts of vandalism aimed at shooters. The major concern is this vandalism will lead to shooters seeking revenge and targeting our homes which both are visible from the Gold Hill Road. We have had one incident where a shooters passenger’s side back window was blown out by some type of projectile. The shooters then drove down my daughter’s driveway to her house to confront her. Fortunately, her response was to have them call the sheriff and they calmed down immediately. What would have happened if she was not at home or if the shooters were not “reasonable” people?! We are highly opposed to dispersed shooting in Boulder County but we are law abiding people and oppose any and all illegal retaliatory actions against those shooters. However, allowing dispersed shooting off of county roads that are populated with homes creates a potential crisis of innocent people being held accountable for illegal acts of vandalism and suffering consequences that could be deadly. Please remove consideration of Alternative Maps 2 and 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Campagnoli</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Regarding Boulder County - Alternative 2 Focused Concept Map I am commenting on a small specific area with which I am familiar, the Forsythe Canyon Trailhead on Boulder County Road 68 (or 68J), but I think the points addressed have much in common with other areas. The Alternative 2 map appears to show &quot;Lands Not Suitable for Dispersed Recreational Sports Shooting&quot; as a relatively small area encompassing about 1/4 mile distance from the trailhead. I often visit this area alone, with family and friends, frequently finding the trailhead parking lot filled to capacity, encounter quite a few people on the trails, and many people hiking, biking, horses and camping along Forest Service Road 359 and Boulder County Road 68J. The entire area including trails and Forest Service Roads all the way to Gross Reservoir is very high use. I think all of this area should be considered as Not Suitable for Dispersed Shooting, not just the area around the trailhead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Melamed</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>I have lived in western Boulder County on the Gold Hill Road since 1971. There is a well known and popular shooting “range” ½ mile from my home. Recreational shooters use this area regularly, year round. In addition to the usual and justified arguments against dispersed shooting such as noise pollution, public safety, environmental impact, littering, lead poisoning etc, dispersed shooting is an exclusive use of the National Forest. No other recreational use is so exclusive – hikers, campers, mountain bikers, bird watchers, etc can all recreate compatibly. However, when shooting is occurring all other National Forest users are unable to enjoy the National Forest in the interest of their safety. Unfortunately not all shooters can be trusted to shoot responsibly, safely and respectfully. It is not equitable that one activity should exclude all other activities. Keep shooting in closed, private, designated ranges away from our public lands. If recreational shooters would like a mountain experience, as one of the partnership members stated, they should leave their guns at home and try going for a nice hike. Sport shooting simply is NOT compatible with all other uses of the National Forest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have lived in western Boulder County on the Gold Hill Road since 1971. There is a well known and popular shooting “range” ½ mile from my home. Recreational shooters use this area regularly, year round. In addition to the usual and justified arguments against dispersed shooting such as noise pollution, public safety, environmental impact, littering, lead poisoning etc, dispersed shooting is an exclusive use of the National Forest. No other recreational use is so exclusive – hikers, campers, mountain bikers, bird watchers, etc can all recreate compatibly. However, when shooting is occurring all other National Forest users are unable to enjoy the National Forest in the interest of their safety. Unfortunately not all shooters can be trusted to shoot responsibly, safely and respectably.

It is not equitable that one activity should exclude all other activities. Keep shooting in closed, private, designated ranges away from our public lands. If recreational shooters would like a mountain experience, as one of the partnership members stated, they should leave their guns at home and try going for a nice hike. Sport shooting simply is NOT compatible with all other uses of the National Forest.

Comment submitted by Molly Melamed
Alternative Map One shows designated shooting ranges in five places along the Peak to Peak Highway and dispersed shooting throughout the James Peak and Indian Peaks Wilderness Areas. This map is absolutely unacceptable on two fronts. 1) After reading many of the comments from people after previous informational meetings it is very clear that none of the designated shooting ranges are safe for local landowners and other users of the National Forest. Additionally, the two, not one, designated ranges at Ruby Gulch are within one mile of my home as well as many other homes. My home is actually concealed under the Ruby Gulch label. Home owners will be seriously affected in all five of the designated areas and it is inequitable to subject some landowners to concentrated shooting while protecting others. 2) If dispersed shooting were permitted in the James Peak and Indian Peaks wilderness areas, this beautiful, pristine natural area would be closed to all other National Forest visitors since it would be dangerous to enter the forests when shooters could be anywhere. You cannot be serious to actually be considering allowing dispersed shooting in the wilderness areas, even if it is legal according to Wilderness by laws.

Alternative Map Two shows dispersed shooting throughout the foothills of Boulder County, close to thousands of homes. This map cannot be taken seriously. Have you not considered the safety of the people living in these areas? Do shooters have more rights than landowners and National Forest users? Alternative Map Three shows more concentrated areas open to dispersed shooting, but still too close to homes, including my own home and my daughter’s home where shooting is permitted right up to our doorsteps according to the map. Once again our homes cannot be seen as they are covered by the Ruby Gulch 2 label. As stated under Map One, it is inequitable to subject some landowners to the invasion of shooters and protect others. If all homeowners cannot be protected then shooting should not be occurring in any of these areas.

Alternative Map Four shows no dispersed shooting in the foothills and is the only map worth considering. I am assuming that the proposed shooting ranges in the mountains listed on this map are not really under consideration due to the infinite comments that clearly illustrate the dangers of shooting anywhere in the foothills or wilderness areas. Have you read ALL of the comments from previous meetings? After studying the maps closely it is apparent that there is no viable solution to this issue. Since most of the shooters do not even live in this region, perhaps the partnership should consider passing this issue on to rifle clubs etc and permanently ban all sport shooting.

Please see attached photo of live trees shot down by shooters. I have many of these photos.
Alternative Map One shows designated shooting ranges in five places along the Peak to Peak Highway and dispersed shooting throughout the James Peak and Indian Peaks Wilderness Areas. This map is absolutely unacceptable on two fronts. 1) After reading many of the comments from people after previous informational meetings it is very clear that none of the designated shooting ranges are safe for local landowners and other users of the National Forest. Additionally, the two, not one, designated ranges at Ruby Gulch are within one mile of my home as well as many other homes. My home is actually concealed under the Ruby Gulch label. Home owners will be seriously affected in all five of the designated areas and it is inequitable to subject some landowners to concentrated shooting while protecting others. 2) If dispersed shooting were permitted in the James Peak and Indian Peaks wilderness areas, this beautiful, pristine natural area would be closed to all other National Forest visitors since it would be dangerous to enter the forests when shooters could be anywhere. You cannot be serious to actually be considering allowing dispersed shooting in the wilderness areas, even if it is legal according to Wilderness by laws. Alternative Map Two shows dispersed shooting throughout the foothills of Boulder County, close to thousands of homes. This map cannot be taken seriously. Have you not considered the safety of the people living in these areas? Do shooters have more rights than landowners and National Forest users? Alternative Map Three shows more concentrated areas open to dispersed shooting, but still too close to homes, including my own home and my daughter’s home where shooting is permitted right up to our doorsteps according to the map. Once again our homes cannot be seen as they are covered by the Ruby Gulch 2 label. As stated under Map One, it is inequitable to subject some landowners to the invasion of shooters and protect others. If all homeowners cannot be protected then shooting should not be occurring in any of these areas. Alternative Map Four shows no dispersed shooting in the foothills and is the only map worth considering. I am assuming that the proposed shooting ranges in the mountains listed on this map are not really under consideration due to the infinite comments that clearly illustrate the dangers of shooting anywhere in the foothills or wilderness areas. Have you read ALL of the comments from previous meetings? After studying the maps closely it is apparent that there is no viable solution to this issue. Since most of the shooters do not even live in this region, perhaps the partnership should consider passing this issue on to rifle clubs etc. and permanently ban all sport shooting in the National Forests and Wilderness Areas. The time and money being spent on this issue is mind boggling considering the limited resources the forest service and the county have. Why are these people so important?

Next 3 pages submitted by Molly Melamed
Alternative Map One shows designated shooting ranges in five places along the Peak to Peak Highway and dispersed shooting throughout the James Peak and Indian Peaks Wilderness Areas. This map is absolutely unacceptable on two fronts.
1) After reading many of the comments from people after previous informational meetings it is very clear that none of the designated shooting ranges are safe for local landowners and other users of the National Forest. Additionally, the two, not one, designated ranges at Ruby Gulch are within one mile of my home as well as many other homes. My home is actually concealed under the Ruby Gulch label. Home owners will be seriously affected in all five of the designated areas and it is inequitable to subject some landowners to concentrated shooting while protecting others.

2) If dispersed shooting were permitted in the James Peak and Indian Peaks wilderness areas, this beautiful, pristine natural area would be closed to all other National Forest visitors since it would be dangerous to enter the forests when shooters could be anywhere. You cannot be serious to actually be considering allowing dispersed shooting in the wilderness areas, even if it is legal according to Wilderness by laws.

Alternative Map Two shows dispersed shooting throughout the foothills of Boulder County, close to thousands of homes. This map cannot be taken seriously. Have you not considered the safety of the people living in these areas? Do shooters have more rights than landowners and National Forest users?

Alternative Map Three shows more concentrated areas open to dispersed shooting, but still too close to homes, including my own home and my daughter’s home where shooting is permitted right up to our doorsteps according to the map. Once again our homes cannot be seen as they are covered by the Ruby Gulch 2 label. As stated under Map One, it is inequitable to subject some landowners to the invasion of shooters and protect others. If all homeowners cannot be protected then shooting should not be occurring in any of these areas.

Alternative Map Four shows no dispersed shooting in the foothills and is the only map worth considering. I am assuming that the proposed shooting ranges in the mountains listed on this map are not really under consideration
due to the infinite comments that clearly illustrate the dangers of shooting anywhere in the foothills or wilderness areas. Have you read ALL of the comments from previous meetings?

After studying the maps closely it is apparent that there is no viable solution to this issue. Since most of the shooters do not even live in this region, perhaps the partnership should consider passing this issue on to rifle clubs etc. and permanently ban all sport shooting in the National Forests and Wilderness Areas. The time and money being spent on this issue is mind boggling considering the limited resources the forest service and the county have. Why are these people so important?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>DeLong</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Graeber</td>
<td>Clear Creek</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgepole Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Swift</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I'm trying to be open-minded and constructive. However, where me and my family live, along Magnolia, it makes absolutely no sense to have hunting and/or shooting of any kind. This is a residential area, not a shooting area of any kind. While we're surrounded by wilderness, this is an extremely active area with: hikers, runners, cyclists, etc. Throughout hunting season we are constantly running into hunters that have no idea where homes are located and we are all too frequently crossing paths. While I doubt they're concerned about what harm the other users of these areas might do to them, we are very concerned about what harm might come to us. There should be no recreational shooting or hunting of any kind in the east Magnolia area, period. Sincerely, Paul, Becky, Jacob (14yrs) and Brody (our dog).  PS If someone gets shot, we'll exercise our rights to the fullest extent. Would anyone in their right mind want it to come to that?

I live at 1042 Lodgepole Dr.  Yes we need some areas to shoot so folks don't just shoot anywhere. I shoot about once a week down at ranges in Denver. Being able to shoot up here would be fantastic. But it must be in an approved area with some type of periodic patrol or something to keep folks following the rules.

I live in Gold Hill and have a couple of neighbors that have experienced an increase in gun shots since the shooting prohibition. We really need to get a new shooting site in Boulder County to help reduce the moron factor here. Ruby Gulch would be an excellent location for a shooting range. It has good access, great backdrop on all 4 sides (also helps with sound attenuation) and room for parking. I have read the objections to this location and find them without merit. For example, one individual said that they were worried about errant rounds falling on their property. They are located in the reverse of the shooting direction and are more than 1.25 miles away over rolling terrain. Their objection seems baseless. Look at the north Boulder Rifle Club which is 1/2 mile north of residential Boulder and has existed for decades without incident. Yes, they have range officers, so perhaps a new location in Ruby Gulch could have volunteers or regulated times with certified range officers. I would strongly recommend this location and would volunteer to monitor some shooting times.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>My wife and I own a home in Raymond. We hear recreational shooting from the Allenspark Dump site on an almost daily (and sometimes nightly! basis). Although we understand the need for shooting sites the noise can be quite annoying. I have attended meetings in the past but was unable to get to the recent open house. However, after reviewing the alternative maps I have the following comments. Alternatives 1. and 4. would certainly be preferable in that they address both the public safety and noise issues related to dispersed shooting. It seems reasonable to limit shooting to regulated sites. That brings me to the Proposed Ranges which I think is the best way to meet the need for shooting sites and the safety and noise issues. The number of Ranges should be a function of both access and demand which hopefully your group can define. Ideally shooting ranges should be indoor facilities available in all weather conditions and able to control safety and noise issues. Whether located indoors or outdoors, shooting Ranges should be staffed and managed and there should be reasonable charges for their use to help offset the cost of operation and maintenance. Most serious shooters would be happy to pay to shoot. Also, if located outdoors, Range hours should be limited or staggered across multiple locations to provide &quot;quiet days&quot; at each location, particularly on weekends when residents are at home. Evening hours should be extremely limited. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>Hello, As a longtime Boulder County resident and a frequent hiker in west Boulder County, I am opposed to any dispersed shooting or designated shooting area in Boulder County. First, because of the potential injury or death of others who are recreating there. Second, because of fire danger. Public safety must come first, and both dispersed shooting and unsupervised shooting areas pose too much risk for both the reasons I mentioned above. Sincerely, Sara Avery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Mr. Sanfacon, I am writing to weigh in about regulating sport shooting in our national forests, specifically since Ruby Gulch and West Magnolia are being considered sites for dispersed shooting. While I selected Boulder County as the area of most interest to me regarding this issue, all of the areas and county options above are of concern to me. A simple internet search shows that shooter-sparked fires are as common (if not more so) as negligent campfires (see links at www.peaktopeakcoalition.com/ShootingRangeFires.pdf). Recent Colorado fires, sparked by shooters include: Boulder County in February, 2017: Target shooters ignite 150-acre fire. Grand County, August, 2015: A stray bullet at Byers Canyon Shooting Range ignited a fire that burned a square mile (evacuations and highway closures). Fort Carson in 2017: A 100-acre fire at the Cheyenne Mountain Shooting Complex. Douglas County, 2017: A seventh fire at the Turkey Track shooting range. Falcon in 2016: Ricochet bullet at shooting area; 214-acre fire. In 2012, a fire started at the Basalt Shooting Range. We have limited resources to combat wildfires. More and more people are moving to, living in, and recreating in our mountains and forests, so the conflicts are steadily increasing on top of the pre-existing problem of illegal and unattended fires (and trash) posed by transients, displaced families, and others camping long term on national forest land in Boulder County. The purpose of this comment is to request an enhancement of public safety and protect our natural resources. FIREarms can cause FIRES, as evidenced by the recent rash of shooting-related fires in Colorado and other arid southwestern states. Please restrict shooting areas to places where 1. it can be easily accessed by the Forest Service, police, and firefighters, 2. there is a reliable, working water source at all times, 3. there is cell service and/or working emergency call phones on site that are regularly maintained, 4. stray bullets from the area can not reach people's homes/driveways, 5. it can be easily and consistently maintained and monitored for trash, tall, dry grass, and safety, 6. the consequences for negligent shooters not adhering to the restrictions are severe, as in the form of a steep monetary fine, 7. all people present in the shooting area are required to sign in with their name, license plate number and description of vehicle, date and time, and number of people in their party, and 8. no exploding targets are allowed. Also, who will keep these areas clean and free of trash? I agree with community member, Doug McKenna, who states that "the self-evident harms of one recreational activity desired by the few should not blatantly violate the rights of or risk the property destruction of so many..."
Dear Mr. Sanfacon, I am writing to weigh in about regulating sport shooting in our national forests, specifically since Ruby Gulch and West Magnolia are being considered sites for dispersed shooting. While I selected Boulder County as the area of most interest to me regarding this issue, all of the areas and county options above are of concern to me. A simple internet search shows that shooter-sparked fires are as common (if not more so) as negligent campfires (see links at www.peaktopeakcoalition.com/ShootingRangeFires.pdf>). Recent Colorado fires, sparked by shooters include: Boulder County in February, 2017: Target shooters ignite 150-acre fire. Grand County, August, 2015: A stray bullet at Byers Canyon Shooting Range ignited a fire that burned a square mile (evacuations and highway closures). Fort Carson in 2017: A 100-acre fire at the Cheyenne Mountain Shooting Complex. Douglas County, 2017: A seventh fire at the Turkey Track shooting range. Falcon in 2016: Ricochet bullet at shooting area; 214-acre fire. In 2012, a fire started at the Basalt Shooting Range. We have limited resources to combat wildfires. More and more people are moving to, living in, and recreating in our mountains and forests, so the conflicts are steadily increasing on top of the pre-existing problem of illegal and unattended fires (and trash) posed by transients, displaced families, and others camping long term on national forest land in Boulder County. The purpose of this comment is to request an enhancement of public safety and protect our natural resources. FIREarms can cause FIRES, as evidenced by the recent rash of shooting-related fires in Colorado and other arid southwestern states. Please restrict shooting areas to places where 1. it can be easily accessed by the Forest Service, police, and firefighters, 2. there is a reliable, working water source at all times, 3. there is cell service and/or working emergency call phones on site that are regularly maintained, 4. stray bullets from the area can not reach people's homes/driveways, 5. it can be easily and consistently maintained and monitored for trash, tall, dry grass, and safety, 6. the consequences for negligent shooters not adhering to the restrictions are severe, as in the form of a steep monetary fine, 7. all people present in the shooting area are required to sign in with their name, license plate number and description of vehicle, date and time, and number of people in their party, and 8. no exploding targets are allowed. Also, who will keep these areas clean and free of trash? I agree with community member, Doug McKenna, who states that "the self-evident harms of one recreational activity desired by the few should not blatantly violate the rights of — or risk the property destruction of — so many others. Creating open-air shooting area/ranges in Boulder County's fire-prone mountains is an act of wholesale government negligence, quite literally a disaster in the making." Amy Fortunato
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Naylor</td>
<td>Clear Creek</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Along with my wife, dog and young family, I am planning to build a home on Squaw Mtn Trail, near several shooting sites that would become unlawful under option 3. The shooting seems to be going on primarily at an unofficial range just South of Echo mountain. We often hear automatic weapons (albeit perhaps 'just' the 'bump-stock' variety) and explosives (presumably tannerite or similar). I know that your models don't take the noise into consideration, but it's not an exaggeration to say that the constant sound of gunfire ruins our experience of being in the mountains. We're up there trying to decompress and the constant, violent, intrusive sounds make us want to go back to the city. I've been to the site and while some of it has a backdrop there is also a west-southwest direction that some are shooting at. This is less than 15 degrees off of the direction in which we live. It's therefore not a stretch think that a misfire high and to the left could put us in danger of a stray bullet. We also have legitimate concerns about fire safety. If I had my way I would choose option 4: I honestly don't feel that there is a need for dispersed shooting in the national forest. But I also appreciate the limitations of enforcement and feel that option 3 is a solution that should be adequate for our needs - if it is accompanied by some enforcement, or at least signage. I'm sure that signs get shot up from time to time but I think that most of the shooting is going on where it is because the participants are trying to follow the rules. If 'no shooting' signs go up along with some reference to a legal range at Devil's nose just a few miles west on 103, I think most will choose to go there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lnda Berteau</td>
<td>Clear Creek</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Proposal C is the most sound. You can't have shooting in areas where people live (like Floyd Hill). A developer is planning to add 550+ townhouses at the base of the hill phased in in the next 10 years. This will double the population here. We won't be able to walk outside our homes without risk of a bullet hitting us if you use Alternative A or B. We won't be able to hike on Pat Creek or SaddleBack Mountain, or across I-70 west of &quot;The Mart&quot; for fear of getting shot. (Proposal D is probably overly conservative, but acceptable. You should be able to measure decibels and consider sound a part of your criteria. We come to the mountains for seclusion and serenity. Hearing guns shot all day sounds like a war zone, not &quot;away from it all&quot; mountain living. There are so many places on Forest land that are secluded and safe - why categorize highly populated zones for recreational shooting? If you really value safety, then have recreational shooting only at specific ranges - made for containing the contaminants of shell casings and ammo. Shooters MUST clean up after their messes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment: WILL THE FOREST SERVICE Supply IAU INFORMANCE FOR CLOSED AREA OR IS THIS HIP SERVICE

Name: LEWIS & DIANNA WAGNER
Address: PO Box 810
BLACK HAWK CO 80427
Email: WAGNER LESB23@AOL.COM

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: We have been attending these meetings for many years. We have been waiting for a designated shooting range. Now we are at another meeting with no progress towards shooting area. I agree to limit shooting. But we need a place to shoot!

Vote Proposed 3

Name: Norma Deede Jones
Address: P.O. Box 358
Black Hawk, CO 80122
Email: Jones Ranch 357C and.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: I'm a shooter and I support the creation of shooting ranges. I do not support restrictions on shooting in the forest. We need to create nice, long ranges that people would prefer to use. Additionally, we should enclose the shooting area under a indoor area like structure to contain the noise and allow shooting during weather. It need not enclose the whole range which should be no shorter than 500 meters.

Name: Geoff Strebe
Address: 2290 Robinson Hill Rd
Golden, Co 80403

Email: ____________________________

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment:Liked Gilpin County Map 3 & 2
Don't believe current open areas should be restricted or closed. Designated range area OK if not causing restrictions as above. Map 2 & 3 only acceptable options.

Name: Dean Davis
Address: 253 Rangefire Dr.
Email: didavis@central.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: As an out of state hunter, I am most concerned about stray bullets and noise. I have hunted in area 38 for 25+ years and have seen hunting pressure go up. I propose that during the hunting seasons all recreating should be disallowed in all areas. This is for the safety of all people and animals. I know all people have the right to recreate in the forest, but when hunting season is only 2 months.

Name: John Gallimore
Address: 1292 Codie Lane
Ammon, Idaho 83406
Email: JimGallimore56@Hotmail.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Long for all seasons, everybody should have curism to let us hunt peacefully.
Comment Card

Comment: All these meetings? I know two sides in Forestry. They want to do something. The county commissioners say no on my watch and the NRA would probably help pay for it.

Name: Larry Sterling
Address: 30 Trail Dust Rd
Blackhawk CO 80427
Email: Larryshomestead@gmail.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment:

I live across from Arapahoe Natl Forest in the Dairy Lakes Subdivision 1000yds on from 119 State Highway. Weekends are a war zones with hundreds of rounds discharged. With cold springs camp ground so close and less used because of safety and noise along with Columbine Camp Ground those would be great places to establish ranges. A partnership with Black Hawk on Mines Map would be good too. Just do something. Law enforcement would use these ranges also like the Summit CO Range.

Name: Brock Nichols
Address: PO Box 88
Black Hawk, CO 80427-0088
Email: qbrocknichols@gmail.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: I am opposed to widespread closure — just unreasonable. We really need a range to shoot at; I think that would reduce dispersed shooting.

Name: Barry Leaver
Address: 1093 Golden Gate Dr, Golden, CO 80403
Email: baleaver@mcn.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.
For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment Card

Comment: I prefer Alternative 2. We need a designated safe shooting area. I oppose closure of Norrie like in Alt. 1.

Name: JERRY K. LEVAN

Address: 1093 Golden Gate
Golden, Co. 80403

Email: dcjim82@comcast.com

Check this box if you’d like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment Card

Comment: They are shooting down trees shooting across the road shooting/throwing rocks at my family cabin.

I like #4 the best!!

Name: Laura Bolles
Address: 3737 Mexia Ln Louisville, CO 80027
Email: Volunteer@Hotmail.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: Close trail and let's build a range. It will make shooters happy to have a safe place to shoot and this rec area is full of residents happy to not hear a gun fire.

Name: Gail Watson
Address: 19411 Hwy 119 Black Hawk, 80427
Email: gail@birdwoodpress.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: WHERE WE CAN SHOOT, HOW EASY TO GET TO, WHEN IT IS OPEN AND DOES IT CLOSE.

Name: **Jim Nelson**
Address: **179 Lodgepole Dr.**
**BLACKHAWK CO, 80427**
Email: **sonofneil@aol.com**

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit

[www.SportShootingPartners.org](http://www.SportShootingPartners.org)
Comment: Ultimately, people will shoot if no area is given to them to do so legally. I believe that a small area should be designated for shooting (somewhere between Alternative 3 & 4) with a designated shooting range within that area. Additional money should be granted for range management and out of range investment.

Name: Linda Lehrer
Address: 1950 Wedgewood Rd
Black Hawk, CO 80427
Email: llehrer5@gmail.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.
For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment:
Retired Law enforcement — potential interest for Range person
Alternative 1 & 4 are not realistic. There are all kinds of "loopholes" where people can still take their guns into the Forest and shoot there guns. Example: "I have my license & I am hunting for coyotes." Alternative 2 or possibly a modified 3 could work.

Name: Paul Wacker
Address: PO Box 17636 Edith & Bay 22
(121 Sth Gate E)
Email: WSK_Wlm59@hotmail.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: Lift above pick up quick then is an
Exhibit informal range already set up.

I would personally want to see any range
moved - highly marked - perhaps fencing
around.

Name: Rebecca Wacker
Address: 20631 17686 Rd. Co 80532
        (621) 971-9402
Email: wsk-wms9@hotmail.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.
For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit
www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: I am a shooter and believe that as citizens we have a right to use our forests and public land. However, the constant noise of shooting during the summer is getting on my nerves. I would like to vote no closures but to preserve my sanity and my need for some peace I will have to vote for option 3.

Name: Nancy Benson
Address: 256 Fox Tail Cir
Black Hawk, CO 80427
Email: 

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
We definitely need range and depending on the demand created by the Denver/Front range people, one might not be enough in Gilpin County. I really hope that it will be possible to actually get a range in Gilpin County. It is a daunting task! Don't give up.
Comment Card

Comment: PLEASE SHOW US THE DATA ON HIGH USE RECREATIONAL AREAS ON FS & COUNTY LANDS - WHERE IS ALL THIS SHOOTING CURRENTLY TAKING PLACE, THE AMOUNT OF COMPLAINTS, INJURIES, LAW ENFORCEMENT ABLE TO SUPERVISE AREA - "THE FRONT RANGE" IS A NARROW RANGE
SHOW DATA FOR INDIVIDUAL COUNTIES - MAYBE NOT ALL COUNTIES NEED A RANGE!

Name: Trudi Kinser

Email: trudi@ionsky.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.
For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
The argument that closing REC Sport Shooting automatically means that we need to provide a shooting range is false. One does not equal the other. Law enforcement seems to have a lack of personnel to enforce closures. Any closures. First, show there is money to hire more law enforcement to patrol National Forest when closures take place.

The argument that the political climate makes us have to provide a shooting range is short-sighted/one-sided and is not taking into consideration the unique make-up of each county.
Comment Card

Comment: I CHOOSE TO LIVE IN A PLACE WHERE IT IS REMOTE. I KNOW I HAVE TO DRIVE TO ANOTHER AREA/CITY FOR MY HOBBIES. SHOOTERS CAN DO THE SAME. FOR MANY, HOMES REPRESENT WEALTH. THAT IS A RETIREMENT ACCOUNT. PUTTING A SHOOTING RANGE IN BRINGS PROPERTY VALUES DOWN. THIS SEEMS TO BE A WAY TO CATER TO THE FEW.

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.
For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
IN GILPIN COUNTY BY PROVIDING A SHOOTING RANGE. WHY IS THERE NOT A VOTE ON WHETHER OR NOT THE COUNTY WANTS SHOOTING RANGES? PEOPLE ARE NOT GOING TO MOVE AWAY—they don't have one now. Further, I see no strong evidence Gilpin has the funds to pay for more enforcement if dispersion is limited—people are going to continue to use Nat'l Forest until there are real consequences for shooting in Nat'l Forest. Show the enforcement possibility with data/funding.
Comment: I think rather than restricting an area to just develop requirement that needs to be met to shoot safely. My neighbor allows shoot firearms on his side of the canyon. I can here 2-3 times. They all shoot safely. The citizens needs to be taught what safe shooting practices are. Public Service message would be great. Only Alternative is even close to reasonable. Some folk are causing damage when there is none. They need to learn as well.

Name: Robert Clemans
Address: 6494 Lone Eagle Rd
Golden CO 80412-8122
Email: rjclemans@wildblue.net

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Target should be paper or wood blocks
plastic, metal (slings, swings, etc)
Be sure of your target background (side-safe areas)

What's an safe shooting site?

If you restrict areas you must develop formula ranges
within 10 min. out of the door. Like Pawnee Branchbanks. But closer
That would mean developing 5-7 formula ranges.

There are more fishermen. Shooters every day. Owners must have
somewhere to learn about safety and practice their skills.
Comment: Please ban shooting in the National Forest near residential areas. I hate the sound of gun fire & I hear it way too much where I live—West Chicago Creek.

Thanks!

Dede Waldron

Name: Dede Waldron
Address: 15 Gray Wolf Place, Idaho Springs, 80452
Email: dedeleen@gmail.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.
For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit

www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: Map #4 is the only acceptable option. All other allow shooting in areas where people hike, bike, camp, ride ATVs, etc. and areas that are close to homes. None of these activities should be done with people shooting. I have encountered people shooting on trails + paths - it is scary and people with guns are aggressive. I am not opposed to hunters during season - it should be well posted on highway signs + county roads that it is hunting season.

Name: Nancy Spletzen

Address: PO Box 365
Idaho Springs, CO 80452

Email: nancy.spletzen.com
Comment Card

Comment: My property has been greatly compromised with dispersed shooting. What was once peaceful and serene has become a war zone. There is no reason shooters should be allowed to interrupt my peace and quiet. Let them go to a designated area to satisfy their ego boosting trip. If you can hear it, it's too close.

Alternative: NO DISPERSED SHOOTING

Name: John Ewers
Address: 312 Pisgah Lake Rd
Idaho Springs, Colo 80452
Email: ewers@yahoo.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment Card

Comment: I'm near Pisgah Lake (up off of Fall River to top of mountain) and does not solve issue. Include noise problem.

Alternative #1 Acceptable

Alternative #2 Acceptable

Alternative #3 Acceptable

People are shooting down valley & I hear bullets whizzing by my house. Happens every few weekends.

Name: Jeff Payne
Address: 1151 Pisgah Lake Road
Email: Jeff.Payne@iwwmsys.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list. For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: I like the concept and lean toward options that close more area. Would like to err on the side of closing areas where conflict is likely to arise as population increases. Popular hiking trails, high alpine ecologies, etc. should be considered. Bigger buffers around municipalities. Please include noise as a factor in your analysis.

Name: George Marin
Address: 1302 Colorado Blvd
Idaho Springs, CO 80452-2095
Email: Gmarlin86@gmail.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: Alternative 4 is the best one. It leaves shooting options open at designated shooting ranges, but protects bikers and residents from the dangers of firearm consequences, including but not limited to fires resulting from discharge, accidents near homes, environmental impacts to trees, wildlife, trash, and the obvious lack of enforcement ability. Alternative 3 is only one possible.

Name: Etta Satter
Address: 330 Hiddenway Circle
Evergreen, CO 80439
Email: etta@ettasatterpottery.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment Card

Comment: THE ENVIR. ASSESSMENT SHOULD INCLUDE OTHER NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF SPORT SHOOTING INCLUDING NOISE, ENVIR. DAMAGE, TRASH, ETC.
ALT #4 - EXCELLENT! BEST
#3 - VERY GOOD
#2 - ACCEPTABLE
#1 - UNACCEPTABLE, THIS SOLVES NOTHING

Name: OTTO VANGEET
Address: 58 BIG MEADOW DR
IDAHO SPRINGS
Email: OTTO.VANGEET@NREL.GOV

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.
For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
My family and all my neighbors have had many safety issues with sports shooting including the noise of bullets whizzing by, bullets hitting houses, etc. We are all very lucky no one has been hurt or killed.
Comment: Act #1 & 2 are totally unacceptable. Too much conflict with hikers & mountain bikers. Preference for alternate #3, it protects homes & most hiking trails.

Yes on Act #3.

Name: Sue Howell
Address: Box 432 / 365 Divide View Dr
Email: jasa howell @ Aol.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: I would be fully supportive of alternative 4 only. Current restrictions do not support safe use of modern high powered weapons (150 yards grossly inadequate). There is no difference to me shooting end user between shooting on range and dispersed shooting on public lands.

Name: Andy Dees
Address: 6707 Fall River Rd
Idaho Springs, CO 80452
Email: Freddie34@aol.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment Card

Comment: DON'T CONTAMINATE OUR PRECIOUS WATER SUPPLY
BEAVER BROOK CLEAR CREEK WITH LEAD
FROM BULLET CASINGS!
PROJECTILES & GROSS FROM CASINGS

Name: LINDA BERTHAU
Address: 957 ASPEN DRIVE
EVERGREEN CO 80439
Email: MUSICTS420@ECENTRAL.COM

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: The shooting at the unofficial range on Squaw Mtn off of 103 has become very frequent. Participants are using automatic weapons and explosive devices. Local residents desire to have a voice when it comes to the noise. We are also legitimately concerned about the fire risk. The Devils Nose proposal is an acceptable compromise but other a prohibition against shooting in other areas needs to be enforced.

Name: Shawn Naylor
Address: 2547 W 32nd Ave
Denver, CO 80211
Email: drnaylor@gmail.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: ALT #1 is deficient by not excluding the land/house along Soda Creek. Why?? What do you gain by not excluding Soda Creek safety is paramount noise is next in consideration protect those of us who have invested in the county/forest by living here.

Name: Norm Kramer
Address: C.O. Box 657
Idaho Springs 80452
Email: storminden@AOL.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.
For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: ALT #3 is by far the best by protecting the residents of Idaho Springs.
- safety buffer
- noise buffer

- Noise needs to be considered in analysis as well as safety.

Name: Norm Cramer
Address: P.O. Box 657
Idaho Springs 80452
Email: storminder@AOL.com

☐ Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit
www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: SPORT SHOOTERS IN MY AREA, 1904 PISGACH LAKE ROAD, HAVE BEEN SHOOTING RECLASILY ENDANGERING MY SAFETY AND PROPERTY AND SPORT SHOOTING OF PISGACH LAKE ROAD NEED TO BE BANNED, IT IS OUT OF CONTROL AND EVENTUALLY SOMEONE WILL BE SHOT OR KILLED

Name: RALPH NELMS
Address: 5305 ORCHARD STREET
          GOLDEN, COLORADO
Email: ralphnelmse901.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
I support ALTERNATIVE 1 + 4

I oppose ALTERNATIVE 2 + 3.

Noise should be included.
Comment: Noise absolutely needs to be part of this study. It affects people for up to 10 miles from the shooter depending on topography. It can ruin a hike, a day off, a day in the "wilderness".

- Fires do start from shooting!!
- 450' is not a safe distance by any means
- Noise is not ok. If I blared an air horn all day in the same place, I would be arrested.

Name: Steven Kroll
Address: 4162 Beaver Brook Canyon Rd.
         Evergreen, CO 80439
Email: skroll345@gmail.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit
www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment:  We have lived at the bottom of Rainbow Rd for 18 years. At that time we were the only home five to six miles up. There was intermittent camping and shooting at the bottom of the valley near the Rainbow Rd. It has always been a nuisance: noise and trash is a safety issue. However, over the last few years it has gone beyond a nuisance. Every weekend and many weekdays it is from morning until dark. We have not been able to take our grandchildren hiking for the last two summers fearing a stray bullet. We bought Sacres 18 years ago for the peace, rec. hiking, snowshoeing, etc. We are no longer able to enjoy peaceful activities.

Name: Yvonne Dees
Address: 6707 Fall River Rd
(at the bottom of Ayla Rd - Shooting at 1st switchback)  
(*Rainbow Rd)
Email: yvonnemeades@ad.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
our property with our family because of the noise and safety of rec. shooting. We bought this area with forest service ground to for the shooting opportunity. Also, many more homes have been built on this road. Also, the traffic has increased greatly. The safety of shooting so close to cars, homes, and hiking is a big safety issue. I have made the analogy that it might be "legal" to ride my motorcycle around & around someone's home on a city street but is it the right thing to do? Is the shooter's rights more important than the homeowner's rights to peace and quiet and our right to hike without grand daughter without fearing for her safety.

Again, at one point in the past it was just us but now there are more homes and many more planned. It is only going to get worse because more & more people driving and building on Rainbow Rd.

* Rainbow Rd

Definitely Alternative 4

2nd Choice Alternative 1

Thank you for listening.
Comment: As an avid outdoorsman, I've experienced several near misses from shooters near our home & hiking trails near our home. The areas of Bald Mt. Rd., Alpine, Pisgah are occupied by numerous homes yet shooters regularly shoot unsafely. Please select Alternative 4 or Alt. 5. Please do not select Alternative #2 as it will provide no protection.

Name: Mike Sowden
Address: 659 Alpine Way
         Idaho Springs, CO
Email: msowden@rmrdg.org

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: Shooters regularly subject our family to harm by shooting near our home. Please restrict shooting in our neighborhood (Alpine way, Pikes Peak Bald Mtn). Several times a year we call police to rescue us from unsafe shooting. Please do not select Alternative #2 as that endangers my family.

Name: Logan Souders
Address: 657 Alpine way
Idaho Springs, CO 80452
Email: 

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment:

1) Prefer Alternative 4 as most consistent with the Constitution as it protects our peace, tranquility and our safety.
2) Noise must be analyzed and a threshold established. I suggest 65 to 70 decibels. I could live with accommodating a small amount of noise, but not increased beyond 10 decibels. Alternative 3 is an open to recreational sport shooting.

Name: Glenn Wallace
Address: 586 Hyland Drive
Evergreen, CO 80439
Email: rawguy@gmail.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.
For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment:  
- Option 2 seems the best as safety factors are considered and the maximum acres are kept open for sport shooting.
- A greater number of USFS shooting ranges need to be provided. If ranges are not provided on FS lands, the shooting pressure will greatly increase on private and other public lands (fed, state, county).

Name: Frank Young
Address: P.O. Box 1027
        Silver Plume CO 80476
Email: fyoung 2688@aol.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: Options 1-3 - the broad brush approach to closure areas does not take topography into consideration. More local/specific site analysis needs to be done in order to tailor the closure areas with the local condition.

Name: Frank Young
Address: Bay 1027
        Silver Plume CO 80476
Email: fryoung2688@aol.com

☐ Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.
For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: Number 1 alternative and if alternative is my vote.
I have encountered unsafe shooters up and down Bald mountain lane specifically towards the top of Bald mountain lane. Shortly before you reach York Gulch at a curve with an old gate and a forest service road that goes down toward Eureka meadow, also near Bald mountain cemetery I and about halfway between these two locations. The other area we have had problems with unsafe shooters is at the base of Pigeon mountain trailhead (extreme). In all of these occasions we were in literal danger and had to yell to let them know we were hiking and needed them to stop as we went in their line of fire.

Name: Diane Knapp
Address: 659 Alpine Way
Idaho Springs, CO
Email: diane.m.knapp@gmail.com

☐ Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit

www.SportShootingPartners.org
In 3 out of the four occasions they did not hear us and we had to either crawl out of danger because the bullets whizzed near us or hit trees right next to us or had to turn back up Pigeon Hill to get to safety. We have had to call the cops many times and sometimes on the same people who come back and shoot near or toward hiking trails that people hike in the summer and snowshoe/cross country ski in the winter.

I don't have a problem with people shooting responsibly but I feel that that is the exception. It seems, in our area, irresponsible shooters have been the rule.
Comment Card

Comment: I strongly support Act 4 - No Disposed Shooting. Shooting should be restricted to established ranges.

Clear Creek County has become a recreational destination for the Front Range. A recreational use will only grow. Shooting is inherently dangerous and is incompatible with other forms of recreation.

Name: STEVE AXTELL
Address: 37 PAT GRIFFIN RD EV CREEK CO 80439
Email: STEVEAXTELL@MSN.COM

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: As a resident of Beverly Brook Canyon at the entrance of the Beverly Brook Waterfall, I'm highly opposed to shooting in a area of great recreation. Don't worry.

Name: Kaye Axtell
Address: 37 Park Circle Rd
Evergreen, CO 80439
Email: kaye.axtell@gmail.com

☐ Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: Key concern for me is along FS 175.1, particularly the junction with Sherley Mtn Rd (708.1?) and then the existing "shooting area" at the junction of 173.3B.

at the first location numerous pines and other trees have been "shot down" in the past few years.

Name: Glen Smith
Address: 1819 Collyar St
Longmont, CO 80501
Email: [email protected]

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment Card

Comment: ALTERNATIVE A DOES NOT SHOW IN PURPLE THE 525

NOVES ON FLOYD NILE, BREDER BARK, SADOOLBACK, THE GRAND PRESERVE +

THE HIDEAWAY. IT ALSO DOES NOT INDICATE THE HIGH SCHOOL +

EARLY TAIL DAY CARE CENTER. IT ALSO DOES NOT INCLUDE

THE PAT CREEK & SADOOLBACK TRAILHEADS. THIS IS A RESIDENTIAL

AREA & SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED FOR RECREATIONAL SHOOTING.

IN ALTERNATIVES 1 & 2, IF SAFETY IS TRULY YOUR #1 CONCERN

[Signature]

Name: LINDA BERTENAU
Address: 957 ASPEN DRIVE

EVEGREEN CO 80439
Email: MUSCLECATS420@ECENTRAL.COM

□ Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
August 25, 2015

Arapaho & Roosevelt National Forests
Attn: RSS Proposal
2150 Centre Avenue, Building E
Ft. Collins, CO 80526

Dear U.S. Forest Service Recreational Shooting designated areas Planners

After reading the USFS proposal as well as attending an informational meeting at the Bergen Park Fire Station on July 23, I would like to express my concerns with the Beaver Brook Watershed (BBW) being designated as suitable for recreational sport shooting. My husband and I have lived on Floyd Hill in Clear Creek County for 9 years. We value this pristine mountain area that we share with 1,000 other residents in 4 subdivisions*: Floyd Hill (aka Hyland Hills subdivision*), Beaver Brook, SaddleBack, and the Preserve. We all enjoy the close proximity our homes share with the BBW for taking hikes with our families and pets. It is very concerning that the Forest Service is considering recreational sport shooting (RSS) or a designated shooting area (DSA) in an area adjacent to such a large mountain community and in a highly used recreational area.

The U.S. Forest Service has the responsibility to protect public health and safety and with the size of Denver and the I-70 corridor expected to double in size by 2024, adding recreational sports shooting to mix use U.S. forest areas is of great concern to those living in the urban interface.

1. **The proposed Forest Plan Goals and Objectives clearly establish Public Health and Safety as their #1 concern. The highly populated 4 mountain communities adjacent to the BBW plus those on Squaw Pass's safety as well as hikers in this highly trafficked area are endangered by the likelihood of stray bullets able to injure or kill hikers or pets legally using the same open space for recreation. Note Park County shooting killing a citizen sharing the same area as a recreational shooter.***

   a. Planning recreational shooting within 1,000 feet of homes is a safety issue since .22 bullets travel up to 1 mile and 30.06 bullets travel as far as 2.5 miles!**** If your principal concern is public safety as stated in your proposal, this is a serious flaw which affects the safety of all who pass through this high usage watershed.

   b. Our subdivision has been designated has an "extreme fire risk" by the Evergreen Fire/Rescue's CWPIP. Documented wildfires started by recreational sport shooting impose an added risk of starting fires which risk the lives and property of the 1,000+ individuals living west of BBW. Our emergency egress routes are nowhere near the capacity needed to evacuate the 1000 residents in 4 subdivisions in a timely manner in case of a wildfire. Our lives and homes would be put at risk if shooting were allowed in the BBW.

2. **The proposed Forest Plan Objective #4 proposes to identify at least one designated shooting area within each of the 5 counties inside or adjacent to the Arapahoe and Roosevelt National Forests. Clear Creek County has designated 3 RSS, whereas Boulder and Gilpin Counties have not identified even one. Perhaps the other 2 Clear Creek areas designated suitable for DRSS are safe (Devil's Nose and expansion of the Dumont Shooting Club), but the BBW is not. Only one is required. How many designated areas have been identified by the other 2 counties in the plan? How can this disparity be tolerated based on equal taxation of residents of all 5 counties?**

3. Some U.S. forest lands have limitations on their use (non motorized, no horses, bicycles on designated days only, etc.). The Clear Creek Open Space Commission originally designated BBW as non-motorized and no
target shooting. When/Why was this changed? Sport shooting is too dangerous to be allowed in a high-usage hiking/ picnicking/ skiing area in close proximity to residences. Even one injury is too many to risk.

4. How can shooting regulations be enforced for the parts of the BBW which are not designated for recreational shooting (on the mix adjacent of private land, State Land Board land, and Lookout Mountain Water District lands)? How will the perimeter be clearly marked? If shooting is not allowed within 150 yards of a designated public trail or across the 2 reservoirs located in the BWW, practically, how can this be monitored in such a large area, especially if dispersed shooting is approved? Exposed high pressure gas lines occur in the BBW (see photo). How can these areas be protected from explosions/fire if hit by errant bullets? How will the litter created from shell casings, broken glass, and clay disks at an outdoor shooting area be collected and removed from U.S. Forest land? \textit{Toxic lead will leach into our water supply.}

While I am generally in agreement with multiple use of our forest lands, since U.S. citizens all pay taxes to support the maintenance of these shared resources, recreational shooting should be limited to safe areas (such as box canyons with totally isolated backstops) and distant from major population areas where the danger of accidental shooting of humans or pets is high, as is the chance of starting a fire on these pristine lands the U.S. Forest Service has pledged to protect.

If the BBW is designated as a recreational sport shooting area, I will no longer walk along it’s designated paths, even with a fluorescent vest on, I will be terrified to risk my life walking in such a dangerous area. I will likely move out of this area, due to fear of wildfires started by RSS. Such fears will affect other neighbors, visitors, and ultimately the economy of Colorado.

Mike Weege, Fire Chief of Evergreen Fire/Rescue, e-mailed me his opinion on recreational sports shooting in the BBW area: "I, personally, do not like the idea of recreational shooting in the Beaver Brook area."

As a resident of eastern Clear Creek County who is a frequent user of U.S. Forest Service Resources, I emphatically feel Beaver Brook Watershed is unsuitable for any type of recreational sports shooting, but in particular, dispersed shooting.

*see Floyd Hill 2009 Sub-regional Master Plan and 2011 Floyd Hill Colorado Wildfire Protection Implementation Plan.

** Per Hyland Hills first filing Covenants, Book 270, page 129 7/31/81.

***note 7/10/15 death of Glenn Martin in Pike National Forest by errant bullet from recreational sport shooter, and 2009 injury of Otis Freisen at Rampart Range Road in Pike National Forest in El Paso County.

****Per Northern Front Range Recreational Sport Shooting Management Partnership.

\[\text{Signature}\]

Linda G. Berteau  
957 Aspen Drive  
Evergreen, CO 80439  
musicats420@ecentral.com  
303-679-3025
A 25-year-old man was shot and killed at a shooting range in Colorado Springs.

Otis Freison of Aurora, Colo., was killed Saturday. Authorities said Freison was shot in the chest while shooting with friends at the Rampart Range Road shooting area, which is on U.S. Forest Service land. The range is in the Pike National Forest, near the Garden of the Gods park.

A spokeswoman for the El Paso County Sheriff’s office told 7NEWS the man was accidentally shot by a friend as he was unloading the 9mm handgun. The person was trying to clear their weapon when the gun fired, said Lt. Lari Sevene.

"As a general rule, everyone is on the line parallel to each other and their firearms are pointed down range, but this is a public range so there is no oversight," Sevene said.

That lack of oversight should lead officials to close the range, according to the victim's father.

Freison’s father, also named Otis Freison, told 7NEWS reporter Lane Lyon, This is something that was preventable.

Freison said he believes the shooting area should be closed, based on large crowds he saw Sunday when he visited where his son died.

It was pretty disturbing, he said. I took pictures of toddlers running up the hill where their parents were shooting. It was like a carnival. Freison said.

Individuals are responsible for their actions, but this situation doesn't allow for people to be responsible, Freison said.

If it's not closed, there needs to be some type of supervision or safety zone, he said.

The area, known as South Rampart Shooting Range, sees 40,000 visitors a year, said Brent Botts, District Ranger for the US Forest Service.

Botts stressed responsibility falling upon users of the range.

I compare it to being on a beach without a life guard, Botts said.

A National Rifle Association-sponsored shooting range adviser inspected the trash-strewn site in April 2007, according to a decision memo on the Forest Service Web site.

The adviser "recommended that supervision on site was needed immediately," the memo said.

In 2006, an article in The (Colorado Springs) Gazette described the range as chaotic and full of trash, from beer cans to computer monitors and refrigerators.

Botts told 7NEWS large dumpsters filled with trash are taken from the area six times a year. The decision not to have a range master on site has come down to available resources.
Man killed by errant bullet in Pike National Forest highlights growing problem

The Douglas County killing of Glenn Martin has implications for a decades-old debate

By Jesse Paul
The Denver Post
Posted: 07/10/2015 03:45:33 PM MDT | 174 Comments | Updated: 13 days ago

Camper Porsche Carey, 14, left, and her brother Ryu, 12, right, check out a tree that is filled with bullet holes in their campsite at Rainbow Falls Park campground near Woodland Park, Colorado on July 8, 2015. The kids and their grandfather Larry Smith, say they hear gunfire every single day while camping. (THE DENVER POST | Helen H. Richardson)

- Jul 14:
  - Douglas County investigators: 2 more guns slated for testing in forest death, 1 ruled out
- Jul 13:
  - Douglas County investigators: 1 gun turned in for testing in forest death
- Jul 9:
  - Douglas County sheriff to test rifles in slaying of man by apparently errant bullet
- Jul 6:
  - Family remembers man killed by apparently errant bullet while camping in Douglas County

RAINBOW FALLS PARK — Spent shell casings and trees chewed raw by bullets litter campgrounds where families have come for decades in search of wilderness.

It was here, in the shadows of land scarred by the Hayman fire, that Glenn Martin, a 60-year-old Monument man enjoying the holiday with his family, was killed last week by an apparently errant shot as he waited to roast marshmallows.

Down the U.S. Forest Service road from where he died, a "No shooting" sign greets all who enter the secluded Douglas County campground about 50 miles southwest of Castle Rock.

"It's a scary thought," Larry Smith, of Peyton, said at his campsite as his three grandchildren fumbled over discarded bullet casings. "We don't want to stop coming. We could wear a helmet and pads."

The forest service has been systematically closing areas such as Rainbow Falls Park, inside Pike National Forest, to shooters for years. But gun enthusiasts say doing so has only pushed
When asked what changes were implemented since recommendations were made in 2007, Botts said berms were built down below to prevent lead contamination, a perimeter was established behind the shooting range to make sure visitors don't go where people are shooting, and large signs were posted in lieu of a range manager.

The president of the state association for the NRA argued the shooting area should not be shut down.

Where this occurred is immaterial, said Tony Fabian, of the Colorado State Shooters Association.

"What's important to focus on is what happened here. And what happened here was a complete irresponsibility of handling a firearm and in violation of safety rules," Fabian said.

The El Paso County District Attorney's Office will review the shooting to determine if charges should be filed.

There are similar impromptu shooting ranges on national forest land in Jefferson and Park counties. Another Rampart Range shooting area in Douglas County was used by Dylan Klebold and Eric Harris to practice using their weapons before the Columbine massacre.

Freison said he planned to visit with El Paso County sheriff's officials on Tuesday. He declined to give too many details about the incident until is meeting.

Frieson said his son and the person who shot him had taken gun safety courses. They knew they're supposed to point their gun down range, he added.

I don't believe in accidents, Freison said. I believe in carelessness, and that's what happened here.

2009 by TheDenverChannel.com. The Associated Press contributed to this report. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed.

CASTLE ROCK — Glenn Martin was roasting marshmallows with his family during a holiday weekend camping trip when suddenly he "just went down" in his chair and said, "Ow."

Through tears and nostalgic smiles, Martin's daughters and son-in-law on Monday remembered the man killed Friday by what authorities believe was an errant bullet, and they recalled the tragic event.

Martin, 60, of Monument was shot in Pike National Forest while sitting by a campfire in the Rainbow Falls Park area, which is north of Woodland Park and popular among recreational shooters.

Martin's daughter Carlie, who asked that her last name not be used for privacy's sake, burst into tears when asked how it happened.
In August, the U.S. Forest Service banned recreational shooting on land near Mount Herman between Monument and Woodland Park, east of where Martin was killed. In one of the incidents that prompted the ban, a couple told authorities their Jeep was hit by a bullet as they sat in it eating lunch.

The ruling was met with disapproval among shooters, and The Gazette reported that several "No shooting" signs in the banned area were peppered with gunfire.

"It's an issue that some of our Front Range forests are working through," Chris Strebig, spokesman for the forest service's Rocky Mountain Regional Office, said Monday afternoon.

Firing a gun in the forest is not allowed within 150 yards of a residence, building, campsite, developed recreational site or other occupied area, or in any circumstance in which a person could be injured or property damaged, according firearms rules for the forest.

"Forests are generally open to target shooting, but you can't shoot across roadways or near recreation sites," Strebig said. "You need to have a backdrop."

The Douglas County Sheriff's Office said Martin's death remains under investigation. Officials said the shooting is not believed to be an intentional act, although "that has not been ruled out."

Investigators are asking anyone who was shooting a high-powered rifle in the area or saw someone shooting such a long gun at the time of the shooting to call law enforcement.

Carlie called whoever shot her father an "irresponsible person" who probably doesn't even realize what happened.

"They know they weren't supposed to have guns there," she said. "It's not a shooting range."

Son-in-law Chris said he hopes that anyone who was shooting in that area or has information on the incident comes forward.

"Man up," he said. "So we can have some peace of mind and closure."

---

**Shortline Subaru**

- Home
- Denver and the West
- Story

**Denver and the West**
Martin's daughter Carlie, who asked that her last name not be used for privacy's sake, burst into tears when asked how it happened.

"What happened was that I lost my best friend," she said Monday afternoon during a news conference at the Douglas County Sheriff's Office. "I lost the role model for our boys. Now we just have to have the memory."

Sgt. Ron Hanavan, spokesman for the sheriff's office, said the area in which Martin was shot had "No shooting" signs posted.

Martin was the quintessential family man, Carlie said. He went to every one of his grandsons' school events, games and milestones.

"Sunshine. That's what he was," Carlie said.

Having grown up camping, Carlie said it was her idea to gather the family for a trip over the Fourth of July weekend.

After talking Martin into taking a day off work as a machinist — a profession she said fit her "engineering genius" father — they headed up to a secluded campground about three miles up into the park area with her husband, Chris, and her sons.

"It was a perfect camping spot," she said. "We felt it would be very safe."

The family had just finished eating dinner and was roasting marshmallows, Carlie said. Nobody realized that Martin was shot. Authorities have not said where the bullet hit Martin.

"We thought he was stung by a bee or having a heart attack," Carlie said. "Then it just happened very quickly, very graphically and in front of my sons."

The family had been hearing shots fired in the area throughout the day, and Martin reported it to forestry services, who said they would check into it.

"We assumed it would be taken care of," Carlie said.

After Martin was struck, Carlie and Chris loaded him into the back of their vehicle with their children and dogs and raced down the mountain.

"I thought if I just kept giving CPR, as soon as we got to the paramedic, they could fix him," she said. "We just couldn't get down the mountain fast enough."

With so many gun enthusiasts in the Rainbow Falls Park area, stray bullets have raised concern and have been blamed for a number of close calls, especially within the past year.
that prompted the ban, a couple told authorities their Jeep was hit by a bullet as they sat in it eating lunch.

The ruling was met with disapproval among shooters, and *The Gazette reported* that several "No shooting" signs in the banned area were peppered with gunfire.

"It's an issue that some of our Front Range forests are working through," Chris Strebig, spokesman for the forest service's Rocky Mountain Regional Office, said Monday afternoon.

Firing a gun in the forest is not allowed within 150 yards of a residence, building, campsite, developed recreational site or other occupied area, or in any circumstance in which a person could be injured or property damaged, according firearms rules for the forest.

"Forests are generally open to target shooting, but you can't shoot across roadways or near recreation sites," Strebig said. "You need to have a backdrop."

The Douglas County Sheriff's Office said Martin's death remains under investigation. Officials said the shooting is not believed to be an intentional act, although "that has not been ruled out."

Investigators are asking anyone who was shooting a high-powered rifle in the area or saw someone shooting such a long gun at the time of the shooting to call law enforcement.

Carlie called whoever shot her father an "irresponsible person" who probably doesn't even realize what happened.

"They know they weren't supposed to have guns there," she said. "It's not a shooting range."

Son-in-law Chris said he hopes that anyone who was shooting in that area or has information on the incident comes forward.

"Man up," he said. "So we can have some peace of mind and closure."

**Denver and the West**

**Man killed by errant bullet in Pike National Forest highlights growing problem**

The Douglas County killing of Glenn Martin has implications for a decades-old debate

*By Jesse Paul*

*The Denver Post*

Posted: 07/10/2015 03:45:33 PM MDT [174 Comments] | Updated: 13 days ago
some that don't."

In the forest district where Martin was killed, the number of firearms-related incidents, warnings and citations jumped from 65 over a 12-month period starting in July 2013 to 324 over the comparable period ending this week, according to the forest service.

But patrolling such a vast space — more than 1.1 million acres — is difficult, even with the help of county sheriff's offices and other law enforcement agencies. Shooting is generally legal on national forest land except in marked areas, across roadways, near recreation sites and without a backstop.

"The more places you close down, the more concentrated you make the places where people can go shoot," said Anthony Fabian, president of the Colorado State Shooting Association. "These competing-use issues have really only come to the forefront in the last decade."

While Martin's death is a rare occurrence there, illegal shooting is rampant at Pike National Forest. The National Forest Service recorded 324 shooting violations last year. Compare that to 65 the year before.

End of comments from card #55
Comment Card

Comment: I support either Alt. 4 or Alt. 1, with lots of homes near trails and many inexperienced shooters, it's a very risky proposition allowing shooting near homes. A buffer of at least 1/2 a mile is needed, preferably 1 mile from homes to areas where dispersed shootings is allowed.

Name: Carmi Gazit
Address: 7578 Magnolia Dr.
Nederland, CO 80466
Email: ___________________________

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: The vast majority of all firearms in use today are semi-automatic. Please do not ban these firearms. Banning fully automatic weapons is fine with me. Even WWII + WWIII weapons are semi-automatic.

Yes to the Lyons site!!! We would love this.

Also, please 2 sides - one north + one south. BOCO is big. People don't want to drive from.

Name: Pamela White
Address: 2100 Sherman St, Broomfield CO 80050
Email: pswhite@earthlink.net

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment Card

Comment: I think that any alternative other than closing all dispersed shooting on Forest Service land will concentrate the destruction and littering that happens with unregulated shooting. The problems and conflicts will become worse within a few years.

Name: Elliott Larson
Address: 15927 Gold Hill Rd, Boulder, CO 80302

Email: 

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: There are a lot of shooting ranges that are out close to Beaver Reservoir & these areas could expand. I have no dispersed shooting areas by Beaver Reservoir. This area is way too full of people who use this area recreationally & many don't wish to hear shooting all day (we hear it already at our cabin & it impacted us negatively). If we could stop dispersed shooting in our forest, it would have much more joy in it.

Name: Jennifer Shindell
Address: O County Rd 96
Email: Steurdi@mac.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
We cannot get cell service at Beaver Reservoir to call to report dispersed shooting. We don't want any shooting at Beaver Reservoir as it's so unsafe for so many people. We couldn't get cell service to call for an accidental shooting or a fire starting from hot ammunition.
Comment:
The Beaver Reservoir site would be dangerously close to the Camp Tahosa Boy Scout camp and many hikers, off readers, mushroom hunters, hikers, etc. This is a very active area & this range could endanger others with inexperienced gun enthusiasts. I'm concerned about fires starting from this use as well.

Name: Jennifer Shindell
Address: 0 County Rd 96
Email: fleuri@mac.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Our cabin is not a dot on your map. It is very close to Coney Creek through Stappes Lakes Lodge (which is also not on the map). We built it in 1922 and we have a lot of shooting at it. Consistently scares our family and makes our cabin much less enjoyable. I'm fearful of one of my children, nieces or any family member being shot while in the woods. A shooting range could really be an added danger to our family's cabin.
Comment Card

Comment: The Beaver Reservoir is not a good place for dispersed shooting as there are so many people around that could be dangerous to the public. In this area we have consistent users from spring to early winter from hikers, a Boy Scout camp, backpackers, mushroom hunters, ATV users, off-road users and many more.

Name: Jennifer Shindal
Address: 0 County Rd 96
Email: fleurdi@mac.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: Given that wilderness areas are designated to be valuable and protected by many that they are protected as “untarnished by man,” how can target shooting in such areas be allowed? If this is not considered conflict, how can this not be a conflict?

Name: Sara Michl
Address: 501 Aurora #6
80302
Email: smichl@colorado.edu

Check this box if you’d like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: Given the conflict between the need to protect surrounding areas from impacts of a shooting range and the desire to provide a shooting range before limiting sport shooting on public lands, what criteria do we use to make a decision? How do we establish criteria to use in decision-making? How do we order these criteria? In other words, what are the highest values? (e.g., preserving natural values, protecting safety and comfort of residents, safety of people near shooting ranges?)

Name: Sara Michi
Address: 501 Aurora Av., Boulder 80302
Email: smichi@colorado.edu

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: How is a gun range the highest use on Forest Service lands. The lands in Boulder are used extensively by families. Use Boulder County Road 94 to move shooting range to areas that are usable to public right of way (highway).

Name: Todd Atchens
Address: 92 Boulder County Rd
Email: 

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: How will the Forest Service handle the huge maintenance & management tasks with shrinking budgets? The Forest Service will be in no position to commit the resources to the range that will be needed.

Name: Todd Attenous
Address: 2 Boulder Court 916
Email: 

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment Card

Comment: **SUBJECT - GOD RANGE VS. DISPERSSED SHOOTING**

- Protection of health, welfare & safety are paramount concerns.
- Beaver Res. Site or any site off State Highway is a major problem for safety.
- Out of sight, is not safe; locations need to be more visible.

Name: **Todd Ahlernus**

Address: **
COUNTY ROAD 96
BOULDER**

Email: **AHLERNUS @ MAC.COM**

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit

www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment:
- Good range concentrates noise & other adverse impacts on properties within 3 miles.
- Noise creates negative conditions.
- Good anti-gun range concentrates negative drop a few neighbors' property users.
- Noise will negatively impact our off of our cabin - 95 years of family use.

Name: Tove Ahlundus
Address: 6 Beaver Court, CO 80919

Email: ____________________________

Check this box if you’d like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: ARE VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENTS EQUIPPED TO DEAL WITH RURAL GUN RANGE SITES BECAUSE THE POTENTIAL INCIDENTS INCREASE EXPONENTIALLY WITH THE CONCENTRATION OF GOODS ON ONE SITE.
- GUN RANGES ARE ATTRACTION DESTINATIONS AND THIS IS BAD FOR OUR COMMUNITIES.

Name: Todd Atteus
Address: 0 Boulder County 80919
Email: __________________________

☐ Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: My opinion is that Alternative 3 map is a nice compromise of areas open to dispersed shooting along with designated sites.

Until we get to the point of selection, I really stress the need for recreational shooting to pick up after there shooting. I constantly clean up shells on hikes. + beer bottles.

Name: John Mahoney
Address: 577 Primos Rd Boulder 80302
Email: mahoney@leritzindustrial.com

[ ] Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
I think that the Wilderness Area should be free from dispersed shooting.
Comment: My family lives in Nederland and we are very much opposed to any shooting range within ear shot of the town and near any hiking, biking, cross-country ski trails. Please locate a shooting range far from Nederland!
Thank you

Name: Jennifer Kowal
Address: 224 Big Springs Dr.
Nederland, CO 80466
Email: ________________________________

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit
www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: I live near Nederland/West Magnolia and very much hope you will prevent a shooting range in West Magnolia, for 2 main reasons—the sound makes me feel like I'm living in a war zone, right from my house; and I worry about safety as me + my children hike + bike in West Magnolia.

Name: Steven Karowe
Address: 224 Big Springs Dr.
        Nederland, 80466
Email: skarowe@yahoo.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: Sport shooting is not compatible with wilderness areas. Your assumption that it is would put wilderness distinguishable from forest service lands that is not wilderness.

Landscape shooting is incompatible with wilderness designation.

Name: Luke Jones
Address: 8212 Kenross Dr.
Boulder Colo 80301
Email: bkempr09@hotmail.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: I support Alternative 1 as it balances restrictions around residences and heavily utilized areas while also allowing shooting in remote areas. Plus, the county ranges will help balance access. I do not support option 2, it's too narrow and too many areas along Magnolia allow access, option 4 I think is too restrictive for a balanced approach.

Name: Charlie Farrel
Address: 6583 Magne Rd. Nederland, 80466
Email: CTF88943@GMAIL.COM
Comment: Alternatives 2 and 3 will not serve the purposes of the proposed action. The areas proposed for shooting in these alternatives are not substantially different in character from the areas closest to shooting in respect to danger to other users, fire danger and noise pollution. Bunce School Road is not an appropriate place for dispersed shooting.

Name: chat Kamin
Address: 18673 SH 7, Lyons
Email: ret subtle@mac.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit
www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: CU's Mountain Research Station would be adversely affected by any continued dispersed shooting around its periphery or the periphery of the Niwot Ridge Biosphere Reserve. Options 2 and 3 allow dispersed shooting in these areas, putting students and researchers in danger and negatively affecting research and educational experiences. These concerns were raised by the comments of many users and by the University of Colorado administration and frustratingly were ignored in the "local factors" alternative.

Name: William Bowman
Address: 5828 S Orchard Creek Circle
Boulder, CO 80301
Email: William.Bowman@Colorado.EDU

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: Regarding FEEs. It’s not right to close non-fed Shooting areas and then charge shooters to shoot there. I don’t want any private entity that might operate a range to charge fees for shooters. If a private entity were to operate one or more ranges, they should not charge fees. Pauma Grassland does not charge. Thanko for your work.

Name: Pamela White
Address: 2100 Sherman Longmont CO 80501
Email: 

Check this box if you’d like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: Best order of Map Alternatives: 4, 1, 3, 2. #2 says basically "shoot everywhere." #4 says basically "No shooting anywhere." Even though I'm a gun owner and I've enjoyed shooting my entire life, the word "responsible" has totally disappeared from the vocabulary of this subject. Peace & Quiet no longer exists and the safety of our homes & property is constantly in jeopardy. Please use some common sense and fix this issue.

Name: Bob Carlisle
Address: 522 Lazy E Rd., Nederland, CO 80466
Email: rpcarlisle.ned@gmail.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: Alternative 4 is my priority #1. We have too many residents and too many other users - horseback riders, mountain bikers, hikers. We moved to the front hills for peace and quiet. So many weekenders it sounds like a town band.

Name: Penny Ann Carlisle
Address: 522 Lazy Z Rd, Nederland, CO 80466
Email: pennycarlisle@hotmail.com

Check this box if you’d like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: Alternative Four is the only sensible option. Other options will lead to increased conflict and consequent damage on public lands.

Name: Elliott Larson
Address: 15027 Gad Hill Rd
         Boulder, CO 80302

Email: 

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit

www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: In your decision on locating the Shooting area, please consider that most shooters come from outside Boulder County. I’ve been informally collecting information for approx 10 years of discouraging shooting near my property. Please locate the facility closer to where the shooters live (Littleton, Gunnison, etc.). They don’t like driving so far into the mountains.

Name: Tom Carr
Address: 10797 Left Hand Canyon
		Jamestown, CO 80455
Email: ThomasMcCarr@gmail.com

Check this box if you’d like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: I live in the last house on upper Gamble Gulch. My home is just under the second T in Gilpin on large maps. Alternative 3 comes close but still allows shooting to close to residents of upper Gamble Gulch & Lump Gulch.

Name: Randy Dubois II
Address: 1815 Gamble Gulch Rd, Eldorado 70 Box 248 Rollinsville, CO 80471
Email: duboisr@msn.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: Are you planning for parking at designated shooting areas.

Name: Anne Vickers
Address: 5255 Pennsylvania
13 Boulder, CO 80303
Email: vickersanne@outlook.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment Card

Comment: I AM ONLY AN OCCASIONAL SHOOTER, BUT I HAVE ENJOYED DISPERSED SHOOTING FOR 60 YEARS. I AM CONSIDERATE & SAFE. DO NOT TAKE AWAY MY HISTORICAL (& PRECEDENCE) ACCESS TO THE SHOOTING OPPORTUNITY.

Name: Jack Gathright
Address: 1620 S. Pitkin Av
Superior, CO 80027
Email: Jack_G_Gathright@msn.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: I THINK DISPOSED SHOOTING SHOULD BE CLOSED AROUND CABINS ON FORREST WISE LAND OUTSIDE OF ALLENS PARK ALONG ROCK CREEK RD, SKI RD & ST. VRAIN TRAILHEAD ROAD.
MANY KIDS, ANIMALS AS WELL AS THE ADULT POPULATION ARE IN DANGEROUS CONSTANT VIOLATIONS OF THE 150 YR RULE.

Name: George Kasynski
Address: 869 Dearborn Pl.
         Boulder, CO 80303
Email: george.kasynski@comcast.net

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment Card

Comment: ENFORCEMENT OF DISPERSEMENT AREAS IS IMPORTANT. OUR VOTE WOULD BE TO KEEP THE SHOOTING AREAS AWAY FROM HOMES, CAMPGROUNDS & HIKING TRAILS. CLEARLY A DESIGNATED AREA SEEMS THE D

Name: HIDELLY HANSON

Address: 155 PEACEFUL VALLEY RD, LYONS, COLO.

Email: HIDELLY @ CV STUDIO, BOSCOM

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
SAFEST. IT WOULD BE TERRIFIC IF THAT DESIGNATED AREA COULD BE OUT OF AUDIO RANGE OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.

THANK YOU FOR THIS PROCESS.

[Signature]

[Name]
Comment: As I read the maps I don't believe that Buckingham Road and the 4 houses on it are on the current maps. This is critical because several of these properties about the Left Hand Canyon and are directly across from the Left Hand Canyon OHV area. I also don't think the houses on Valley Lane are on the maps. This is a fairly heavily populated area that should be protected from any shooting at the Left Hand Canyon OHV area.

Name: David A. Donaldson
Address: 1417 Rembrandt Road
         Boulder, CO  80302
Email: donaldson@comcast.net

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Option 3 (Boiler City Moor) seems to be the most balanced option, depending on specific current and future conditions relative to locating "acceptable" shooting ranges. Enforcement of regulations is a current problem and will be a continuing problem unless addressed with adequate staffing.

Name: Bill Ellis
Address: 3202 Riverside Dr.
Lyons (Reynold) CO 80540
Email: billis@comcast.net

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org.
Comment Card

Comment: Respecting the lands and protecting them from risk of fire and environmental damage needs to be our legacy. All of the maps show "ok to shooters" on Bunce School Rd. Besides homes, forest, wildlife there are now ATV, rental companies, etc., more people will get shot at there. The idea of a place for Shooters to go would be good. The Lyons location is excellent. The fire risk would be much less there.

Name: Maura Christoph
Address: 8600 Aurora Ave.
Boulder, CO 80302
Email: mautoph@aol.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit
www.SportShootingPartners.org
As well as risk to the shooters. The shooters wouldn't have to drive as far, hike to shoot. And the first responders could be there if needed to assist in first aid if needed versus dispersed shooters.

The overall use of our forests is going to continue and we need to preserve them for future generations versus damaging them for an afternoon of fun.

Thank you for your work.
Comment: Thank you for closing the Lupton Canyon OHV. Notice from the area is gone. The lead bullet from guns, bullets is evaporating. Is that lead contamination is still a worry? Where can I range is located? It will be a problem. Have you considered requiring shooters to use copper bullets? I know they’re more expensive, but they’re better for our future. So, thanks for doing the right thing.

Name: Susan Kohnle
Address: 1417 Pendroy Rd
Boulder, CO 80302-9478
Email: Sldonaldson43@comcast.net

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment Card

Comment: Environmental impact due to School Road has been
RAPED & continues to be! How does the WES give a permit
for an ATV company to make $$$ for their company & continue
the destruction...allegedly shooting the tops etc.
This is a travesty to our beautiful land. Also consider
value of people's homes to have to deal with noise pollution.

If they want to sell, no doubt that would affect the sale
of their home. This is wrong, very wrong.

Name: Mary Hunter
Address: 27 2nd Ave PO Box 237
Ames, IA 80510
Email: mary@healthybeatitudes.com

Put yourself in their shoes!

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit
www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: On all the maps except the nothing allowed you have Dispersed shooting allowed next to cabin. We are the cabin to the north of lakes. We hear semi-automatics constantly & no one knows where there. We have no phone service so I've never called. Is that the reason we aren't in a no shooting zone?

Name: Rebecca Ward
Address: County Road 90
Email: bec.becca.rebecca@gmail.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: Have you considered the psychological effect that listening to frequent shooting, rifle shots & semi-automatic shots have on the people who live within a "ear shot" of these ranges? PTSD!!

What about the impact of living close to these ranges on property values? Would you purchase a place where this noise permeates your everyday life?

Name: Carol B. Stiver
Address: 623 S Skinner Rd
Organ: 805 10
Email: 

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit

www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: Option 1 would be my preference because it keeps shooting away from all residential areas. However, I think it might not be politically feasible, shooters will demand closer options to roads and trains. If option 3 begins to get any traction, you must develop the criteria to trigger more closures if problems persist near residential areas.

Name: Paula Farrell
Address: 6583 Magnolia Drive
Email: paulafarrell@yahoo.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment Card

Comment: Shooting should be banned within at least one mile of residential areas. Please develop areas that are significant distances from residences. Just off the highway such as the old Allenspark dump is way too close for safety and sanity of residents, hiker, and other outdoor enthusiasts.

Name: James G. Johnson
Address: 790 S. Skinner Rd
Allenspark, CO 80510
Email: jimj444@yahoo.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: 
I like the idea of a shooting range in Lyons and less dispersion shooting up in and near Athens Park.

Name: Jessica Feld
Address: 454 CR 90 Athens Park
Email: jessica.feld@colorado.edu

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: I am the board chair for The Indian Peaks Wilderness Alliance. We are a long time volunteer based organization with the mission of "Preserving and Protecting the Indian Peaks and James Peak Wilderness Areas." As a group, we are adamantly opposed to designating these two areas as "suitable for dispersed recreational shooting."

Name: Scott Dodd
Address: 3904 Wonderland Hill Ave
Boulder, CO 80304
Email: sodd@gmail.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment Card

Comment: you need to look at the 2017 Wilderness backpacking permit book in the Boulder ES office. Feehak made very steep, steep gradients up to 7 people and one group up to 12. All these people start at very crowded entrances to the Wilderness. A hike 3 to 20 miles round trip on crowded trails.include Peaks of Jemez. It's crowded.

Name: Anne Vickery

Address: 5265 Pennsylvania Ave

Email: VickeryCaren@outlook.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment Card

Comment:

Option 4 is too restrictive and would be in court for years.

Option 2 looks the best for compromise.

Free and near free developed range a must. Prior to any area in the County closure.

IF funds for enforcement needed. Himing claim not working.

Name: Robert W. Mojer
Address: 1205 Juniper St
Longmont, CO 80301
Email: rwm@indra.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit

www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: We live in Gilpin County, CO, the very last house on Gamble Gulch. Every weekend for most of the year and all week during the summer, Gamble Gulch is peppered with bullets—especially from the very top of the hill, a known but unofficial shooting place. There is nothing resembling a backstop, just annihilated trees and broken glass and garbage all over the ground. It’s on the top of a ridge, turnout our house. I hear bullets whizzing through the trees by our house.

Name: Carrie Bladyka
Address: 1815 Gamble Gulch
Email: chlad@gmail.com

Check this box if you’d like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit

www.SportShootingPartners.org
and pick up bullets out of our driveway, out of the road and off the lawn. I am legitimately afraid for my life, my dogs, livestock... and that's not even when I'm out hiking. No one should have to live like this for someone else's "recreation."

The land we live on is private. Bought & paid for. We pay taxes and maintain our own road and mitigate and maintain our beautiful forest. For what? So we can be afraid to go out and enjoy it?

Given the population of both Gamble & Lump Gulch, dispersed shooting in the area is totally inappropriate. Alternatives 2 and 3 will be of no help whatsoever. Please, please help us to keep shooting out of this area.

Thank you so much for your time & effort.
Comment: I favor Alternatives 1 and 3. NFMA mandates multiple use of USFS lands. While I favor closing high-conflict areas to dispersed shooting, I think Alternatives 1 and 3 preserve multiple use while still closing the most contentious areas. At this level of closure, I think at least two ranges, one north and one south. Ideally ranges should be within 30-45 minutes of most people. The Lyons range site is exciting.

Name: Benjamin White - Patanno
Address: 3100 Sherman St.
Longmont, CO 80501
Email: benwpe@earthlink.net

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.
Already on list

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit
www.SportShootingPartners.org
I think USFS should consider creating a specific process for building ranges and incorporate it into the Forest Plan. I am happy it sounds like this will happen. A consistent process with specific thresholds for NEPA analysis will help future decisions. I do not think range fees are a good idea. People go to public lands because they are free. Charging a fee makes compliance less likely. The Baker Draw range is an example of a successful, free USFS range. If there absolutely must be a fee, it should be as cheap as possible, under $10. Funding from the Civilian Marksmanship Program should be considered for ranges. If there are ranges, I will use them instead of dispersed sites.
Comment:
Difficult to comment on maps for closures on the range that more closures require more ranges built which cannot be discussed - can you eliminate some of those course's sides?
Allen park has 2 but neither meet more than 3 of the 19 criteria on your website.

Name: Jasmine Holan
Address: 9277 St Agy
              Allen park 60 510
Email: jasmine.holan@yahoo.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.
For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: Have you considered limiting calibers of weapon in dispersed shooting areas? The semi-automatic and automatic loud sounds are a big part of the increased fear for safety. Keeping 470 pace.

Name: Jasmine Holan
Address: 9972 St. Hwy 7
          Allenspark CO 80510
Email: jasmine.holan@colorado.com

☐ Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: I would prefer Alt. #4 as too many people want- ing to shoot on public NF land do not seem concerned about endangering other people by not finding out where hiking trails are, and do not seem to be concerned about the irritating noise bothering people living in homes within ear-shot. Alt. #1 would be my second choice. Developed shooting ranges are a good plan as long as sound issues and protection to keep bullets from crossing the boundaries are adequately addressed.

Name: George Blakey
Address: 615 Aspen Meadows Rd.
        Nederland, CO 80466
Email: gblakey@earthlink.net

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: I strongly urge the selection of plan Fory for the area where I live. We have put up with near misses in our neighborhood for too long. Dispersed shooting doesn't belong in residential areas. Times have changed, even the "approved buffer" is not acceptable. Also, there has to be some enforcement for this new system, not the current pathetic lack of personnel available.

Name: Yvonne Short
Address: 618 Aspen Meadows Rd.
Nederland, CO
Email: ysgb@earthlink.net

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: Alternate 3 makes the most sense. Need to place the most impacted and populated areas and leave some areas open to truly dispersed shooting. Can't enforce full closure. There should be no dispersed shooting in wilderness areas, so I think this Alternate should be modified accordingly.

Name: Kevin Tone
Address: 14153 G HR
Boulder 80302
Email: ktone@jua.jua.com
Comment: Alternative #2 is the most remotely reasonable choice, much less so, Alternatives #1 + 4 are both thoroughly unreasonable unacceptable and far beyond unfair.
Do not hesitate to consider closure of other use facilities to provide shooting opportunities, since the shooting part of the public has been unreasonably unfairly deprived.
Multiple (5-6 more) rather smaller designated "target ranges" scattered up down the peak to peak is better than fewer large sites.

Name: MARK MOLL
Address: PO BOX 303
Nederland, CO 80466
Email: markmoll@com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: Every shooting range needs to charge a membership fee for the range. There needs to be a surveillance mechanism (photo of car/license on toll road comes to mind) so people who do not clean up their shells or demonstrate misconduct will be fined. Actually, this type of sport...there should be video monitoring!

Name: Mary Hunter
Address: 472 2nd Ave., PO Box 237, Colorado Park, CO 80510
Email: mary@healthybeadtudes.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment Card

Comment: Our family has about 200 acres on Magnolia Drive. There is a serious noise issue from shooting bullet casings, burning garbage, and damage to the environment very close to our property (Boy Scout Trail, now called Front Range Trail). We are very concerned about safety issues including starting a fire. As a scientist, there needs to be baseline data on environmental impact and numbers of people shooting in the area including where they come from. Consider partnering with universities and local people to collect data (citizen science).

Name: Nancy Kellogg
Address: Boulder - 2944 Timucua Circle 80305
Magnolia Drive - 7873 & 7877
Email: nancy.kellogg@comcast.net

☑ Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Once specific sites for shooting ranges are identified, how will these areas be managed? How will areas closed to shooting be enforced? I would like to see the wilderness areas closed to shooting. I am totally opposed to dispersed shooting.

My preference for the alternatives for recreational sport shooting:
- Best option - Alternative 4
- 2nd best option - Alternative 1
- 3rd - Alternative 3
- Last/terrible option - Alternative 2

Our family has major concerns about safety while hiking, biking, etc. on our property and the adjacent Forest Service property. We have many guests that come to our area also. We find bullet casings on our property even though there are no trespassing signs. We have added padlocked gates.
Comment Card

Comment: you need to look at the hundreds of cars parked separately at Arvada, Arvada 4th of July - shooting should not be mixed with all these people going into Indian Peaks Rollins Pass parking lot is full - over 100 cars on weekends with more than 300 people on the trail at the same time - check the figures

Name: Denise Dickey
Address: 5255 Pennsylvania Ave
Boulder 80303
Email: DickeyDame @outlook.com

☐ Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: I strongly support Act. 144 for safety reasons. Acts 2 and 3 are unsafe for East Magnolia when we live. East Sugarloaf and West Magnolia are closed under all 4 Acts yet East Magnolia has equal or more population density and recreational visitors. Also, the area north of Magnolia and south of 119 is the area through which the Forest Service is planning a MT. Bike Trail System.

Name: Howard Kauschansky

Address: 474 Aspen Meadows Dr. Nederland, CO 80466

Email: HowardKauschansky.com

ACT 3 WORKS IF THE AREA NEAR EAST MAGNOLIA IS CLOSED.

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment Card

Comment: "Wilderness" - No mechanized equipment - No bikes, No Chainsaws... but guns are okay? Guns are mechanized!

Consistency of existing laws & regulations:
Denver & collins migrating to shoot here - make range for them

Name: Clare Tove
Address: 14153 Gold Hill Rd
Email: Clare.tove@comcast.net

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.
As much as humanly possible, these laws & regulations should be held consistent. For example, no mechanized equipment in/on wilderness. That should include all mechanized equipment, not excluding guns. Another example is "Do not shoot across road, body of water or within 150 yards from residence, building, campsite or recreation area or occupied area". The way the boundaries are drawn on Alternative #2 & possibly also Alternative #3 show open dispersed shooting within 150 yards of many places (homes, buildings, etc.). A full closure (Alternative #4) is my 1st choice. Considering likely pushback on that, Alternative #3 is next best but
needs to use different formula for "residential housing density". There should be no shooting allowed near any residences, especially considering low density (35 Acre parcels) required in CO.

AH #2 is ridiculous & totally unsafe & environmentally degrading.

Need to account for density of large cities (Denver, CoSpoo, Ft Collins etc.) & the impact of these people tripping into USFS Foothills - need to make ranges in close proximity to those urban centers.
Comment: I am choosing Alternative 1 because that is the only one that closes shooting at a very site specific location at the west end of FR 372 off CR 102/Gold Lake Road.

Per Dr. Clark's advice: This site specific closure should be added Alternative 2.

If not added to Alternative 2, a site review visit should be made.

Name: Andrew P. Steemer
Address: 10453 Cent. Rd. 730
        Gunnison, CO 81230-9732
Email: fordtrail@gmail.com

Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
Comment: I recommend Alternate C of the Proposals presented. I would like to see the least restrictive use of the F&S land while still protecting the people that live in the forest. I would like to see better enforcement to reduce the conflicts.

Name: **BRUCE FITZGERALD**
Address: 2807 BALMORAL DR
**FORT COLLINS, CO 80525**
Email: **fitzgeraldbruce53@gmail.com**
Comment: We are building a house 1.5 miles west of Red Feather Lakes down the CR 86 corridor.... And hear a lot of shooting from sites on CR 86 very close to our land. It is very stressful and very confusing. Most of the shooters are weekend RV campers... from the city. The few that I've spoken with admit that they would not appreciate shooting near their house.

Name: Wm Keramier
Address: 1001 CR 86
Red Feather Lakes
Email: Globes@bellsouth.net

[ ] Check this box if you'd like to be added to the Sport Shooting Partnership email list.

For more information about recreational sport shooting on the Front Range, visit www.SportShootingPartners.org
It seems that a very few have impacted negatively the majority who visit like a forest for peace, get away from the city, enjoy the hiking...

We, on the land, spend time reenacting our forest for fire and sometimes very nervous about walking in the forest with all the high powered rifle noise...

It seems that a few, isolated, dedicated spots for shooting, away from any residential lands would serve everybody better than dispersed shooting...

William Kiefer
970-222-8999
985-807-7478

Alternative 4 or 3
Dear Sir or Ms.

I am submitting my comments to the Sport Shooters Partners/NFS/Gilpin County/Clear Creek County representatives regarding the dangerous and careless sport shooting events which have been taking place on and adjacent to my property over the last 2-3 years which are realistically out of control. The comments are a follow up to the meeting held by the Partnership on November 2, 2017 at the Idaho Springs City Hall from 6:00 pm to 7:30 pm which I attended.

I own properties in both Clear Creek and Gilpin Counties consisting of a home and 27 acres of undeveloped properties on Patented mining claims with a combined value of $500,000 accessed via NFS Road 1751 and York Gulch off Fall River Road West of Idaho Springs on Exit 238 from I-70. I have owned these properties for eleven years, initially purchased in 2006.

I strongly support Alternative 1 which excludes recreational shooting North of I-70 on both Clear Creek and Gilpin County in the area I live. I strongly oppose Alternative 2 which basically allows continued recreational sport shooting without restriction which is what we are experiencing now. Alternative 3 does not go far enough to restrict shooting in my area and Alternative 4 would likely never be approved since it bans all recreational sport shooting on all the NFS lands.

In order to support my position of banning all recreational shooting in my area on NFS 1751, as outlined in Alternative 1, I have included the following information and documents on events which I and my neighbors have experienced due to the careless and reckless activities by sport shooters in the areas of our homes and on our properties of the last 2-4 years.
(1) Firsthand accounts of recreational sport shooters trespassing on my property in my absence while away at work.

(2) Firsthand accounts of bullets from careless and reckless sport shooter bullets flying ten feet over my head 50’ from my home.

(3) Firsthand accounts of sport shooters shooting directly toward my home and my neighbor’s home which were confronted and their responses.

(4) Correspondence between myself and Clear Creek County, Gilpin County, NFS, and State of Colorado offices regarding events of careless and reckless sport shooting around my home.

(5) Documents demonstrating forest fires caused by careless and reckless sport shooters from explosive illegal targets (Tannerite) in Colorado and other western states.

(6) Documents demonstrating forest fires caused by careless and reckless sport shooters from target shooting in Colorado and other western states.

(7) Documentation of injury and death of members of the public using NFS lands for recreation activities caused by reckless and careless sport shooters.

The above documents are listed below and attached to this letter:

At the November 2, 2017 Sport Shooters meeting in Idaho Springs it was pointed out that the basis of several of the Alternatives was safety defined as the distance between homes and sport shooting activities. And the maps were created based upon a distance of ¼ to ½ mile radius from the homes.

I believe this selection process assumption does not enable the safety of residence and recreational users of the NFS lands in my area. In fact, the Northern Front Range Recreational Sport Shooting Management Partnership brochure itself clearly states that a .22 bullet will travel for up to one mile and a 30.06 bullet travels up to 2.5 miles.
Having experienced a bullet flying ten feet over my head at 50’ from my home, I strongly recommend that any selection criteria for distance from sport shooting activity be based upon a distance of more than 2.5-3.0 miles from a residential home in my area along NFS 1751.

The same brochure states that shooting is allowed within 150 yards from residence or road. I have never seen any sport shooter along NFS 1751 honor this rule over the last 11 years and in fact every sport shooter I have seen or encountered shoots directly on NFS 1751. One of my neighbors has caught one sport shooter shooting down the road itself near his home.

The reason sport shooters continue to violate all the NFS and county restrictions in my area is that we have no legitimate mechanism to enforce the rules and bans as you will see on the attached documentation. Simply stated, the sport shooters along NFS 1751 know they can get away with careless and reckless shooting activity, including using exploding targets, with no consequences. Which is why this area north of I-70 in Clear Creek and Gilpin County needs to be permanently excluded and banned for sport shooting activities.

Simply stated, in the area of my home on NFS 1751 in Clear Creek and Gilpin County is not a matter of if someone will be shot or killed from careless and reckless unregulated sport shooter activities but only a matter of when. It also not a matter of if a forest fire will be caused from target shooting or explosive target material (Tannerite) from careless and reckless unregulated sport shooter activities but only a matter of when.

If the true basis for decisions regarding approval, or denial, of continued reckless and careless sport shooting activities is the safety of the people living along or using NFS 1751, all sport shooting activities should be banned as soon as possible.

Statement of Fact.

Recreational Sport Shooters have no regard for private land ownerships and trespass on private land to shoot.

During October 2016 I had an incident on my property reported to me by my neighbors of sport shooters trespassing on my land undeniably knowing it was private land but shooting skeet on a Tuesday afternoon while I was at work. My neighbors knew the sport shooter drove into my meadow and were shooting shot guns but were afraid to confront them because they did not know the direction they were shooting in and did not want to walk out of the trees into the line of fire.
They tried to get a license plate from two older model SUV’s that drove onto my land but when the trespassing sport shooters drove out quickly they could not catch the license plates. I called Gilpin County to file a complaint of trespassing and Gilpin County told me my area was under the jurisdiction of Clear Creek County, so I filled a report with Clear Creek County as shown on the attached documentation.

The sport shooters who trespassed on my land and shot skeet went through two unlock gates and drove by multiple private property and no trespassing signs as shown below. After this event, I placed three locks on the gate to my meadow where they illegally shot skeet. In addition, I had to clean up three 5-gallon buckets of shattered skeet targets, shot gun shell casings, beer cans and trash they so kindly left on my land as a thank you for illegally trespassing and shooting on my land near my home.

Picture showing the first un locked gate on private land, my land, the trespassing sport shooters used to access my meadow.

Picture of second unlocked gate that the trespassing sport shooters drove through to illegally shoot on my property. Note I now have three locks on this gate, but it was not locked when they opened it and drove into my meadow. At the time they went through the gate I did have the no trespassing signs up which did not stop them since they had no respect or regard for trespassing on private property to shoot. Notice I hung a bag of skeet fragments on the fence in case they came back when I was at work, so they knew I was aware they had trespassed in my meadow. I also hung bags of skeet fragments all along the access road on the trees prior to reaching the gate as well.
Picture showing my home from the road the illegally trespassing sport shooters drove down to my second gate to trespass and shot skeet on my land when I was at work. Note this is the approximate area I was standing this summer when bullet flew 10’ over my head just missing my home shown in the background.
Picture of one of two no trespassing signs illegal sport shooters drove by before getting to the second unlocked gate on my property to access my meadow and trespass for illegal sport shooting.
Picture of my barn on the left and the road they drove down to my meadow with private property no trespassing sign posted.

Picture of the road and my meadow the sport shooters drove down to illegally shoot on my property.
Picture of the area the sport shooters were shooting skeet at right next to private property sign on a tree. Amazing they did not shoot the private property sign when they were shooting skeet.

In conclusion, what the above pictures show is that the trespassing sport shooters clearly knew they were on private property when they were shooting skeet but did so because they believed (1) they had the right to do so, (2) they could get away with it, (3) there were no consequences for their actions.

Statement of fact

Recreational Sport Shooters shoot directly on NFS 1751 road directly toward homes directly along road in line of site on a routine basis.
In June of 2017 when there was a fire ban in effect on NFS lands in Clear Creek and Gilpin County we had an incident of sport shooters shooting directly toward my home and my neighbor’s home from NFS 1751 at the location shown in the picture below. It was about 6:00 pm in the evening when I heard the shots very loud and very close.

I called my neighbor on the phone just to south of my home and he was going to walk down the hill to confront the shooters. I left my home and started walking toward NFS 1751 which is about 100 yards south of my home. As I got closer I heard the shooting continue then stop. When I got to where my neighbor was down on the road he said that the shooters had driven their SUV off the road slightly up the hill and were shooting a watermelon on the ground directly toward him as he was walking down the hill. When they saw him, they jumped in their SUV and continued shooting toward him and the watermelon on the ground out the windows of the vehicle as they drove away West down NFS 1751 as he was approaching. We waited about 40 minutes for them to return to get a license plate, but they did not come back and might have drove through later that night. But we unable to catch them.
Note this sign was posted on private land along NFS 1751 less than 100’ from the location that the sport shooter where shooting directly toward my neighbor’s house visible at the top of the hill behind the trees.

What this event demonstrates is the following:

(1) Sport shooters routinely shoot directly from NFS 1751 and do not follow the 150 yards regulations
(2) Sport shooters continue to shoot if a fire ban is in effect or not. Personally, it has been my experience that the amount of sport shooting during a fire ban is exactly the same as when no fire ban is in effect. This occurs due to a lack of enforcement of sport shooter activity in area of my home, the disregard of sport shooters to fire bans on shooting on NFS lands, and the fact that no signage is in place by the NFS or county along 1751 to inform sport shooters when a fire ban is in effect and when it is not.
(3) Homes along NFS 1751 that are hidden behind the trees are exposed to careless and reckless sport shooters bullets because posting signs to notify sport shooters along NFS 1751 of residences behind the trees is not allowed by the NFS.
Statement of fact:

NFS, Gilpin County, Clear Creek County do not enforce sport shooting activities or exploding target usage during fire bans on NFS 1751.

Below is a phone text transcript from one my direct neighbors made during the fire ban in June 2017 when we were taking turns calling the Gilpin County Sheriff’s department vainly asking for any kind of assistance:

______________________________________________________________________________

“Just going have you call in to report shooting at the shooting range on NFS 1751. We are under a fire ban and we’ve called 3 x this weekend. Last time the Gilpin County dispatcher said they did not have personnel available or vehicles that could access NFS 1751 and there was nothing they could do about shooting during a fire ban in our area”

______________________________________________________________________________

Below is a phone text transcript from one of my neighbors in September 2017 regarding conversations with NFS staff who pulled down our signs along NFS 1751 because we had bullets hitting near our homes and could not get any assistance from the NFS, Gilpin County or Clear Creek County to stop the reckless and un-safe sport shooting activities on NFS 1751 directly toward our homes.

______________________________________________________________________________

“Ralph, do you have any contact information for the two Forest Service guys from yesterday? According to a group of shooters that I talked to they were told that they could shoot in an area surrounded by trees and in the direction of homes. I personally checked out this spot and am truly in disbelief that the Forest Service would ever condone such shooting. The group was pretty believable. Those guys (the Forest Service representatives) removed all of our signs including the ones that we put up in May (2017). Sue has about 500 feet or so of road that crosses her property. Perhaps signs could be posted there. Also, the Forest Service guys said that they could not do anything about the discharge of fully automatic weapons. I disagree with that. Do you know the specific ruling regarding this and what the rule is regarding shooting toward private property? Thanks.

Below is a phone text transcript from one of my neighbors in August 2017 regarding reckless and careless unsafe sport shooting around our homes on NFS 1751
“Ralph, hope all is well with you and Betsy. If you have heard anything more about shutting down sport shooting up here. It is truly out of hand. I posted a “no shooting in this direction sign” at the top of my property. The sign lasted 4 hours and disappeared. Today was non-stop shooting and tonight there were several Tannerite explosions. Last weekend was absolutely insane!! I’ve written letters but get no response. Have you heard anything else?”

Documentation of another careless and reckless shooting incident on NFS 1751.

Last winter I was visiting with a family that lived in the house at the top of the Clear Creek County maintained road and the start of NFS 1751 on the back road from NFS 1751 to Nevada Ville. We were comparing shooter stories when they told me that that fall of 2016 they had bullets flying by their house at the top of the hill. When they walked down to confront the shooters they found the shooters had hung targets in the trees and were shooting upwards through the trees directly toward their home at the top of the hill. They ran them off and pulled down the targets from the trees. Lucky they did not hit the house and put a bullet through the window and kill someone.

These events are just a small sampling of many other types of unsafe, reckless and careless acts that sport shooters regularly repeat in the area of my home along NFS 1751. Other incidents include bullets hitting houses and bullets hitting the ground only a few feet from people while they are standing in the driveway of their home. And if you wish I can set up a meeting with all the people who I have documented in these events.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons described above, and based upon the many events that have occurred in Colorado over the last few years including injury, death and forest fires resulting from careless and reckless sport shooting on NFS lands documented in the attachments referenced, it is clear that recreational sport shooting in Clear Creek and Gilpin county North of I-70 should be entirely banned. Sport shooting in our area along NFS 1751 is out of control and only getting worse over time. If sport shooting continues like it has been recently, it is not a question of if someone will be injured or killed, or if a forest fire will be caused by target shooting or use of explosive targets (Tannerite) but only when someone will be injured or killed, or when a forest fire will be started as a direct result of reckless and careless sport shooting. I therefore strongly urge the NFS, Gilpin County and Clear Creek County to protect the lives and property of its citizens and adopt Alternative 1, or a more restrictive plan than Alternative 1, to ban all sport shooting North of I-70 which includes the area of my home at 1094 Pisgah Lake Road on NFS 1751.
Hello Mr. Nelms:

Tony has forwarded your letter and I am sorry to hear of the problems you are experiencing. It is very important for residents to let us know about these issues but most importantly, please continue to call the Sheriff's office when these issues arise. Dispatch keeps a record of the calls received and while shooters are often gone by the time a deputy arrives, it does give us an idea of where we have problem areas. You mention that you and your neighbor have contacted the Clear Creek Sheriff - please also contact the Gilpin Sheriff.

As you already know, there are only two law enforcement officers for the entire Arapahoe Roosevelt National Forest and so most calls are handled by the sheriff which in the summer months puts a real strain on the force. Because it is legal to shoot in the forest, the Sherrif can’t do anything about the noise but this use of explosives is a clear violation of USFS Regional Order R02-2013-01 which states:

- You may not use an explosive, including exploding targets. (Regional Order R02-2013-01)

Gilpin County is currently working with the USFS, Colorado Parks & Wildlife and our neighboring counties to try to address safety issues created by dispersed shooting. We are in the process of identifying areas that may be appropriate for shooting and areas that should be closed. All of our maps and information about the process is posted on the county website: [http://www.co.gilpin.co.us/Commissioners/ShootingRange/ShootingRange.html](http://www.co.gilpin.co.us/Commissioners/ShootingRange/ShootingRange.html)

We are trying to find an area in the county for a shooting range so we can direct visitors to a safe range that will not create conflicts with residents. This has proved to be a difficult process but we are still searching. I welcome any input from residents, so please feel free to contact me.

Here are the contacts you requested, and I encourage you to let them know about your concerns:

K.C. Becker, State House Representative: kcbecker.house@state.co.us
Tim Neville, State Senator: tim.neville.senate@state.co.us

Please also take a look at the Northern Front Range Sport Shooting Partnership website (www.sportshootingpartners.org) which is working on a solution to the conflicts while recognizing the right to shoot safely on public land. Let's stay in touch on this issue.

Regards,
Ralph,

At your request, I am forwarding your complaint to the Gilpin County Sheriff’s office and to County Commissioner Gail Watson who represents Gilpin County to the Recreation Sports Shooting initiative.

Tony

**Tony Petersen**

Community Development Director
303/582-5831 x1
tpetersen@co.gilpin.co.us

Ray,

I had the pleasure to have meet you about a year ago in your office in Central City and at that time you provided me with some information of the status of the sport shooting initiative on in Gilpin County.

I wanted to update you on the recent events on Pisgah Lake road this week end.
We had a sport shooter setting off several large volumes of Tannerite exploding target compound on Friday evening, May 20, 2016 on 'Pisgah Lake road about one mile from my cabin at 1094 Pisgah Lake Road about 6:00 pm.

The sound from the blasts were extremely loud and startling. When I first heard it I thought it was dynamite going off in the open air. Visiting with the neighbors the following day everyone in my area heard the multiple blasts.

My neighbor Mr. Jim Hudak was closest to the explosions and will likely forward his experiences to you shortly. Mr. Hudak did confront the shooters but they drove off quickly when the saw him approach. Mr. Hudak was only able to get a partial license plate which the Sheriff could not track. Prior to the explosions Mr. Hudak had bullets hitting his driveway as well.

Mr. Jim Hudak did call the Clear Creek County Sheriff but they could not do anything to assist since he did not have a complete license plate to trace.

It is my understanding that use of explosive targets or Tannerite is banned on Arapahoe or Roosevelt National Forest Service Lands. But conversations with the neighbors and the Forest Service personnel in Idaho Springs indicate the NFS has no personnel or funding to enforce the ban. Which leaves the opportunity for sport shooters to use Tannerite at will with no penalty in my area off of Pisgah Lake road.

I also heard that the Arapahoe and Roosevelt National Forest employee stated that the proposed "Sport Shooting" ban for the Pisgah Lake area we discussed last year has been removed and will not move forward. Can you verify this? We were hoping a sport shooting ban would in fact become a reality in our area since the frequency and carelessness of sport shooters in our area is getting worse over time.

Would you please forward this E-mail to your sport shooting initiative contact because I want them to be aware that sport shooters on the Pisgah Lake/ York Gulch road are now using Tannerite illegally on the NFS lands.

I believe I also forwarded to you an incident last October about sport shooter trespassing on my land and shooting skeet leaving piles of beer cans, garbage, shell casings and broken skeet all over my property. They entered my property without my knowledge or permission and went through a gate clearly marked private property and no trespassing. I did report this incident to the Clear Creek County Sheriff and installed a trail camera after the event.

If you have any other meeting with the sport shooters initiative please let us know and several of my neighbors and I would like to attend and present our case.

Also do you have the name and contract for the Gilpin County commissioner or district government representative we could contract to discuss what is going on in our area regarding sport shooting? Who is the Colorado State House representative for Gilpin County because we would also like to visit with someone on the state government level as well.

We appreciate you input and ideas of how to get this new Tannerite problem resolved and controlled.

As you know with fire season coming up exploding targets are the last thing we need in our area to increase chances of starting a sport shooter initiated forest fire. The spot shoots claim that Tannerite itself will not start a fire. But from what I heard Friday night the Tannerite was likely mixed with gasoline, diesel fuel or ammonia nitrate to create this large an explosion that could be heard for miles.

Thank you

Ralph Nelms
Dear Sir or Ms.,

Please find enclosed the Appeal Forms for the above listed four properties which showed increase in value for the year 2017.

The above three properties listed as #7022 are protested since they are bare undeveloped land similar to the other undeveloped land properties we own which did not have any property value increases in 2017 including #7022 PCL G, PCL C, the Otto Claim, the Cross Claim, the Mackey Extension Claim and the Mackey Extension #2 Claim.

The valuation increase in the #4783 Rattler #2 claim is also protested, as well as the three listed #7022 claims, for the following reasons:

1. In order to access our property we travel on 3 miles of maintained Clear Creek County Road then 2 miles of un-maintained Forest Service Road in Gilpin County (York Gulch and Pisgah Lake Roads). Gilpin County provides no road improvements, or maintenance whatsoever, to the roads or to any of the Gilpin County properties listed above or that we own.

2. The local residences have to personally bare the expense for all road repairs and improvements along the 2 miles of National Forest roads (York Gulch and Pisgah Lake Road), at a cost of approximately $3,000 per year, and maintain the roads year around with our own equipment. Therefore since we are receiving absolutely no Gilpin County Road department support, and Gilpin County is bearing none of the cost to repair and maintain our roads. Therefore in my opinion increasing the valuation of the above referenced four properties is unjustified.
Gilpin County also provides no law enforcement support to any of my properties. When I called the Gilpin County Sheriff’s department to report trespassing on my property I was told by the Gilpin County Sheriff, and the Gilpin County dispatcher, that I had to file a report with the Clear Creek County Sheriff’s department since my Gilpin County property was in the Clear Creek County enforcement district by joint agreement with the Clear Creek and Gilpin County Sheriff’s departments.

In our area we have a severe problem with sport shooters year around and multiple incidents of bullets hitting my neighbor’s homes. I have had bullets hit the trees and ground near my home but fortunately no direct bullet hits so far. But when I, and other property owners in the area, have called the Gilpin County Sheriff’s department for assistance in controlling shooting incidents directly near our homes, or reporting bullets hitting our homes, we have been told that there is nothing the Gilpin County Sheriff’s Department can do and that the Gilpin County Sheriff’s department does not have vehicles that can drive on the NFS York Gulch or Pisgah Lake road to access our properties.

When I have reported to the Gilpin County Sheriff’s department incidents of tannerite explosives usage near my home, which is illegal in Gilpin County based upon conversation I have had with one of the Gilpin County Commissioners, I was told the Gilpin County Sheriff’s department could do nothing to stop its usage in my area since they could not get up the roads. I find this statement especially interesting since traffic along York Gulch is traversed by two wheel drive vehicles routinely, UPS trucks, Propane trucks, and accessed by residence in SUV’s year around.

Also be aware that my home is off the grid and we have no utility power or phone service to my properties. All power to my home must be generated via solar or wind generation which should lower the property values compared to other properties in Gilpin County that have standard utility services.

As stated in (5) above my home and properties are getting zero law enforcement support from Gilpin County and therefore I see no reason I should have my property values increased since in reality they likely have decreased due to severe unsafe sport shooting in my area.

Thank you for your consideration

Ralph L. Nelms
Hey there Ralph, sorry for the delay. My time is mostly spent in the field so I don’t get much time in the office to respond to emails. Since your requests are above what I have control over, I have forwarded your emails to my supervisors. I have not been included in their discussions over the matters you brought forward so I do not know the current status. Here are their emails if you want to contact them directly otherwise I will keep you updated on any developments.

Brant Wobig- bdwobig@fs.fed.us
Lori Denton- ldenton@fs.fed.us

Brady Vaassen
Forestry Technician (OHV)
Forest Service
Arapaho & Roosevelt National Forests & Pawnee National Grassland
Clear Creek Ranger District
p: 720-763-1060
bvaassen@fs.fed.us
101 Hwy 103
Idaho Springs, CO 80452
www.fs.fed.us
Caring for the land and serving people

From: Ralph Nelms [mailto:Ralph.Nelms@whiting.com]
Sent: Monday, August 14, 2017 12:54 PM
To: Vaassen, Brady - FS <bvaassen@fs.fed.us>
Cc: ‘pisgahlake2000@yahoo.com’ <pisgahlake2000@yahoo.com>
Subject: RE: signs on forest service land
From: Ralph Nelms [mailto:Ralph.Nelms@whiting.com]
Sent: Monday, August 14, 2017 12:54 PM
To: Vaassen, Brady - FS <bvaassen@fs.fed.us>
Cc: 'pisgahlake2000@yahoo.com' <pisgahlake2000@yahoo.com>
Subject: RE: signs on forest service land

Brady,

I wanted to follow up on some ideas we discussed yesterday.

I have been visiting with some of the other home owners and we would be willing to pay for installation of shooting restrictions, rules and regulations signs on 1751 by the NFS.

Of main concern are signs clearly identifying homes behind the trees off the main road so that shooters know not to shoot in that direction.

This is a safety issue for everyone on 1751 with private land we face every day.

And I believe one of the mandates of the NFS is insure safe usage on the NFS lands to all users.

How do we go about working together to pay for some NFS signs?

I would also recommend a forest service kiosk at the second octopus notifying people that a fire ban is in effect. We would also pay for installation of a kiosk as well.

The problem is that during the last fire ban the NFS 8 1/2” x 11” signs were stapled to the fence poles by the trailhead to Pisgah Mountain. No one driving down 1751 is going to even see or read these signs.

A well placed information kiosk directly on 1751 would solve that problem where you could staple NFS notices, maps, fire conditions, notice of a fire ban, etc. as you drive by on you weekly trips up 1751.
Right now the only signs notifying anyone of a fire ban is a small 6” x 20-“ red sign from Gilpin County at the first intersection at the top of the hill. If people drive up from Central City they will not even see this sign.

Other than that Clear Creek county places a red and white sign on Fall River road off of I-170 in the ditch that says no fires and no shooting.

I did remove my sign from the turn out area past the fenced off road as you requested. We will be installing the other signs on the private land by the Green gate this coming weekend.

We are also interested in obtaining permission from the NFS to place a fence, at no cost to the NFS, along this road on the North side. This would serve two purposes (1) keep people from driving ATV’s on this undisturbed area degrading it from water erosion and tire tracks(2) provide a barrier to discourage shooting toward our homes North of the road.

How to I submit an application for a NFS permit to install this fence?

I know that the NFS has done this before since they installed the fence up at the upper parking (aka the Ball Park) area several years ago because of damage being done to 4X4’s. I also know the locals helped the NFS put this fence up.

I look forward to calling you during the next fire ban to report shooting in the area on NFS 1751. I appreciate your efforts in helping keep the area safe for all users and residents.

Is there another contact you can give us with the NFS if you cannot be reached?

Thank you

Ralph Nelms 303-917-2707

Ralph Nelms  
Senior Reservoir Engineer  
Whiting Petroleum Corporation  
and its wholly owned subsidiary  
Whiting Oil and Gas Corporation  
1700 Broadway, Suite 2300  
Denver, CO 80290  
Direct (303) 357-1459  
Fax (303) 357-1460  
ralph.nelms@whiting.com  
www.whiting.com
Brady,

I wanted to send you this KUSA article from June 26, 2017, less than two months ago, about a 392 acre forest fire started in Como Colorado from explosive targets.

This could happen in our area since we have people shooting tannerite
devices explosive targets all the time.

Even when the fire ban is in effect in June and July of this year we still have people shooting explosive targets.

I believe you can see, based upon this recent event, why we are so nervous about careless shooters in our area who are blatantly ignoring NFS rules and regulations.

Have you had time to think about, or respond, to my questions regarding the neighbors paying for no shooting signs in the direction of our homes on NFS 1751?

We think this is an urgent matter which the NFS should address and if there is no cost to the NFS our request is not un-reasonable.

We would be happy to meet with or discuss these issues with your supervisor and if you cannot address our questions.

Can you reference your supervisor so we can follow up the line of command?

Thank you.
Thank you Brady,

I wanted to touch base to be sure the issues we discussed are properly addressed. As you know our major concern is the safety of the residents who have homes along NFS Road 1751 behind the trees which are not visible from the road itself.

Many of our homes are less than the 150 yard set-back allowed for shooters under current statues. We experience many instances of bullets hitting our homes and directly over our heads when outside our homes from shooters directly on 1751 who do not realize homes are behind the trees because they cannot see them.

We are asking permission from the NFS to place signs on NFS land along 1751 clearly marking and notifying shooters on the road to not shoot in the direction of our homes. Nothing more and nothing less in order to insure our personal safety and the protect our property and lives.

Not all the home owners, including myself, have private property directly on 1751 which would enable us to place signs. However, my home is clearly in the path of shooters firing into the trees directly from 1751. I can quote you multiple close calls from my neighbors and myself when shooters were firing directly toward me and my home.

As stated earlier the residents along NFS road 1751 will pay all costs for material and installation of signs to the specifications dictated by the NFS. So cost as far as material and installation to the NFS is zero.

All the residence along 1751 feel this is a major safety issue worthy of consideration by the NFS and if things continue as they have been one of us well end up being shot, wounded or killed from indiscriminate careless shooters who think they have the right to shoot at any time, in any place, in any direction along 1751.

We would be happy to meet in person to further discuss this issue at your convenience. Also of note we get no support from either Gilpin or Clear Creek County Sheriff's department in controlling dangerous shooting practices which have occurred in the vicinity of your homes.

Thank you for our consideration.
Forests grapple with 8,500 gun incidents

Nick Penzenstadler, USA TODAY Published 11:03 a.m. ET Aug. 10, 2015 | Updated 9:14 a.m. ET Aug. 11, 2015

A sign is peppered with bullet holes near Sedalia, Colo., in the Pike National Forest.(Photo: Trevor Hughes, USA TODAY)

CASTLE ROCK, Colo. — Perched around a secluded campfire in the Rocky Mountains, Glenn Martin jerked forward, said, "Ow," and died. The wayward bullet that struck him in the national forest has campers and other users calling for changes in recreational shooting policy.

Martin, 60, died July 3 in the Pike & San Isabel National Forest, 30 miles southwest of Denver. The 3.1-million-acre forest holds the record for the most gun-related violations reported in the country, a review of federal records by the USA TODAY Media Network shows.

Since 2010, United States Forest Service officers handled 8,500 shooting incidents across the country. Of those, 926 were in the Pike-San Isabel. The reported illegal shooting has intensified precipitously in recent years.

"You never know when you're going to go; you could be sitting at a campfire waiting to roast marshmallows with your grandchildren," Martin's daughter Carlie Cordova said at a news
conference. "We didn't know what happened. We thought he was stung by a bee or had a heart attack."

Earlier in the day, Martin's family reported hearing shots to park rangers. The report was similar to 3,000 others since 2010 nationwide in which a violator was not identified or found in the vast forestlands.

The Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest in Washington state, and Tonto and Coronado forests in Arizona each had more than 500 gunfire incidents since 2010. Officers field shooting reports and issue warnings about three times as often as writing actual tickets. Those 2,272 citations usually resulted in fines of between $100 and $400, even though incidents can lead to a $5,000 fine and six months of jail time.

Glenn Martin, 60, was killed by a stray bullet July 3, 2015, in the Pike National Forest. (Photo: KUSA)

Martin's case remains unsolved. Douglas County Sherriff's tested five volunteered rifles since the incident to rule out shooters. None has matched the bullet that killed Martin, said Sgt. Ron Hanavan, the department's spokesman, who stressed the case is "very much open and active."

It's unclear how many incidents are related to hunting, because the Forest Service does not distinguish firearm violations. The agency doesn't track injuries or deaths related to guns in forests, said Denise Ottaviano, a national Forest Service spokeswoman.

Shooting and hunting is largely allowed across the 190 million acres that make up the U.S. Forest Service — roughly the size of Texas. In recent years, closures of some areas have pushed shooters to illegal areas, said Erin Connelly, supervisor of the Pike National Forest. In August, a string of incidents prompted the closure of an area just east of where Martin was killed. A couple's Jeep was struck by a bullet while they ate lunch inside.

ADVERTISING
She attributes the shooting issues to the proximity to the major metro areas Denver and Colorado Springs, with droves of gun enthusiasts. Three law enforcement officers patrol the vast forest.

"We've heard the concerns about shooting, and what we've done is implore folks to make sure they know how to use their firearm and what their target is and what's beyond," Connelly said. "Recreational sports shooting and its impacts have been an issue we've looked at intensely since the 1980s. There's no easy answer, but we're exploring how we can allow use on public land and not let this happen again."

Camping or hiking comes with the nervous sound of ricochets and gunshot echoes, said Mel Bernstein, of Colorado Springs who owns a public shooting range.

"It's getting ridiculous. It's a shooting gallery up there," Bernstein said. "No one I know would hike or camp there with bullets that go 3 miles. The Forest Service needs more rangers, but it's a real mess."

Just north of Denver in the Arapaho & Roosevelt National Forest, 374 incidents have been reported since 2010.

Rangers there are wrestling with the same questions — and are shaping a new policy on target-practice shooting in designated areas — which might include berms and other safety measures.

The National Rifle Association issued an alert to members in May to oppose closures. The alert suggested 80% of the forest is "suitable for shooting."

The organization is in favor of keeping options open for responsible shooters, said Lars Dalseide, a spokesman for the NRA's Institute for Legislative Action.

"Recreational shooting has the lowest injury and death rate of any recreational activity on national forest land," Dalseide said. "(That includes) swimming, boating, hiking, off-road vehicles, etc."

Nationally, Forest Service administrators say several factors can contribute to variations in shooting issues from forest to forest, including enforcement policies.

There are sufficient "regulatory tools" across the network of forests to mitigate shooting risks, said Ottaviano, the national Forest Service spokeswoman.

"Despite this isolated activity, recreationists should feel safe visiting any national forest," she said.
NATIONAL FOREST GUN INCIDENTS

Forests with the largest number of gun incidents between 2010 and 2015:

Pike-San Isabel, Colorado

Mount Baker-Snoqualmie, Washington

Tonto, Arizona

Coronado, Arizona

Arapaho-Roosevelt, Colorado

Los Padres, California

San Bernardino, California

Flathead, Montana

Mount Hood, Oregon
LARIMER COUNTY, Colo. — A woman was airlifted to a hospital after an accidental shooting at a campsite in Red Feather Lakes on Saturday night, the Larimer County Sheriff’s Office said.

The woman was shot in the upper thigh while camping in the Swamp Creek area, the sheriff’s office said.

There was no cellphone reception in the area, so other campers had to drive the injured woman several miles before they could call for help, the sheriff’s office said. The injury was not considered to be life threatening.

Several campers in the area told investigators multiple people had been firing weapons throughout the day.

The sheriff’s office said it believes the woman’s injury was the result of someone being reckless with a gun but couldn’t determine the source of the stray bullet.
"The Larimer County Sheriff’s Office and the United States Forest Service would like to remind residents and visitors to understand safe shooting practices before going to your Forests and Grassland,” officials said.

Under federal law, **recreational shooting can take place on the National Forests and Grasslands under these conditions:**

- You are at least 150 yards from a residence, building, campsite, developed recreation area or occupied area.
- You are not shooting across or on a National Forest System Road or an adjacent body of water.
- You are not shooting into or within a cave.
- You are not shooting in any manner or place where any person, property or resource is exposed to injury or damage as a result of such discharge.
- You are not firing any tracer bullet or incendiary ammunition.

Also, possession of an open container of an alcoholic beverage while discharging a firearm is not allowed.
A woman camping in the Red Feather Lakes area was shot in the thigh by an apparent stray bullet in a reckless shooting.

The incident happened Saturday in the area of Forest Roads 171 and 171D in the Swamp Creek area, according to the Larimer County Sheriff's Office.
The victim was taken by fellow campers to County Road 74E and Manhattan Road, where there’s better cellphone reception. Red Feather Lakes Volunteer Fire Department and deputies responded and found the woman, who was taken by helicopter to a hospital. Her injuries were not life-threatening.

Investigators interviewed several campers in the area of the Roosevelt National Forest, where the shooting occurred. Multiple people had been firing guns in the area throughout the day, the sheriff’s office said.

**Related Articles**

- July 10, 2015 Man killed by errant bullet in Pike National Forest highlights growing problem

Investigators were unable to determine the source of the stray bullet. The shooting is likely “the result of reckless discharge of a firearm.”

The sheriff’s office and U.S. Forest Service urge campers and back country users to “understand safe shooting practices” and use extreme caution when firing in national forest.

In 2015, Glenn Martin, 60, of Monument, was killed by an apparent errant shot in Pike National Forest as he was about to roast marshmallows with his family.

Anyone with information on the Red Feather Lakes incident is asked to call the sheriff’s office at 970-416-1985 or Crime Stoppers at 970-221-6868.
Man killed by errant bullet in Pike National Forest highlights growing problem
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Gun enthusiast Dave Gill shoots his .45 ACP at a neighbor's target range near Sedalia, Colorado on July 8, 2015. Gill is the vice president of the Colorado State Shooting Association and promotes safety when using any kind of firearm.
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RAINBOW FALLS PARK — Spent shell casings and trees chewed raw by bullets litter campgrounds where families have come for decades in search of wilderness.

It was here, in the shadows of land scarred by the Hayman fire, that Glenn Martin, a 60-year-old Monument man enjoying the holiday with his family, was killed last week by an apparently errant shot as he waited to roast marshmallows.

Down the U.S. Forest Service road from where he died, a “No shooting” sign greets all who enter the secluded Douglas County campground about 50 miles southwest of Castle Rock.

ADVERTISING

“It’s a scary thought,” Larry Smith, of Peyton, said at his campsite as his three grandchildren fumbled over discarded bullet casings. “We don’t want to stop coming. We could wear a helmet and pads.”

The forest service has been systematically closing areas such as Rainbow Falls Park, inside Pike National Forest, to shooters for years. But gun enthusiasts say doing so has only pushed whizzing bullets into closer quarters. Many times, the bans are ignored.

“We know that closing areas doesn’t deter people from shooting their gun,” forest supervisor Erin Connelly said. “It doesn’t mean that the population of the Front Range area will not increase and the interest in shooting guns won’t increase.”

Connelly called the problem a “large one” that her officers have been trying to tackle since the 1980s. Shooting on the land where Martin was killed July 3 was banned last summer, she said, after a 2008 analysis highlighted the dangers.
“We certainly didn’t want this to happen and don’t want anything else to happen in the future,” Connelly said. “Most people will comply. Most people will understand the reason. And there’s some that don’t.”

In the forest district where Martin was killed, the number of firearms-related incidents, warnings and citations jumped from 65 over a 12-month period starting in July 2013 to 324 over the comparable period ending this week, according to the forest service.

But patrolling such a vast space — more than 1.1 million acres — is difficult, even with the help of county sheriff’s offices and other law enforcement agencies. Shooting is generally legal on national forest land except in marked areas, across roadways, near recreation sites and without a backstop.

“The more places you close down, the more concentrated you make the places where people can go shoot,” said Anthony Fabian, president of the Colorado State Shooting Association. “These competing-use issues have really only come to the forefront in the last decade.”

Fabian says his organization has been advocating for public shooting ranges on forest service land to mitigate the danger, citing a successful project on Comanche National Grassland. The forest service says it is exploring such an option for Pike National Forest.

“If you build it, they will come,” he said. “If you build these recreational shooting areas, those facilities will be utilized by shooters as opposed to ad hoc shooting areas that people just use as locations of opportunity.”

The forest service on Friday announced plans to designate land in Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest for recreational shooting — part of a long-term effort to protect people living near the forests and using them.

The proposal calls for initially setting aside designated shooting areas at Allenspark in Boulder County and Devils Nose in Clear Creek County. It also identifies land suitable for recreational shooting that covers about 80 percent of the forests. The other 20 percent, near subdivisions or heavily used for other recreation, will be designated as not suitable for recreational shooting.
The last accidental shooting death in Pike National Forest was in 2009, when a 25-year-old Aurora man was killed after his friend accidentally shot him at South Rampart Shooting Range. Officials later closed the El Paso County facility.

Gary Routier, who was camping in Rainbow Falls Park when Martin was shot, said a swarm of roughly 40 police vehicles and officers in tactical gear set up a command center in the campground’s parking lot after the death.

“They searched our cars,” he said Wednesday as rain poured on his family’s tents and deafening thunder shook the ground. “They wouldn’t let us leave. They asked what we were doing here. We had to give them our ID.”

The Douglas County Sheriff’s Office, which is investigating the shooting, on Thursday offered to test rifles to rule out their connection to Martin’s death.

While investigators have said the fatal shot probably came from an errant bullet, they have not ruled out the possibility it was intentional.

Despite Martin’s death, many weren’t deterred this week from spanning across the forest to camp, ride horses and hike.

Roger Moore, host of the Indian Creek campground west of Sedalia, said the July 3 fatality is unsurprising but not worrisome.

“People just come up, and they’ll shoot at anything,” he said, standing near an outhouse whose door was riddled with 20 bullet holes.

Teresa and Keith Woidneck of Larkspur said they heard gunfire Tuesday night while they were at an equestrian camp with their horses. They shrugged off the noise and called Martin’s death an awful occurrence.

“I understand people need a place to shoot,” said Keith Woidneck, a gun owner who prefers ranges to shooting in the wild. “But I need a place to go hike.”

Jesse Paul: 303-954-1733, jpaul@denverpost.com or twitter.com/JesseAPaul
Jesse Paul

Politics reporter. He has worked at The Denver Post since the summer of 2014, covering cops, courts, politics, environment, skiing and everything in between. He loves telling stories about Colorado's mountain towns and the Eastern Plains and wants to make sure our newspaper's great work extends into their communities.

Follow Jesse Paul @jesseapaul
KUSA - The death of a 60-year-old mountain biker whose body was found by a hiker in a popular recreation area Sunday is now being investigated as a homicide.

The El Paso County Sheriff's Office said there are no potential suspects in the death of Tim Watkins, a Palmer Lake resident who was very involved in the local mountain biking community — and who even had trails named after him.

While it started as a death investigation, deputies say it is now being considered a homicide after they learned Watkins had been shot.

Friends and fellow mountain bikers say there have been issues with people firing guns in the
While it started as a death investigation, deputies say it is now being considered a homicide after they learned Watkins had been shot.

Friends and fellow mountain bikers say there have been issues with people firing guns in the area where Watkins was found.

A family member said Watkins left on his mountain bike on Thursday. His body was discovered near the Mount Herman area on Sunday morning.

The El Paso County Sheriff's Office is asking residents near this Palmer Lake open space to be careful.

Anyone with information about Watkins' death is asked to call the El Paso County Sheriff's Office tip line at 719-520-6666.
Exploding target pegged as trigger for 46,000-acre Sawmill Fire

By Tony Davis Arizona Daily Star  May 6, 2017
A commonly used exploding target was involved in setting off the 46,000-acre Sawmill Fire on state trust land south of Tucson, the Star has confirmed.

The off-duty Border Patrol agent whose recreational shooting sparked the fire apparently was shooting at an exploding target, when target shooting isn’t allowed on state lands, a law enforcement source confirmed late this week. In general, discharge of firearms is only allowed “pursuant to lawful and licensed hunting,” a State Land Department website says.

Land Department officials didn’t respond to several requests from the Star on whether exploding targets, which are typically detonated by bullets, are specifically banned on their lands. They are banned on U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands in Arizona and other Western states. But the Land Department’s websites say nothing specific about exploding targets.

The Sawmill blaze, which has cost at least $5 million to fight, spread quickly because of high winds after starting in late morning April 23 on state-owned Santa Rita Ranch, east of Madera Canyon near the Santa Rita Mountains.
At the time, winds were gusting up to 40 miles an hour and the National Weather Service had issued a fire watch, said Chuck Wunder, chief of the Green Valley Fire Department, first to respond to the blaze. A fire watch is a red flag, warning that “conditions are ideal for wildland fire combustion and that there is potential for rapid spread,” said Wunder.

His department received a fire call at 10:58 a.m. When the department’s first firefighting unit arrived at 11:11 a.m., the fire was heading north and east and already covered 300 acres, said Wunder. His family has the grazing permit for the Santa Rita Ranch but he was working, away from his house there, when the fire began, Wunder said.

Before the fire was largely contained a week later, it had jumped over the Santa Ritas and crossed Arizona 83 to attack the historic Empire Ranch and the surrounding 42,000-acre Las Cienegas National Conservation Area. Although the fire didn’t damage any buildings, it prompted authorities to put hundreds of neighboring homeowners on pre-evacuation notice. It put scores of homes, ranches and outbuildings, communications facilities and power lines at risk for several days and temporarily closed a section of Arizona 83.

The Forest Service is conducting an investigation of the blaze. It and other agencies have been reluctant to discuss how it started during the probe. The Forest Service has refused a Freedom of Information Act request to turn over records on the blaze to the Star. The Pima County Sheriff’s Department has said its records must first go through a legal review before being released. The State Land Department has not formally responded to the newspaper’s records request.
The Forest Service has also said little about the origin of a much smaller April 4 brush fire that burned 50 acres on Mount Lemmon and briefly closed a seven-mile stretch of the Mount Lemmon Highway. It has said only that it believes the fire was related to recreational shooting, citing witness reports and activity associated with where the fire started. The Forest Service said it is looking for a “person of interest” who may have started the fire. In contrast, the off-duty Border Patrol officer linked to the Sawmill Fire reported that blaze to authorities, the Border Patrol has said.

The exploding target that triggered the Sawmill Fire contained Tannerite, a compound of ammonium nitrate and aluminum powder, a law enforcement source told the Star. Tannerite is known as a binary explosive, in which its two substances are inert by themselves but can explode when mixed. Made by a company in Pleasant Hill, Oregon, it is commonly employed across the country for target practice and other purposes.

“When shot with a high-power rifle it produces a water vapor and a thunderous boom,” says the website of Tannerite Sports LLC, the Pleasant Hill, Oregon-based company that manufacturers Tannerite.

When the two substances contained in Tannerite are kept separately, they are inert and their use isn’t regulated. But when they’re mixed, the final product is regulated by the U.S. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. People can’t transport the mixed product without getting the proper permits or licenses from ATF.
The link between exploding target shooting and fire has prompted widespread concern across the West. Forest Service officials have blamed the use of exploding targets on more than a dozen wildfires across the West in recent years, according to press reports.

Contact reporter Tony Davis at tdavis@tucson.com or 806-7746. On Twitter@tonydavis987

MORE INFORMATION

- Border agent’s recreational shooting investigated as Sawmill Fire’s cause
- Forest Service looking for person of interest in Mount Lemmon fire
- Mulberry Fire held at 1,750 acres with 45 percent containment Sunday
- Mulberry Fire burning southeast of Tucson remains under investigation
- Family, community rally to help woman whose home burned in Mulberry Fire
- Tucson weather: Get ready for a warm weekend
- Wildfire burning south of Peña Blanca Lake
- No overnight growth reported in Bisbee wildfire
- Target shooter admitted starting Sawmill Fire, sheriff's report confirms
- Mustang Fire burns 209 acres east of Sonoita
- Winds expected to affect wildland firefighting crews in Southern Arizona
- County eyes ban on exploding targets after Sawmill Fire
- Sawmill Fire inquiry is turned over to U.S. Attorney's Office
- Supervisors approve limits on the use of exploding targets
- Learn how the historic Empire Ranch survived a raging wildfire

Tony Davis
Thanks and a tip of the hat go out to Rick and Bean.

Bill Gabbert / April 13, 2015 / Colorado. Snyder Creek 2 Fire. target shooting / 1
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Arson charges filed against two who started fire with exploding target, orphaning mountain lion cubs
Two people ordered to pay $9,450 for starting wildfire with exploding target

Two people have been ordered to pay $9,450 restitution for starting the Three Mile Fire nine miles east of Florence, Montana in August, 2014 that burned about 50 acres before firefighters extinguished it at a cost estimated at $94,000. Tristan C. Olson, 30, of Missoula and Caitlin E. Hoover, 28, of Stevensville, Montana agreed to the settlement in exchange for the felony charges being dropped. They will also have to follow specific conditions for three years, including abstaining from the consumption of alcohol and drugs or entering bars or casinos.

The fire started when an exploding target was detonated in a tree surrounded by waist-high cured grass.
Two mountain lion cubs that were rescued in the fire. Photo by Cory Rennaker, Bitterroot National Forest Helitack, USFS.

During the initial attack on the fire, Bitterroot National Forest firefighters rescued a pair of mountain lion cubs. The kittens, just a few weeks old, were taking shelter under a burning log. Firefighters called in a helicopter bucket drop to cool the log, and the kittens, wet from the 600 gallons of water, were rescued. They were adopted by the Columbus (Ohio) Zoo and Aquarium, and on September 23 made an appearance on David Letterman’s show along with Jack Hanna.

The two people being charged were busted at least in part by writing about their adventure on Facebook that amounted to a confession.

Exploding targets consist of two ingredients that when mixed by the end user create an explosive when shot by a high-velocity projectile. They have caused many fires since they became more popular in recent years and have been banned in some areas, and caused the death of one person. In June, 2013 a man attending a bachelor-bachelorette party in Minnesota was killed after shrapnel from the device struck him in the abdomen causing his death. The Missoulian reported that two years ago a woman in Ohio had her hand nearly blown off while taking a cellphone
Felony arson charges have been filed against two people who allegedly started the Three Mile Fire nine miles east of Florence, Montana in August, 2014. The fire burned about 50 acres before firefighters extinguished it at a cost estimated at $94,000.

During the initial attack on the fire, Bitterroot National Forest firefighters rescued a pair of mountain lion cubs. The kittens, just a few weeks old, were taking shelter under a burning log. Firefighters called in a helicopter bucket drop to cool the log, and the kittens, although wet from the 600 gallons of water, were rescued. They were adopted by the Columbus (Ohio) Zoo and Aquarium, and on September 23 made an appearance on David Letterman's show along with Jack Hanna.
The two people being charged were busted at least in part by writing about their adventure on Facebook that amounted to a confession. They should also be charged with Felony Dumb.

Below are excerpts from an article in the **Missoulian**:

Tristan C. Olson, 30, of Missoula and Caitlin E. Hoover, 28, of Stevensville are scheduled to appear Feb. 17 on a series of felony charges stemming from the Aug. 29, 2014, fire on the Three Mile Wildlife Management Area.

The fire was started by an exploding target that was lodged in a tree surrounded by waist-high cured grass. The explosion ignited the tree and the fire quickly spread.

On Aug. 29, Hoover posted on Facebook: “My old pal Tristan Olson just showed up at mi casa and woke me up with a mikes hard ass slurpie and some guns and ammo...heading for the hills...ha! Yay!!!”

The last post on Olson’s Facebook page for the same day showed a photograph of a column of smoke rising above the Three Mile WMA fire with Olson’s back facing the camera. The caption read: “Dang...”

[...]

After receiving a search warrant for Hoover’s Facebook account, the affidavit said the warden found she had deleted photos of the two shooting together on the WMA.
He also found a conversation that Hoover had with someone named “Topher Devoe” on Sept. 21. In answering Devoe’s question of “what other crazy things have you done,” Hoover responded: “I just started a forest fire by shooting an assault rifle at an exploding target and burnt down 60 acres of forest. Shhh the fire is still under investigation.”

Hoover attached the photo of the Olson watching the smoke rising from the WMA.

We have written about exploding targets many times before. The dangerous devices consist of two ingredients that when mixed by the end user create an explosive when shot by a high-velocity projectile.

Exploding targets have caused many fires since they became more popular in recent years. They have been banned in some areas, and caused the death of one person. In June, 2013 a man attending a bachelor-bachelorette party in Minnesota was killed after shrapnel from the device struck him in the abdomen causing his death. The Missoulian reported that two years ago a woman in Ohio had her hand nearly blown off while taking a cellphone video of a man firing at an exploding target placed in a refrigerator about 150 feet away.

The U.S. Forest Service has banned exploding targets in the Northern Region, which includes Montana. The Three Mile Fire occurred on state protected land in a Wildlife Management Area where target shooting is not permissible. The state of Montana has not taken action to specifically prohibit the use of exploding targets, although they can become illegal when fire restrictions are in place.
The orphaned cubs after being adopted. Photo by the Columbus (Ohio) Zoo and Aquarium.

Thanks and a tip of the hat go out to Dick.

Share this:
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Bill Gabbert / January 17, 2015 / arson, exploding targets, Montana, target shooting

Five men ordered to pay restitution for starting fire with exploding target

http://wildfirertoday.com/tag/target-shooting/
Five men who started what became a 38-acre fire near Alfalfa, Oregon in August, 2012 were ordered earlier this year to pay $17,569 to defray a portion of the costs of suppressing the Mayfield Fire. The BLM estimates they spent $88,000 to put out the blaze.

The men pleaded no contest to reckless burning, a Class A misdemeanor. They were identified as Redmond residents Peter Lee, then 31, and Clarence Christy, 32, and Bend residents Albert Sears, 27; William Loving, 25; and Jordon Odell, 25, said Deschutes County sheriff’s Sgt. Vance Lawrence.

They admitted to shooting at Tannerite, an exploding target that is known to have been the cause of numerous wildfires since the dangerous material began to be widely used two years ago. Many areas have banned exploding targets, citing wildfires, injuries, and a death caused by the use of the devices.

Below is an excerpt from an article at KTVZ. The site also has a video report published August 21, 2012 while firefighters were suppressing the fire.

...The BLM said the men admitted to purchasing 50 pounds of Tannerite and had used all but five pounds at the time of the incident.

They had shot about a dozen containers of Tannerite and were placing their targets in a western juniper tree, which ultimately exploded when the Tannerite was detonated.

The BLM said the target shooters also did not follow the recommendations of the Tannerite Company, which recommends
using no more than a half-pound of the mixed composition at one time.

The Oregon State Police Explosives unit had to respond to the incident to detonate the mixed but unused portion of Tannerite, which cannot be safely transported once the two chemicals are combined...

Wildfire Today has published numerous articles about the dangers of exploding targets.

Thanks and a tip of the hat go out to Shaun.
KUSA - A fire in Park County that forced evacuations over the weekend was caused by people shooting exploding targets, fire officials announced Monday.

The 392 Fire sparked on June 24 about 9.5 miles northeast of Coro.

RELATED: 90-acre wildfire in Park County was human-caused

Suspects attempted to extinguish the fire and remained on-scene until firefighters arrived. They're fully cooperating with the investigation, the forest service said.

As of Sunday night, the fire was 75 percent contained. It grew to 90 acres.

At its peak, it threatened one structure — a ranch in Park County.

Keep up with the latest on the fire here.

© 2017 KUSA-TV
392 Fire continues to burn northeast of Como in Park County

BY: Oscar Contreras
POSTED: 11:37 AM, Jun 25, 2017
UPDATED: 5:47 PM, Jun 25, 2017
TAG: park county | denver news | colorado news | 392 fire | wildfire northeast of como

Share Article

PARK COUNTY, Colo. — A wildfire that forced campers and at least one home to be evacuated over the weekend continues to grow in Park County, fire officials said Saturday night.

The 392 Fire is burning nearly ten miles northeast of the Town of Como as firefighters continued to secure fire lines and mop up hot spots overnight.

County Road 56 at Highway 285 was back open through traffic but a portion of County Road 39 that was closed as a precaution will likely open by Sunday night, according to Pike and San Isabel National Forests Cimarron and Comanche National Grasslands Fire officials.

A total of 15 engines, a water tender, as well as two helicopters are fighting the blaze, which has grown to 90 acres in size.

The cause of the fire is under investigation, but officials have determined it was human-caused.

The 392 Fire is now 50 percent contained.

RELATED HEADLINES --

close

COMO, Colo. (CBS4) - Campers have been evacuated, and at least one structure is threatened by a fire in Park County.

The 392 Fire is northeast of Como by nearly 10 miles.

Air support for #392Fire, photo courtesy of Vikki Mackey
https://t.co/HyivEbYmoB #COfire @PSicc_NF @CBSDenver
pic.twitter.com/kFQPwRKRBz

— MyMountainTown (@MyMountainTown) June 25, 2017

Fire engines, as well as a water tender and an ambulance, are being joined in the attack by helicopters and several air tankers.
The fire is estimated at approximately 90 acres in size, with 50 percent containment. It is burning in mixed conifers and grass. The fire's behavior is described as moderate, "with creeping and single tree torching in grass and timber."

Park County Road 39 is closed at both ends, from Park County Road 56 to Highway 285.

One home is currently evacuated, as well as up to 30 campers from area sites.

The cause of the fire is under investigation, but it is believed to be human-caused. Several families in the area tell CBS4 that it may have started from explosives used in gun shooting practice.
Unrestricted high explosives, available at a sporting goods store near you

It's 'dangerous stuff,' according to a Little Rock bomb squad member.

By David Koon

TANNERITE IN A TRUCK: This YouTube video still shows what the explosive can do.

Right now, on the shelves of almost every major sporting goods store in Arkansas, there is a product that goes by the brand name Tannerite. You've probably never heard of it. Most people haven't.

Tannerite is a binary high explosive, the best-selling brand of exploding rifle target in America. The legitimate use of the product is in small quantities as a shot indicator in long-range rifle shooting. A bang and a white puff of smoke shows that a bullet has hit the target, saving the shooter a walk to check. As seen in hundreds of videos online, however, exploding target compounds are being mixed in bulk quantities, used to create explosions that look more like IED blasts than target practice. A member of the Little Rock Fire Department bomb squad said exploding target compounds — some of which feature detonation energy that rivals TNT — are dangerous, and could easily be used to create a bomb.
As the name "binary explosive" suggests, exploding target kits consist of two components: ammonium nitrate and aluminum powder. Unmixed, both are inert and cannot explode. For that reason, as-purchased exploding targets aren't considered explosives in most states or by the federal government. Even when sold as a kit, they can be bought with few regulations, purchased online or shipped through the U.S. Mail.

Once the two components are mixed — an operation that's as easy as opening an envelope of dark powder and a canister of tiny white beads, then shaking them together in a supplied plastic jar — even a pound of Tannerite will explode with an amazing amount of force when subjected to a violent shock, such as a high-powered rifle shot or blasting cap. A minor impact such as a hammer blow, drop to concrete or even a lower-velocity round from a handgun will not set it off. A line in the warnings on the bright orange label of every Tannerite brand target notes that the moment you mix the two components, "you become the manufacturer of an explosive and assume any/all liabilities."
Brian Chilson

EASY BLENDING: Tannerite can be had for around $8 a pound.

In bulk, Tannerite sells for around $8 a pound. It’s available in bulk boxes of up to 10 pounds, though there’s no restriction on how much you can buy at once. While not required by law to do so, most sporting goods stores require purchasers to be over 21 to purchase exploding targets. (When the reporter bought a Tannerite brand target at Gander Mountain in North Little Rock earlier this week, I was asked for a date of birth, but wasn’t required to show a driver’s license.)

A call to Tannerite Sports LLC, the Oregon company that makes Tannerite brand exploding rifle targets, was not returned at press time.
The evidence that exploding target compounds could be used for deadly purposes is incontrovertible. A search for the word "Tannerite" on YouTube returns 136,000 results, including videos of one massive detonation after another, footage of people demolishing trucks, mobile homes, old houses, barns and a herd of live feral pigs. Many are accomplished with less than $200 worth of the material. One video, called "30lbs of Tannerite vs 79 Ford Bronco" shows an explosion so powerful that it obliterates the SUV's steel body, throwing metal fragments hundreds of feet. In another video, called "FPS Russia almost dies," a young man shoots a pickup in which exploding target material has been placed and the resulting explosion bends the truck's frame into a U-shape, sending a huge piece of jagged steel — what appears to be the truck's mangled door — tumbling past the shooter with only inches to spare.

While imagining either of those trucks parked on a city street is enough to give any American nightmares, it's not all "What ifs." There have been several reported incidents involving detonations of large quantities of exploding target material, including a Minnesota man who was fined and sentenced to probation after detonating 100 pounds in a dump truck, creating an explosion so strong that it threw parts hundreds of feet in the air and triggered a lockdown at the Prairie Island Nuclear Power Plant almost five miles away. In May 2012 in Celina, Ohio, a woman's hand was severed after a friend shot a clothes dryer with exploding target material inside. In June 2013 a Minnesota man was killed at a bachelor party after shrapnel thrown by an exploding target placed in a steel container hit him in the abdomen.

The Federal Bureau of Land Management has banned exploding targets on its land, citing them as the cause of several wildfires that cost over $30 million to fight. The National Forest Service has since banned the targets on NFS land in the Rocky Mountain Region for the same reason. (A FAQ page on the Tannerite website says the product will not start fires and are "designed from conception to be non-incendiary.") In March 2013, the FBI sent out a bulletin to law enforcement agencies saying exploding target compounds "can be used as an explosive for illicit purposes by criminals and extremists," adding
that as regulations on ammonium nitrate-based fertilizers increase, "motivated criminals and extremists seeking ammonium nitrate for illicit use will be more likely to seek alternative sources, such as [exploding targets]."

Pulaski County Chief Deputy Prosecutor John Johnson said the prosecutor's office doesn't answer hypothetical questions, so he couldn't say on the record whether someone who set off a large-scale explosion using exploding target material in Pulaski County would be charged with a crime. He did, however, direct the reporter to the Arkansas state statute dealing with "Causing a Catastrophe," which says that both using explosives to cause a catastrophe and threatening to use explosives to cause a catastrophe are felonies.

Capt. Jason Weaver has been with the Little Rock Fire Department bomb squad for the past six years. He said exploding target materials like Tannerite are considered high explosives, and can easily be turned into a bomb.

"It's dangerous stuff," he said. "I look for the ATF to regulate it. I don't know why they haven't up to this point."

Weaver said that depending on the brand, an explosion can propagate through an exploding target compound at between 8,000 to 20,000 feet per second, meaning that shrapnel from any solid object immediately around the blast — what Weaver called "frag" — will also be moving at close to that speed initially. By contrast, Weaver said the blast from TNT moves at 22,000 to 24,000 feet per second, while most explosives used in earth moving clock in at 8,000 to 17,000 feet per second. Bullets fired by most high-powered rifles travel at around 3,000 feet per second. "It's up there with some military-grade explosives," Weaver said.

Asked if exploding target materials like Tannerite should be banned for sale to the general public, Weaver said that while the material does have a use in long-range target shooting, it should be
regulated, and should include "taggants" that would allow investigators to learn when and where the material was manufactured if it was used in building a bomb.

"In my opinion," Weaver said, "It's susceptible to abuse. It most definitely could be easily transformed into an improvised explosive device, so I think it should be heavily regulated. I don't know if they should prohibit the sale, but I think it should be [sold] like they used to do old dynamite: You come in, show your I.D. and you have a certain quantity that you are allowed."

Weaver said that even if a person plans to use an exploding target compound as the manufacturer intended for legal target shooting, the easy availability can convince consumers that the product is much safer than it actually is.

"A lot of people think that because they sell it over the counter, that it's not that dangerous — that if they'll trust just a regular citizen, it can't be that stout," he said. "But everybody I've talked to who has used it is really impressed with the effects. They can't believe the power and the thump that it gives."

End of Ralph Nelms submission
Hi Jennifer,

My name is Nick Apel. In September I purchased a home located at 144 Del Monte Pl, Central City, CO 80427. The Home is located just past Bald Mountain Cemetery on Bald Mountain Lane in Gilpin County. When purchasing the home we were thrilled to find a property that is surrounded by national forest land and we're looking forward to our dream of enjoying the serenity of the mountains. Since moving in, we hear gunshots nearly every day. When hiking around the home on well defined hiking trails we often run into groups of people sport shooting. Usually, people are shooting just off of Bald Mountain Lane within a half mile to mile from our house.

While I support sport shooting I do not feel Bald Mountain and the surrounding area should allow such activities. The area is populated by homes like ours. Ourselves and our neighbors and others wanting to enjoy the peace of hiking in the mountains should not need to carry air horns and seek out shooters in the area to make shooters aware there are people in the area where they are shooting. We should not have to be concerned about stray bullets when walking around our property.

Please consider this feedback as part of the recreational sport shooting partnership project.

Thank you,
Nick Apel
144 Del Monte Pl
Central City, CO 80427
720.940.7719
Dear Commissioners, I am writing to express my support for the joint County and Forest Service effort to regulate dispersed sport shooting in the Boulder forest district. I attended the Open House meeting last Monday and want to submit additional comments on the proposed alternative Maps.

I support alternative Map 1 because I think it offers the best balance between protecting residents and visitors and allowing for shooting in more remote areas. It also recognizes the reality that there will be more residents and visitors to this area over the years, and shooting needs to take place in more remote areas. Map 2 is too limited and will only result in more complaints and dangers as the residential and visitor population in the foothills increases. Map 3 would also be a reasonable solution. although I would like to see all shooting restricted along Magnolia Dr, which is one of the most populated areas and most highly used by visitors. Map 4 does not offer enough balance.

Also, if the Forest Service were to adopt Map 1, I think the County would need to focus on opening two shooting ranges in the foothills. If Map 3, then only one shooting range. I think any range needs to be at least one mile from any concentration of residential housing. Noise and bullets just travel too far up here to allow for any closer location.

I support a balanced approach to the various competing interests, but want to express my belief that safety and quality of life for residents should come first, as it does in other areas of regulation of land use. We live here, spend the most time here and have the most invested here. Visitors also have rights of use, but they need to be somewhat subordinated to residents. As a general theme, I think this is an important aspect. For visitors, it's basically a question of convenient in driving time. For us, it's safety, peaceable enjoyment of our properties and the value of our investments in our properties.

Thank you for your continued effort in this area.

Charlie Farrell
6583 Magnolia Dr
Nederland, CO 80466
To Whom It May Concern:

As a resident of Lazy Z Rd for 20 years, I am concerned with the dispersed shooting problem and have been for years. I attended the last meeting but didn’t have time to submit my comment card. I am in full support of closing the USFS lands to dispersed shooting as indicated in Alternative 4. I am in support of a designated shooting range at a safe location that is convenient for shooters and the community and I hope it will not be a nuisance to residents located in close proximity to the range. Dispersed shooting should not be allowed in Wilderness areas.

Thanks for your attention on this matter,

Todd Adelman
1890 Lazy Z Rd
Nederland, CO 80466
November 24, 2017

To: USFS and Clear Creek County
From: Patricia McCord
257 Circle Dr.
Evergreen, CO  80439
Clear Creek County Home Owner for 20.5 years
RE:  Comments on Forest Plan Direction for managing recreational sport shooting (RSS) in the Arapaho And Roosevelt National Forests and Clear Creek County: Input regarding the Four (4) County Specific Alternative Maps

A little over 2 years has passed since we visited the issues of Recreational Sports Shooting in the Front Range counties impacted by the questions of where shooting can occur safely and with some level of oversight. As a Clear Creek County resident for most of the past 27 years, and home owner for 20.5 years in the Old Squaw Pass neighborhood/Beaver Brook Lodge Estates, I appreciate the Forest Service and County Governments reaching out to the mountain communities and residents directly impacted by the outcomes regarding the above. My ongoing disclaimer is that I am not anti-gun, nor anti-hunting. It is a national tradition with laws protecting that right. I have family members who have hunted on national and private lands over the past century. I love the gift of elk meat whenever staff or clients offer me part of whatever they have bagged. Hunting and the practice of shooting is a right that needs to be protected, at the same time, a right and privilege that needs to be guided and managed. With that said, I am also a major hiker in my neighborhood, the Beaver Brook Watershed and along many of the trails accessed by the I-70 corridor and along Berthoud Pass.

I participated in the commentary of 2 years ago, and recently attended the meeting at King Murphy to hear Tim Mauck and the CCC Sherriff explain the Alternative Map Choices and how they were developed. I was impressed with the amount of time, effort, and collaboration that went into exploring all the options to create RSS areas and keep the public safe. I have studied the maps that offer either end of the spectrum, Maps 2 and 4, which either limit shooting altogether or allow it to occur much too close to homes, neighborhoods and recreational use. Safety first is the best motto. I really like having Devil’s Nose established as a designated shooting range in CCC.

I provided input in 2015, and continue to stand by my concerns related to safety, management/oversight and signage.

1. Ongoing due diligence regarding usage of these areas with an environmental impact study to be completed:

a. Hwy 103 by vehicles, cyclists (the bicycle lane was added 4 years ago), and walker/runners who utilize this highway? The volume of local resident use AND
visitors up this road has increased exponentially over the past 7 years. It does vary seasonally, but summer and fall cyclist and motorcycle use is heavy, and winter use will increase with Echo Hills ski area; and

b. Recreational use of the Beaver Brook Watershed by hikers, walkers (many with small children, dogs on leash, older hikers out for a more leisurely enjoyment of the mountain experience) mountain cyclists, fishermen and women, snowshoers, x-c skiers, etc.

2. Next, I am concerned about the safety issues of those who use the Beaver Brook Watershed or travel parallel to it via Hwy 103. As it is a mixed ownership property (Forest Service, Mountain Area Land Trust, Golden Watershed District and Clear Creek County Open Space), how will folks know which parts of the trail are designated for shooting or not? This has me concerned about shooters (knowing their boundaries) and non-shooters (entering shooting range areas unbeknownst to themselves.) How do we know what is what? None of the ownership entities except the Forest Service allow for RSS. How will the signage be managed and maintained? How will we know when we pass from one jurisdiction into the next? Who will monitor and maintain it? Who will be accountable if shooting accidents occur?

3. The next part of the question related to #2 is the management side of these RSS areas. I am sure you have heard about the shooting area up Hwy 103 that was being used illegally. It was not monitored and when finally cleaned up showed signs of alcohol usage (illegal in your own guidelines), the associated trash left behind (very disrespectful to our public lands and forests), shooting up of trees (fire hazard!!!!) aiming incorrectly toward neighborhoods (no hard back drop). So how is this going to be managed? I believe our Forest Service resources (manpower) is stretched thinly as it is? How can public safety be assured from a management perspective? I have been told an environmental impact assessment is being done and would like to see the results of that study.

**My vote would be to go with Map #3**, as it is mixed use and protects the wants/needs of most parties. Concerns with all the present map proposals include:

1. The USFS has inadequate law enforcement resources to assure that all users are safe unless Alternate 4 is selected.

2. The USFS makes no mention and provision for maintenance of signage so that users interested in dispersed shooting activities understand the boundaries and the presence of areas such as hiking trails. The USFS maps do not include established hiking trails or picnic (whether established by the USFS or by repeated public usage). It is
not possible to tell whether areas designated usable for dispersed shooting intersect with or abut trails and picnic areas.

These are the critical issues that need to be addressed before the final decision is made. Use of volunteers for some of the oversight roles may be an answer when budgets are stretched. The Forest Service has made great strides in answering most of the questions and creating equitable options for the citizens of CCC. Thank you for letting us participate in the decision-making regarding our counties and neighborhoods. Democracy in action!
TO: USFS and Clear Creek County

FROM: Fran Enright, 83 Long View Road, Evergreen, CO 80439, franenright@earthlink.net

DATE: November 21, 2017

RE: RSS proposals

I appreciate the USFS effort to solicit citizen input for the Forest Plan Dispersed Shooting (Recreational Sports Shooting). I have been a resident of Pine Valley for 35 years and my property is adjacent to the Beaver Brook Watershed. Each of these proposed alternatives should address the issues of public safety, enforceability, noise, litter, funding viability and public consensus. Is lead shot an issue?

ALTERNATIVE 1:

Is this map accurate? up to date? It is hard to understand the plan without knowing the topography of the areas. How will public safety be assured? How will the boundaries be delineated and communicated to the public? Is this option “enforceable”? Are the different land managing agencies in agreement over their policies of dispersed shooting?

ALTERNATIVE 2:

This is certainly better that Alternative 1. The homes around the Beaver Brook Watershed look like they have no buffer between them and potential target shooters. This is an area that has lots of trash dispersed by dispersed recreational sports shooters. Will this ever be cleaned up? Clay pigeons, targets, shell casings and beverage containers including beer bottles litter the forest! How will the area be signed for proper use? The boundaries and large blank areas do not appear to intuitively reasonable. The boundaries appear to be straight lines drawn somewhere? Are they field checked? Is it enforceable to have isolated parcels included? Does this alternative encourage the use of the Devils Nose shooting area? Do managing agencies have enough personnel to enforce this alternative?

ALTERNATIVE 3:

This is better that Alternative 1 and 2.

The I-70 corridor brings many users to the public lands to Clear Creek County. Herman Gulch, Watrous Gulch, Bard Creek, Guanella Pass road and Mt Evans, are some of the most popular areas in the Front Range for outdoor recreation, such as hiking, skiing and climbing. Many educational institutions from grade schools to graduate schools use these areas for their classrooms. How will Recreational Sports Shooting be designed for success so that community integrates into these other communities and users?

Are there areas where target shooters would shoot over the heads of hikers? Chicago Creek area comes to mind. Again, how are very popular hiking and skiing area users protected from stray shots?

Does this alternative encourage/discourage use of the Devils Nose shooting range? I would think that with our limited resources, we should be encouraging its use. Focusing the target shooters to Devils Nose by restricting target shooting from other areas nearby would give a loud and clear message to everyone. And, I would suggest that having the RSS shooters in one confined, defined area that should greatly reduce the management and enforcement issues. And, it would help the managing agencies to model good shooting practices.

ALTERNATIVE 4:

This alternative focuses use in the Clear Creek area to the Devils Nose shooting range. I think it is the most reasonable alternative. With clever design, I would think that this range could be safe for every person in the range and the surrounding area. And, by default, shooters are not intermingled with hikers and skiers in what is simply a bad idea but will lead to the inevitable conflicts. These conflicts, unfortunately, have serious consequences when guns are involved.

With limited resources for enforcement, I would think that Alternative 4 has the best chance of success.

Fran Enright
November 2, 2017

Northern Front Range Recreational Sport Shooting Management Partnership

P. O. Box 471

Boulder, CO 80306

I am writing to voice my concern and to oppose all 5 outdoor proposed sites along the northern Front Range and anywhere close to Beaver Reservoir, Netherland, Ward, or Estes Park. There is no reason for an outdoor range in such close proximity to these areas or communities. Since the State government has allowed the population, demographics, water usage, density, and lack of infrastructure to go unchecked, the last thing that is needed is a new outdoor shooting range. The ability to safely be in the out of doors particularly along the Front Range is already in real jeopardy.

Being an NRA member and believing in the second amendment I want those who own guns, muskets, bows and arrows etc, to safely practice their craft. There should be indoor ranges available to them where the rest of the population does not have to worry or hear their activity. There has to be an area for another great indoor range, an underground complex, or an area far away from the population that can be heavily and highly bermed.

No one should have to worry and hear the mass shooting anywhere close to where they recreate, vacation, or live full time. You have to come up with a safer and better solution. Do better! You would never live close to one of these sites.

Sincerely,

A very concerned Native Coloradoan
Anne Vickery
FW: Boulder District target shooting

Tom Ford
Arapahoe Roosevelt National Forest
2150 Centre Ave, Building E
Fort Collins, CO 80526

Dear Mr. Ford,

This comment refers to Recreational Sport Shooting Alternative 1, the Proposed Action, presented at the Boulder Forest Service/County Commissioners meeting November 13.

This comment concerns “high recreation use areas” as a factor for deciding whether lands are suitable or not suitable for recreational sport shooting. Alternative #1 shows the Indian Peaks and James Peak wilderness areas as suitable. As you can see from the following comments these two Wilderness areas are close to several growing urban areas and have unusually high recreational use. The high recreation in these two areas counters the normal understanding of “wilderness” as it relates to quiet and enjoying nature. The safety factor of shooting in an area with high numbers of people hiking, back packing and camping should be a major Forest Service concern. The Indian Peaks and James Peak wilderness areas should not be part of the Forest Service area open to recreational sport shooting.

BRAINARD AREA
The Brainard Recreation Areas contains a campground, a huge parking lot, Brainard Lake surrounded by picnic tables and a road. West of the lake area are two wilderness trailheads and parking lots usually full by 7:30 AM. The large Brainard parking area fills soon after. Many cars have to line up two miles lower at the entrance to the Brainard area and wait for a space in the upper parking lots. There is no sport shooting allowed in the Brainard Recreation Area.

INDIAN PEAKS WILDERNESS

Four Lakes Backcountry Zone
The two upper trailheads enter The Four Lakes Backcountry Zone, a wilderness zone which goes up to the Continental Divide. This zone includes four popular lakes, six popular peaks, heavily trafficked Pawnee Pass to the west slope and the Beaver Creek trail to the north which goes over Buchanan Pass. These trails in the wilderness are crowded with hikers and backpackers from the parked cars. The trails continue over to the west slope’s popular peaks, lakes and camping spots. These areas are not safe for sport shooting.

The Boulder District keeps a record of all wilderness camping permits on both the east and west slope. The Indian Peaks wilderness has 17 Backcountry Zones with a specific number of campsites in each zone. This number varies from 24 sites in the Cascade Creek Zone to 5 sites in Neva and 5 in Hell Canyon. One large group of 8 to 12 campers is allowed each day in each Backcountry Zone. Each of the other sites in each zone allow 1 to 7 campers daily. Many designated camping sites are full weekend after weekend in the summer. The more popular ones are full almost every day, all week long. There is no way to count campers who buck the rules and camp without permit. Campers hike on a variety of trails to reach these campsites. The east side trails from Brainard, Hessie and 4th of July trailheads are the most popular routes to reach the west slope areas. Campers who due to weather or fatigue don’t reach their permitted sites camp somewhere along the way. Mixing these backpackers and day hikers with sport shooting is not safe.
Hessie
The Hessie parking area above the town of Eldora is accessed by a narrow road that has become so crowded on summer weekends and Holidays that buses now leave from close by Nederland every 15 minutes taking hikers and backpackers to the Hessie trailheads. The Hessie area has access to six separate wilderness trails and popular camping destinations both inside and outside the wilderness. The crowds don’t mix with shooting.

4th of July
The road beyond Hessie continues up to the 4th of July city campsite and five wilderness trails leading to a variety of popular camping sites, Diamond Lake, Arapaho Pass, high peaks such as Mt. Neva and South and North Arapaho and Caribou Lake and west slope Backcountry Zones. The road and 4th of July parking area can have many cars on week day and up to 100 parked cars on summer weekends and holidays. Numerous day users plus backpackers makes this not an area suitable for sport shooting.

Rainbow Lakes
The Rainbow Lakes area has a popular campground, an often overflowing parking area for hikers and two trails into the wilderness. One trail is to the Arapaho Glacier and spectacular mountain views. The lower elevation trail goes to multiple lakes where you can camp and fish. It is an easily accessible wilderness area and the lakes are particularly popular with families with small children. This area is not suitable for sport shooting.

JAMES PEAK WILDERNESS
This is a relatively new Wilderness Area with many lakes and several high peaks. The FS is developing management regulations. The Continental Divide Trail goes through the area and attracts local, national and international hikers. There are numerous access points on both the east and west slope. A major access is the East Portal where the train goes under the Continental Divide. The East Portal has a huge parking lot for cars. On a summer weekend some 130 cars were counted. A constant stream of hikers and backpackers, many with dogs on leash, were going into the wilderness. Many people give up on the crowds in the Indian Peaks and head into James Peak. This area is fast gaining in popularity and is becoming a high use recreation area and not suitable for sport shooting.

CONCLUSION
The Committee must give serious consideration to what is going on in these wilderness areas. Recreational sport shooters carry in guns and target equipment or use trees or rocks or grass and dirt mounds. Many don’t use official sport shooting sites. They want simply to go out and usually don’t walk very far into an area. If the wilderness remains open to sport shooting that is where shooters will go. The easy to reach areas are also the ones most frequented by hikers, backpackers and campers. The increasing popularity and large crowds throughout these wilderness areas mean the Indian Peaks and James Peak are definitely not suitable for recreational sport shooting. These two Forest Service Wilderness areas must be closed to recreational sport shooting.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Anne Vickery
IPWA Co-Founder and IPWA volunteer
303-499-3001,
vickeryanne@outlook.com
INDIAN PEAKS WILDERNESS AREA
Camping Permit Required June 1 through September 15

NOTE: Campers permit are valid only for backcountry zones and date specified on permit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not camp outside of your assigned Backcountry Zone. Have a topo</td>
<td>At Crater, Jasper, Diamond &amp; Caribou Lakes, camping is only allowed in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>map.</td>
<td>numbered designated campsites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In other zones camp in already disturbed areas a minimum of 100 feet</td>
<td>Lightning is dangerous. Storms are common in early afternoon. Be below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from water and trail. No camping in Four Lakes Zone.</td>
<td>tree line before noon and camp in the trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public lands are our lands: we are responsible for protecting</td>
<td>To protect the landscape and trees, campfires are prohibited in tan &amp; blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vegetation &amp; wildlife</td>
<td>areas on the map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear hiking boots to keep you dry on wet, snowy, muddy trails and</td>
<td>Stepping off trail to avoid snow, mud and water tramples vegetation &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safe on rocks</td>
<td>causes damage. Stay in the center of the trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry dog poop with you. Do not leave bags on the trail.</td>
<td>Dogs must stay on leash. Off leash dogs frighten wildlife and can get hurt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off leash dogs get tularemia &amp; giardia from water. Domestic feces</td>
<td>Off leash dogs get tularemia &amp; giardia from water. Domestic feces affects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affects soil &amp; vegetation.</td>
<td>soil &amp; vegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moose consider dogs wolves and will attack. Do not approach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JAMES PEAK WILDERNESS AREA
(no camping permit required)
Prohibited: campfires and groups of more than 12 persons
Pets must be on leash at all times
Indian Peaks Wilderness Quota Sheet

PLEASE NOTE: The Four Lakes Backcountry Zone is off-limits to all overnight camping!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thurs</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribou Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascade Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coney Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crater Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devil's Thumb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glacier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hell Canyon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasper Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Boulder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle St Vrain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roaring Fork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aug 28 to Sept 3, 2016
1 8 to 12 campers
1 1 to 7 campers
[Compartito yuv]
1 1 to 7 campers
Indian Peaks Wilderness Quota Sheet

PLEASE NOTE: The Four Lakes Backcountry Zone is off-limits to all overnight camping!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thurs</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe</td>
<td>10/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>11/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribou Lake</td>
<td>6/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascade Creek</td>
<td>16/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbine</td>
<td>9/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coney Creek</td>
<td>6/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crater Lake</td>
<td>8/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devil's Thumb</td>
<td>11/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Lake</td>
<td>6/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glacier</td>
<td>7/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hell Canyon</td>
<td>4/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasper Lake</td>
<td>6/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Boulder</td>
<td>8/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle St Vrain</td>
<td>8/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neva</td>
<td>7/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roaring Fork</td>
<td>4/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>7/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

July 24-30 2016

8 to 12 campers
21 to 7 campers
11 to 7 campers

Campsite full
Subject: Recreational Sport Shooting Project Comments

Date: 2017-11-29 20:52

From: jp lande <jp_lande@hotmail.com>

To: "info@sportshootingpartners.org" <info@sportshootingpartners.org>

First, let me applaud the effort taken to organize recreational shooting practices in the Front Range area. I live in Gilpin County and can only comment on this and southern Boulder County area as these are where I recreate. I grew up sports shooting and still support target/sports shooting but not in a dispersed fashion.

Apart from annoying noise, safety and environmental concerns are huge. Trees are used as targets or target holders causing the trees to die. Particularly the FS road 718.1 near Pickle Gulch campground is being heavily used. The shooting in this area is done from or within 10 feet of the road and across the creek. Spent cartridges, alcoholic beverage and other miscellaneous articles being used as targets pollute the area. Another area is an area just north-west of the junction of hwys 119 and 46. There are trails behind the area being used. I have hiked on the trails and had to use a whistle to alert the shooters that they are shooting towards the trail. I have also had bullets flying by too close for comfort when a couple of shooters used a trail I was hiking on as a shooting range.

Another concern is the use of tracers or explosive targets. These provide a real fire hazard in our area. Although they may be banned, it doesn’t stop shooters to use them.

Dispersed shooting means to me indiscriminate shooting and as a hiker/runner/mtn biker I don’t know which direction they are shooting and if I’m safe or not. Designated shooting areas/ranges provides a safer option for all.

Alternative 4 would be my only choice as I don't see any reason at all to practice recreational shooting outside an official designated shooting range. Right to bear arms does not mean right to shoot wherever/whenever or at whatever.

I cannot comment on the Nugget shooting area in Gilpin County as I don’t know exactly where it is related to properties around. A description of each proposed designated shooting area would be good to see in the proposals and why it was chosen.

But I am concerned about the W Magnolia Camp Ora Penn shooting area in Boulder County. This is an area that is heavily used by campers/mtn bikers/hikers/runners/riders/school groups. The noise from this area would put a damper on these recreational groups. It only takes one to make many others uncomfortable. It is not fair for the majority.

Unfortunately, I am not able to suggest an area for designated shooting in Gilpin County. Nobody wants one in their backyard. If there were an enclosed/indoor shooting range in the county I would probably be one of the first to become a member.

Thanks!

JP Lande
Gilpin County
-----Original Message-----
From: Sue and Dave Thompson [mailto:arfcows@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2017 8:54 PM
To: Sanfacon, Garry
Subject: Spam: Alternative shooting ranges

Hello, and thank you for hosting area meetings in Boulder County to offer information on solutions to shooting issues. My family is definitely in favor of Alternative 4 for the following reasons: We live near 68J, where people regularly shoot semi-automatics as well as other types of guns. Although hikers and campers far outnumber recreational shooters, area residents are often afraid to hike or to camp in their forest areas because of gunfire. Shells and trash, including shot cigarette lighters, are often left behind. 68J has been turned from a double track into a main highway by traffic, many of these vehicles belonging to shooters. Although you can’t see a few of the houses within a hundred yards of 68J, people shoot near them almost daily, including from the rocks above my sister’s house on Twin Sisters. A tragedy eventually will occur. Additionally, along West and East Magnolia, 68J and 68, the areas where the Forest Service cleared trees for fire mitigation have opened land for exploration by hikers and children beyond the trails. This increases danger from recreational shooters. A few years ago a grandfather was killed by a stray bullet near Pike’s Peak while sitting at a campfire with his granddaughter. This tragedy will happen here eventually if shooters aren’t separated from hikers and campers.

-Sue Thompson

1059 Twin Sisters Rd.
Nederland,CO 80466
-----Original Message-----
From: George and Yvonne [mailto:ysgb@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2017 2:37 PM
To: Boulder County Board of Commissioners
Subject: Sports Shooting comment

Dear Board of County Commissioners,

I don't know if it's too late to enter my comment on the Sports Shooting issue but here are my thoughts.

Having lived for 31 yrs. within easy earshot of two popular sports shooting areas off of Magnolia Rd. in the WUI, I can say with complete accuracy the number of near misses in the past 8/10 yrs. has only increased in frequency. It is UNCONSCIONABLE to even consider having dispersed shooting in an area as heavily populated and visited as ours. A "sport" that literally endangers the lives of residents and tourists needs to be in an area where NO ONE will "accidentally" catch a bullet.

Another sane reason for closing these 2 areas is the very real threat to the communities here of shooting caused wildfires from more than one source; abandoned campfires, incendiary targets, and bullet caused fires in our often very dry, windy environment.

Healthy trees loaded up with bullets to the point of crashing down are sadly more common with the reckless attitude of some shooters who don't get caught due to sparse public law enforcement.

Of the alternatives presented at the recent open house for Boulder County #1 & 4 are the only ones that will protect residents and the many tourists in our area. I VOTE FOR THE MORE RESTRICTIVE OF THE PAIR.

Both Sugarloaf and West Mag. are shown as being closed in all 4 alternatives. Why in the world would East Mag. and Front Range even be considered with how populated and popular our area is with the history of problems we've been having?

Shooting allowed to continue at the Front Range/Boy Scouts trail site will increase in potential stray bullet fatality with the Mag.Trails Project for this area. I would think having more trails constructed in an area where sports shooting is allowed to be logically considered a bad idea.

Having a sports shooting range so close to Nederland is also not a bright idea with the Middle Senior High School relatively close to the designation. Not only will gunfire sound travel disrupting students in their studies but as I understand it the high schoolers have been using that area for cross country running for a long time. I live more than a mile from one of the shooting sites on Magnolia rd. and we easily hear the gunfire here. It is very disruptive to our forest setting one of the main reasons for living up here.

SHOOTING belongs in a place far away from peaceful people doing non threatening activities. Times have changed, this isn't the wild west anymore.

Thank you for considering my opinion.

Yvonne Short
618 Aspen Meadows Rd.
Nederland
Sir,

I am an interested party who lived in Gilpin county for over fifteen years and maintain ties with friends and family there, as well as regularly utilizing the forest when I visit to this day. Beyond this, I have worked with the Boulder OHV committee in the past, as well as Gilpin county on land use issues.

For these reasons and my deep love for Colorado, I wish to make a contribution to this discussion. I believe we have done a good deal of harm to the western forest by neglect and misappropriation of priorities. The overcrowding and disease problems that have been allowed to propagate have left the forest prone to catastrophic wildfires. There needs to be considerable effort put into mitigation, continued prescribed burning, and salvage timber sales to get the fuel out of the Forest and offer an opportunity for fire to be controlled and utilized in a way that mimics nature. As a farmer, I think there could be an increase in grazing as a management tool as well.

The area of the Front Range in your care is in exceptional danger with the development that has occurred in the last thirty years. I believe it is an obligation of the people who have property there to mitigate in order to be insured. I was a developer in my time there and am well known to advocate the importance of mitigation at every opportunity. This should extend to the public lands as well. Part of the public is those who assume the obligation of having to help pay the costs of insurance claims and fighting catastrophic wildfires. Please promote these principals of responsible stewardship.

I have said I am an advocate of OHV use. This is a vitally important part of forest recreation as well as recreational shooting sports and equestrian activities. I strongly support a multiple use management strategy and ask that the long historical use by these interests should be preserved and potentially expanded. Part of the problem with crowded forests come from the manifold restrictions that have essentially confined certain uses to smaller and smaller areas.

Another area of concern for me, would be to suggest further review of the potential for reopening the Rollins Pass route and the Needles Eye Tunnel, as agreed to at the conception of the James Peak Wilderness. It is a fact that this plan exists and with modern advances in tunnel technology it would be a much less costly and safer endeavor than ever before. This route could be the gem of the front range and it’s historic significance and the fact that it was a part of the Wilderness Agreement should make it a priority. We age also, and I fear the loss of access to these wonderful places should I one day be unable to hike miles at high altitude. It is my reasonable request that this should be accomplished in my lifetime.

I was a young man of 21 who literally came to Colorado with a backpack and fifty dollars. I made a good life there and have a deep connection to the land there. It is my plan to invest there in the future and I will be reassured to see these values respected. I have seen a great deal of progress in the last few years on mitigation work and cooperative uses. I think you all deserve a Thank You!

I hope this will continue as there is much more to accomplish, and that my views will be introduced into the discussion. Thank you again for your consideration. I am unfamiliar with the scope of the plan review presently at hand, and wish only to make my general views known. Please share this as appropriate.

Humbly Submitted,
John Ryther,
Austin, MN / Rollinsville, Co.
November 20, 2017

Deborah Ewing  
Gary French  
8055 Sugarloaf Rd  
Boulder, CO 80302  
(303) 258-7799

Northern Front Range Recreational  
Sport Shooting Management Partnership  
Attn: Garry Sanfacon  
P.O.Box 471  
Boulder, CO 80306

Mr. Sanfacon:

Please consider closing Forest Service Road 332 in Roosevelt National Forest, Boulder County, to recreational shooting. This is a multiple use area enjoyed by those who hike, camp, bike, horseback ride, etc. When someone is shooting they dominate the area, threatening the safety and enjoyment of others. Since FSR 332 is one road in & out (about 3 miles round trip), it would be enforceable if closed to RSS.

We have lived here 22 years and border the forest close to FSR 332. Numerous times we’ve had people shooting with no backstop in the direction of our house. Neighbors have had the same problem. There is litter left by some shooters that nearby residents regularly clean up. Trees have been shot up or shot in half. The noise from shooting can be heard by many homes and neighborhoods in the area.

When suitable sites have been selected for developed shooting ranges and are constructed, please consider the safety, health, and enjoyment of all users and adjoining residents of this forest by closing the area to RSS.

Sincerely,

Deborah Ewing  
Gary French
I have lived on Glacier Lake, a half mile east of the Peak to Peak and six miles north of Nederland, for 21 years. I am writing to beseech the Commissioners to ASK THE USFS TO ADOPT Map Alternative #4, which would close 100% of the USFS lands to dispersed shooting.

Alternatives #1 and #3 would seem to meet my primary interest in seeing that the USFS land surrounding Glacier Lake and abutting most of the Peak to Peak is closed to dispersed shooting. Though Alternative #3 also leaves too much USFS land near Ruby Gulch open to dispersed shooting.

Map Alternative #2 is ABSOLUTELY UNACCEPTABLE as it would not close areas all along the Peak to Peak where people constantly camp, shoot, leave untended campfires, toss their cigarettes and otherwise desecrate and endanger our public lands.

The intensity and frequency of people shooting their weapons has increased multifold in the time we have lived here. And in the past year, I have called the sheriff multiple times to report what sounded like automatic weapons, shooting while a fire ban is in effect, or shooting at night - all of which is illegal even where dispersed shooting is allowed. I have felt personally unsafe and deeply unsettled by the prospect of a wildfire caused by bullets sparking or poor respect for the natural environment by irresponsible shooters.

With regard to the proposed designated shooting ranges, I am dismayed that the County has apparently made no progress in identifying a potential range NOT IN THE MOUNTAINS. The five (six if you count both Ruby Gulch sites) sites that were proposed well over a year ago are still all inappropriate. In particular, I do not support the County placing a shooting range on the Ruby Gulch sites for the following reasons:

1) Increased chance of catastrophic wildfire due to fire caused by bullets sparking flames (has happened at a number of other ranges nationally) and due to increased likelihood of humans concentrating there and proving inattentive to their campfires (humans are the #1 source of wildfires far outpacing natural causes like lightning).

2) Immediate adjacency to University of Colorado Mountain Research Center lands endangers wildlife and ongoing wilderness research studies.

3) The proven inability of the County to properly construct and monitor a designated shooting range for safety, cleanliness, and noise pollution and lack of funding in County or within the Forest Service to enforce rules and regulations.

4) The presence of a waterway through Ruby Gulch will mean that lead from bullets will seep into the soils and water headed downstream.

Just over a year ago, inattentive campers set off the costly and damaging Cold Spring wildfire outside of Nederland. I attended the previous Commissioner’s meeting that addressed updated
rules for designated shooting ranges. At that time, it seemed that the Commissioners understood that recreational shooters DO pose personal safety and catastrophic wildfire threats. Data was provided by speakers showing links to individuals being killed/injured by stray bullets (an event that happened again a few weeks ago in Florida) and to wildfires being caused by bullets sparking off rocks and by human activity.

The newly published and authoritative book, Land on Fire, makes it clear that Climate change has already dried out our Colorado mountain forests making them prime for catastrophic fires. The book also is clear that humans cause these fires far more than lightning or natural forces.

I understand that the USFS is requiring that Boulder County provide at least one designated shooting range before it will institute any dispersed shooting ban let alone the 100% ban shown on Map Alternative #4. PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE Commissioners, keep looking for a shooting range down in the plains to the east, north and south of the city of Boulder, where the risks of a catastrophic wildfire or of stray bullets harming unseen recreationalists are demonstrably reduced.

At the last meeting, it seemed to me that the commissioners should put the money it has to build a designated shooting range into buying land adjacent to the Boulder Rifle Club and expanding the shooting range possibilities there. That would be safer for the dry mountain forests, more efficient to patrol and enforce, and faster to build.

Thank you.

Katrina Peterson

70 Pennsylvania Gulch

Nederland, CO 80466
Hi,

I'm writing to comment on the proposed sports shooting sites in my area. I live on Aspen Meadows Rd, Nederland, 80466.

I support Alternatives #1 and #4 for dispersed for dispersed shooting. The other alternatives are not viable due to proximity to dwellings, hiking and biking trails, and the near misses that have occurred in recent years.

I oppose the proposed shooting range off West Magnolia-the one close to Nederland High School. With all the school shootings experienced in this country, having a shooting range behind the high school doesn’t seem like the best idea. I'm thinking in terms of students being able to study or being traumatized by constant shooting and the fear that could engender.

In health,
Dr. Pais

Gregory Pais, ND, DHANP
570-974-9294
gpsnds@whnow.com
www.facebook.com/NaturalDoc
twitter.com/gpaisnd
I’m just getting up to speed on the issue of RSS closure proposals on the front range National Forest. I feel like the proposals are too far reaching, and only benefit people rich enough to buy homes right on the edge of the National Forest. I feel like I have no real recourse, as I’m sure that regardless of any letter I right or input to any plan, it’s just going to happen anyway. I don’t think rights or access should be taken away so readily.

http://www.sportshootingpartners.org/forest-service-recreational-sport-shooting-management-project/

Regards,

Corey