



On June 20, 2016 a video was posted to YouTube channel: JPSR Concerned Citizens. The video is entitled JPSR Concerned Residents - Main Explainer Video.

There are several inaccuracies with this video which Jefferson County would like the opportunity to correct.

Video Time	Correction/Clarification
0:22	<i>It is stated that the proposed range would be the largest in the Metro area.</i> The proposed range would be comparable in size to other public facilities in the Front Range.
0:40	<i>The photo depicts firearms that are not consistent with those that would be allowed at the proposed range.</i> This is a type of long range sport shooting that would not be allowed at the Jeffco Public Shooting Range. Additionally the shown facility does not have any of the safety or noise mitigation best management practices that would be in place at the Jeffco Public Shooting Range.
0:43	<i>It is stated the project is being fast-tracked.</i> This proposal has been worked on for 3 years, beginning in 2013 with a citizen working group.
1:24	<i>It is stated that the study was flawed because only one shot was fired at a time.</i> This is standard noise modeling technique, which includes a single shot that is then modeled for results of multiple shots.
1:44	<i>It is stated that the study was flawed because the firearms that were tested are not representative of all firearms that would be allowed at the range.</i> The large bullet shown in the photo was to indicate the size of bullet NOT allowed at the range. The range will only accommodate firearms of similar caliber to those tested.
1:51	<i>It is stated that the sound was averaged over one second, instead of showing peak values which are much higher.</i> The noise study utilized standard methodology. While sound was averaged over one second, peak values are accounted for in the data.
1:56	<i>It is stated that the study was flawed because noise meters were not placed in 'affected areas'.</i> Placing a noise meter in the 'affected areas' does not yield usable data for noise modeling. At these distances the noise level of the shot is lower than the ambient noise level. This makes it unlikely that the sound of the shot could be singled out from other ambient noises in the area. This does not mean that you cannot hear the sound, but it means that the noise is below the normal ambient level and can't be distinguished from other ambient noises. This means that the sound is on the same level or below the level of other typical noises in the area.
2:08	<i>It is stated the study was flawed due to the choice of consultant.</i> The noise study is being conducted by professional sound engineers with extensive shooting range experience. Jefferson County has hired AECOM, a national consulting firm with specialized and significant experience in conducting noise studies and designing sound mitigation for shooting ranges across the country. Some have raised concerns because this firm performs work for the National Shooting Sports Foundation and assert their study methodology is flawed and biased. The County understands this perceived conflict of interest and is taking actions to ensure that these subject matter experts perform this work objectively.



2:20	<i>It is stated that the consulting firm that conducted the noise study will also have the ability to bid on the environmental portion of the project. Should this project move forward, it would be a competitive process just like every other County project, per County purchasing policies.</i>
3:40	<i>It is stated that only one public meeting has taken place. One public meeting regarding the noise study has taken place, but there were two public meetings regarding the Blunn/Pioneer Master Plan (May 19 and June 23, 2015) at which a public shooting range was discussed as part of the master plan at this location. The proposal then went to Arvada City Council and further study was recommended. Refer to the Blunn/Pioneer Master Plan for details on the public process.</i>
3:44	<i>It is stated that the May 31, 2016 community meeting was purely a one-sided presentation and did not allow for public comment. The audience was encouraged to ask questions and provide written comments. It was a two hour meeting; with 50 minutes devoted to taking public comment in group discussions and answering questions in front of the group, as well as 20 minutes answering questions at table stations.</i>
4:19	<i>Discusses lead and other environmental concerns. This is a valid a concern, and lead mitigation and environmental safety is a priority for the proposed range.</i>
4:30	<i>It is stated that the proposed Hwy. 93 drinking water reservoir will be located less than 1 mile from the proposed range. This question was raised in the public process of the Arvada Blunn/Pioneer Master Plan and the response is documented on page 38, question 3.</i>
4:57	<i>It is stated that current plans have the shooters firing in a northerly direction, towards subdivisions. The preferred direction for a shooting range is north because of solar direction (not firing into the sun).</i>
6:02	<i>It is stated that the June 28 meeting is the last public meeting. The Blunn/Pioneer Site is owned by the City of Arvada. Since this site is owned by and located in the City of Arvada, the Arvada City Council would need to approve the site, this particular use, and be willing to lease the site to Jefferson County to build and operate the JPSR. The site and its use must then be approved by the Jefferson County Board of County Commissioners. This public process, coupled with the community meetings Jefferson County staff is currently conducting provides several opportunities for citizen input and community discussion to ensure many factors and points of view are considered by decision makers.</i>