



**2014 Jefferson County Public Shooting Range Working Group**

**March 12, 2014**

**11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.**

**Meeting Notes**

<b>Working Group Member in Attendance</b>	<b>Organization</b>
<i>Mark Loye, Lead Facilitator</i>	<i>Jeffco Mediation Services</i>
<i>Devin Rau, Co-Facilitator</i>	<i>Jeffco Mediation Services</i>
<i>Jenna Ambacher, Co-Facilitator</i>	<i>Jeffco Mediation Services</i>
Tom Hoby	Jeffco Open Space & Parks
Nancy York	Jeffco Open Space
Joy Lucisano	Jeffco Open Space
Dave Davenport	Jeffco Open Space
Russ Clark	Jeffco Planning & Zoning
Janet Shangraw	Jeffco Open Space Advisory Committee
Lloyd Ackerman	Jeffco Sheriff's Office
Reid Dewalt	Colorado Parks & Wildlife
Lisa Heagley	U.S. Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Region
Bill Jewell	City of Lakewood
John Litz	PLAN Jeffco
Gene Adamson	Interested Citizen
Ed Sutton	Interested Citizen
Michael Poindexter	Interested Citizen
Bob Swainson	Interested Citizen

<b>AGENDA</b>
Welcome & Introductions
➤ Ground Rules
➤ Observers
➤ Summary of Events To-Date & Timeline Moving Forward
➤ Develop Mission of Working Group: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss Scope of Proposed Facility</li> <li>• Future consideration of Operating Criteria &amp; Funding Strategies (Possible Subgroups)</li> </ul>
Discussion of Site Criteria
Discussion of Feasible Locations for Range
Discuss Next Meeting & Subgroup Volunteers

**Note: Official (flip chart) meeting notes appear in bold**

*Transcribed notes (from Nancy York) appear in italics*



## 2014 Jefferson County Public Shooting Range Working Group

March 12, 2014

11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

### Welcome & Introductions

*Mark Loye, Lead Facilitator, began the meeting by providing background information about himself, including being the Director of Mediation Services for over 20 years. Close to 25 years ago, he spent over 2 years facilitating an effort to locate a public shooting range in Jefferson County that resulted in the Lakewood Law Enforcement Range north of Thunder Valley Motorcross Park, but there is no public range.*

- Ground Rules
- Observers

*Mark Loye discussed meeting ground rules with the group (see attached), with which everyone present concurred.*

### Observers

- **Parking lot**
- **Timed Question and Answer period at the beginning of each Working Group meeting (10 minutes)**

*Mark discussed with the group how to handle meeting observers/members of the public interested in sitting in and listening. Trying to focus the group on what they think is primary; being able to participate in the meeting is important; the working group needs to decide how to manage observers.*

*Mark suggested a parking lot for sticky notes that observers can use to make written comments on things they want to see discussed or disagree with. Those comments will then be incorporated into the record.*

*The group agreed that this would be a good way to engage observers, however, one working group member expressed concern about limiting observer participation to written notes. He suggested a set amount of time at the beginning of each meeting to allow observers to voice their thoughts in a verbal comment period and the group agreed on 10 minutes for observer for comments. This will occur at the next meeting in April, allowing for comment on the preceding meeting. Mark said the group will not be voting on items, but rather, he's looking for consensus. Voting tends to divide people, but having just enough discussion on where the group decides to go seems best.*

*Mark suggested the parking lot and a 10 minute comment period at the beginning of t all future meetings. The group concurred.*

- Summary of Events To-Date & Timeline Moving Forward



## 2014 Jefferson County Public Shooting Range Working Group

March 12, 2014

11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

*Nancy York showed a 10 minute PowerPoint presentation on events to-date.*

*Mark mentioned that many of the challenges discussed were true 25 years ago.*

### ➤ Develop Mission of Working Group:

- Discuss Scope of Proposed Facility
- Future consideration of Operating Criteria & Funding Strategies (Possible Subgroups)

### Scope

- Private property is possible for a location.
- Are there funds available if land needs to be purchased?
- Who is the target “customer”?
- Complementary to other facilities?
- Target audience will determine the size of the facility
- Will there be Open Space support? (use of their land)
  - Can't answer that yet. Need to scope out issues, first
- Will State land be available?
  - Will evaluate properties – per parks
- Input from Jefferson County is needed to determine what land is available (e.g., Open Space, etc.)
- “Family” shooting facility is desirable
- What things serve the broadest range of people?
- What other facilities are already available in order to work with them as opposed to competing with them
- Long range/competitive facility not needed – available commercially
- Include archery in scope of facility
- Natural backdrops will affect cost (lower if using natural backdrops)
- 100-yard rifle – multiple pistol bays, sporting clays, skeet, archery
- Sub groups to consider all options
- Lease or no cost to the County
- User funded
- Donates services from contractors
- Special financial district
- Full-time staffing is important



## 2014 Jefferson County Public Shooting Range Working Group

March 12, 2014

11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

- What certification is needed?
- Safety (e.g., home firearm safety)
  - Users need to know these issues
    - Colorado Hunter Safety
    - Range Specific orientation
    - Signed consent
- Full-time range supervision
- Include 90 - 95% of uses
- Does everything need to be at one location?
  - Increases logistics
  - How important is full-time staff?
- Bigger/more uses = economy of scale (parking, funding, facilities, staffing)

*Mark mentioned the scope of a facility. We need to hear and talk about what a facility might look like based on the knowledge you all possess; how much land is needed, what kind of activities will take place? Rifle, trap/skeet, handgun, archery, etc.*

*There are challenges that don't exist today that did 25 years ago (e.g., coupling a motorcross park and gun range.)*

*Next task: What do we see as a potential facility scope? Other future considerations?*

*Overview ideas are sought; succeeding meetings might have the entire time devoted to one topic, but for this first meeting, we are purposefully keeping discussions broader; Mark mentioned the importance of sub groups being formed 3-4 people who work with Jefferson County Departments and other information sources to give full feedback to the larger working group; it is estimated that the group will have about 10 hours of time to discuss items on a broad level and make decisions as a group; sub groups are important to be able to delve into greater detail.*

*What do people think the scope of the facility will be: area, kinds of activities and needs?*

*Tom Hoby mentioned that he briefed the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) on a public shooting range back in October 2013 and again in January 2014. He reiterated that the BCC asked County staff to investigate the possibility of a public shooting range facility, but that this is not necessarily a Jeffco Open Space endeavor. There are some Open Space sites that seem possible, but important to note is that private properties are part of the mix too. This is not a Jeffco Open Space initiative. It is a County initiative.*

*Mark stressed he's not a County employee he's a contractor, as his whole staff has a degree of separation from County staff. This is important as a facilitator.*



## 2014 Jefferson County Public Shooting Range Working Group

March 12, 2014

11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

*A working group member clarified that a proposed facility does not have to restrict itself to Jeffco Open Space or private property. The site could be land that the County does or does not own. One member asked if there is a cap on potential funding for the purchase of property and has the County allocated funds for the potential purchase of private property? Not yet determined.*

*The idea now is to further investigate ideas and see how it all plays out? Not yet determined.*

*With the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), people don't like to create something that's in direct competition with private business (like other shooting ranges). Complimenting the offering is better. NRA instructors would be able to work with other facilities and this facility.*

*What is demographic that we're trying to appeal to? Hand gunners? Long distance rifle shooters? Size of property will dictate what we want to offer; rifle, long distance, or traditional, bulls eye shooters, etc. Size is dictated by offerings and demographic to whom this will serve.*

*Will Jeffco Open Space support and provide funding for range? We have support from the BCC, but it's unclear on what support there is on the Open Space Advisory Committee (OSAC), and in past there has been a struggle for support.*

*One working group member said that we're getting ahead of ourselves on these questions. We need to focus now on what specifically is needed and then begin to look at what sites work. There are a lot of open space lands in the County and over 52,000 acres of land have been purchased. However, much of that land doesn't meet the criteria that we are talking about. The reason we don't already have a public shooting range (apart from the Buffalo Creek Gun Club in the Pike National Forest) is that it creates challenges. What are we talking about and what will serve the greatest need for the greatest number of people; what lands might meet the criteria (open space, private, etc.) and then let's assess possibilities.*

*One working group member asked if Colorado Department of Natural Resources (DNR) or Colorado Parks & Wildlife (CPW) are able to provide land. He thinks the USFS is an option, but otherwise private property is the choice. Will these entities support this? We've looked at Jeffco Open Space parcels in the past; suitability wasn't the issue, it was whether OSAC would support this use.*



## 2014 Jefferson County Public Shooting Range Working Group

March 12, 2014

11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

*CPW will evaluate lands that are suitable. In Park County, half of a 200-acre site was purchased with agency money; Chatfield Reservoir is not a good option due to proximity to homes, but we can re-examine possibilities there.*

*One member commented that the group needs to look at what's available in concert with the scope of the facility. Ranges of many sizes and uses can be the case; it's possible that we want more than a 5 lane pistol range; people who know the county need to provide input on what's available. Many landowners exist. We must consider what's there and if we could build it, what would we want to build.*

*Mark Loye, Lead Facilitator, asked the group: in a perfect world, what would you want to see happen? What are kinds of uses would be good for this facility?*

*One group member commented that a family shooting facility would be desired; one that encourages families; he mentioned a great range down in the Phoenix area that is family friendly where people feel safe; multi-use is key.*

*A member commented that when we're looking at this as a public shooting range it's important to not try to be all things to all people; what are the things that are most important? Family-oriented, etc. are things that are important.*

*Building on what others have said; not wanting to compete with other facilities (private) and seeing what is possible in terms of availability is key. It's important that a range is within a certain close-in radius to people for ease of access.*

*One member commented that there has been so much work done in the past on this effort (between the early 1990s and now), and that this is not rocket science. A range can serve 90% of peoples' needs. Appropriate design that includes berming, etc., can control impacts. Facilities exist that target the ends of the spectrum (more specialized shooting); for a rifle range, 300 yards is ideal, but can survive with 100 yards; this facility would not be designed to compete with private indoor facilities. That is not in the description of what we're trying to accomplish here; we should include archery and all of the disciplines; location of range is much more important to the use of it than going outside the 90% of what shooters want rule. Clear Creek County Sportsman's Club has 800 members, almost 650 are from Jeffco. There is a desire for a public shooting range in Jefferson County.*

*We know how often the range is used and when it's used and a number on how often it's used; we have a pretty good idea on what's needed; natural backdrops are going to have a major impact on cost of construction; we'll be able to tell more when a site is located; no danger of interfering with commercial shooting operations; we won't be able to provide what those facilities do.*



## 2014 Jefferson County Public Shooting Range Working Group

March 12, 2014

11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

### Discussion of Site Criteria

*Mark Loye, Lead Facilitator: Criteria for site and where it might be are important.*

#### **Criteria for site**

- Type of soil – need excavation
- Accessibility or drive time
  - Maintenance of access road and parking lots
- Guidelines “corrective actions for shooting ranges” (CDPHE)
  - Flood plains outline
- Lead reclamation and slope requirements
  - Post closure reclamation
- Allowable levels of lead
- Ongoing/regular lead reclamation
  - Bullet trapping
  - Effective procedures for monitoring and reclamation exist.  
Need pre-sampling.
- Lead trapping water run-off
- Soil acidity (pH balance)
- What was on the site before (e.g. landfill/industry)
- What factors would make a site unusable?
- What are the must-haves?
  - NRA has an existing document
- How to coordinate with others to mitigate environmental impact
- How “encroach-able” is the site? Future residents?
- Could it potentially expand?
- Prevailing winds/sun

*One member commented that we don't have to shoot for all of the bells and whistles, we can be thinking about what can we do for little to no cost for the people of the County? We should be able to figure out the development of the facility and how much we can charge. Fees from potential users could possibly generate a good amount of funding.*

*A way to keep cost down is to engage private contractors who donate services, and look at special financing methods and special district to operate it, etc. Capital costs should be figured with operating costs as a separate item. Open to the public without parameters can create many issues. We must have full time supervision with training*



## 2014 Jefferson County Public Shooting Range Working Group

March 12, 2014

11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

*on the range and rules, but certification is key. We must have insurance and cooperation with the NRA on design of the range, etc. Safety is the most important*

*thing; having someone there all the time and training people will be costly; who will be allowed into range? People will want to enter a public range without certification and that must be managed as there is so much demand for this.*

*Archery and a family-friendly shooting range have been mentioned, but Jenna, Co-Facilitator asked what other aspects of a range are desirable. A member mentioned a 100-yard rifle minimum with covered bays, multiple pistol bays for different disciplines of shooting. Sporting clays and skeet/shot gun and archery are all desirable. The length of shooting for rifle depends on the discipline; what has been discussed will cover 90% of demands.*

*One member commented on the topic of safety and that at the Lockheed Martin 1,100-member private club, families are put through hunter education-type training; expectations are laid out ahead of time on rules and code of conduct.*

*One member further said he believes it's imperative to have users possess a valid Colorado Hunter safety education card and that on-range safety orientation should be required; people should sign that they've read and understand regulations; this is the basis of full-time range supervision. We need a safe site, 90% of uses should be provided to manage size and operational consideration.*

*If all of those uses are offered, the lines will be crazy from users who want to see a facility like this built. Why not get creative and consider two separate ranges, one for rifle and another for pistol separate; one serving one use and one serving the other. Only downside to this is that it requires double management and operations. Byers Canyon in Hot Sulphur Springs is an example of an unmanned facility.*

*The group heard the opinion from one working group member on how he believes this facility must be manned. On County land or on that of another land management agency, full time supervision is required; Clear Creek County is a good example of a facility on a few acres that offers shotgun, and pistol ranges and it is extremely safe.*

*Mark Loye, Lead Facilitator, mentioned how we need to keep open all ideas; there are expenses to running every site, with two, it would be double. This can be figured out along the way, though.*

*One working group member commented that as for scope of the facility, we should include everything for now. Sub groups should be used to consider everything; as for unmanned sites across the State of Colorado, there is supervision via park rangers and they check sites where there's no manned supervision.*



## 2014 Jefferson County Public Shooting Range Working Group

March 12, 2014

11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

*An economy of scale important; we need to figure out the basics of what we want and then consider what we can actually achieve given possible sites.*

*The group discussed site criteria. As big as Jeffco is, accessibility and a manageable drive time for people to get to the facility is important. Pike National Forest is an hour drive; the facility should be proximate to population. Relatively easy access not over rough jeep trails would be great.*

*One member brought up her review of a Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment corrective action guidance document on a shooting range in La Plata County. She said it contains guidelines and site criteria that can be useful in this process. It stresses the importance of abiding by regulations. The document contains Best Management Practices to keep in mind for operations and containment of lead. Another member commented on the importance of lead management. There are many examples of state-of-the-art facilities where lead is effectively contained and repurposed.*

*One member reiterated how important consideration of site closure and costs are associated with maintenance. This will reduce expense in the long-run. Another member mentioned how there are thousands of ranges across the U.S. that face similar problems involving water contamination, etc. Looking at soil acidity is important early on since pH balance can offset lead.*

*Another member brought up site considerations and what makes them unsuitable? e.g., the presence of Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse? Others? Someone asked, "what are the poison pills and what are must haves in a site?" Reid Dewalt with Colorado Parks & Wildlife offered to provide to the group the manual developed by the National Rifle Association (NRA) on the development and management of shooting ranges. Someone mentioned the importance of not recreating the wheel.*

*Distances/buffers from residential must be considered and what level is acceptable. Must figure out if a site exists, how long it can be there before conflict exists and what is an acceptable long-term buffer? If in 15-20 years from now there's a movement to shut down a facility because homes were built up to its boundary, that's a concern; considering a degree of permanency is key.*

*In Jefferson County with dense suburban cities adjacent to each other, there is inherent conflict like goose and duck season and encroaching on each other. The other concern is the ability for a facility to expand. Is wind a factor in siting? Would that exclude a site? The sun is more important than wind. Plan a range for the sun, with the right orientation. They're all important considerations, but we don't need to reinvent the wheel. Adams County has a new range and we can benefit from them.*



## 2014 Jefferson County Public Shooting Range Working Group

March 12, 2014

11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

### Discussion of Feasible Locations for Range

#### **Potential Sites**

- South of Thunder Mountain (expansion)
- Areas along hogback (as backstop)
- Forest Service/BLM land
- Partnering with other Counties
- Land/site investigation sub-committee
- Organization structure

#### **County Commissioner Deliverables**

- Facility uses
  - Serving largest number of people
- Potential locations (3-4 ideally)
- How facilities should be operated
  - Indoor
  - Outdoor
- Funding
  - Acquisition, operations, improvements

*Mark Loye, Lead Facilitator: no constraints on thoughts and those who know the County, please participate.*

*Possible areas discussed were those along the Hogback, although the Front Range Mountain Backdrop/Foreground Plan protects much of these areas.*

*One member asked about expanding the existing Thunder Valley site to include public instead of just law enforcement. Another member said there are only a dozen or so sites that will meet our needs and the most productive way to explore them is through sub group. He commented that there needs to be a land investigation sub group, with Open Space staff and Jeffco Planning & Zoning staff. Private properties need to be identified too; let's not be constrained by cost of land acquisition for now.*

*Are there opportunities on Bureau of Land Management (BLM) or Rocky Flats land?; Reid Dewalt from CPW asked if another county had lands, and Jeffco had funding, could a partnership take place? Unclear right now.*



## 2014 Jefferson County Public Shooting Range Working Group

March 12, 2014

11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

*Joy Lucisano, Real Estate Coordinator for Jeffco Open Space asked about the subgroup that will investigate potential sites and how do we involve the public so that they understand that a particular area is being looked at; for potential sites privately*

*held, we'd work with willing sellers, and the community at large being aware of what sites we're looking at.*

*Mark Loye, Lead Facilitator mentioned that any meeting like this is a public meeting and that the subgroups are also open to the public to hear what people are saying; facilitated by Mark, Jenna or Devin. People need to know what's going on. We need a parking lot and subgroups can adopt what they want.*

*Tom Hoby, Jeffco Open Space Director, said Joy brings up a good point about sensitivity on how landowners are approached. She does it every day; we have policies with Jeffco Open Space on acquiring land and we only deal with willing sellers; If a particular landowner is not interested, we can't and don't talk to them; we pay fair market value for property, we don't look at any property that has an active case with County Planning & Zoning, etc.; these are our limitations, with Jeffco Open Space employees working on this we should operate under these guidelines. The end result of this working group is to report of findings to the BCC on a few potential sites, site considerations, etc., and funding and then see where we go from there.*

*Mark Loye, Lead Facilitator: as happened 25 years ago, with potential sites, there could be a succeeding group to take on the work of a site that's recommended for development, etc.*

*One working group member suggested a white paper to BCC be drafted on generally what percentage of population we want to serve, that we want to find a centrally located site to be of service, occur on either public or private land, discuss how it could be operated, using public and private funds to finance it, etc. However, Mark Loye said it is not yet time to provide such a report until this working group has had a chance to do its work. The need for an organizational structure was brought up (on how to build this thing all talent needs to be utilized; how is this all going to be organized to pull this off?; Mark Loye mentioned that this is why subgroups are important.*

*A working group member mentioned that for financial consideration, operations, site considerations, feasible locations, etc., community retailers of providing firearms and ammo; need to be engaged.*

Discuss Next Meeting & Subgroup Volunteers

### **Possible sub-groups**

- Financial (grants, public/private partnerships)



## 2014 Jefferson County Public Shooting Range Working Group

March 12, 2014

11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

- Operations
- Environmental concerns (lead, sound, dust, traffic, construction)
- Land/site investigation (site criteria)
- Involve community members
  
- Construction/design
- Vendors

### **Sub Groups**

#### **Site Exploration/Scope of Facility Sub Group**

- Gene Adamson
- Janet Shangraw
- Joy Lucisano
- Karey Baker
- John Litz
- Russell Clark
- Reid Dewalt (resource)

#### **Operations/Design Sub Group**

- Bob Swainson
- Lloyd Ackerman
- Gene Adamson
- David Davenport

#### **Finance Sub Group**

- Reid Dewalt
- Joy Lucisano
- Mike Poindexter

*Mark: Adjunct members can be added to subgroups if there's someone who can give great input, that group could bring in others to help out (e.g., vendors).*

#### *Subgroups Discussed:*

*Financial, Operations/Construction & Design and Environmental (site) Assessment Concerns & Land/Site Investigation noise, etc., (constant and impulsive) dust, potential safety for what leaves the site, other area impacts, transportation impacts, etc.; environmental impacts need to be shared with other subgroups.*



## 2014 Jefferson County Public Shooting Range Working Group

March 12, 2014

11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

*Each group works individually and reports back to larger group; and vice versa; might be issues with a given site that one or either subgroup needs to figure out.*

*Mark Loye, Lead Facilitator: We have 4-5 months to do this work each following meeting can be devoted to a subgroup report (who works with staff and comes up with a*

*site, larger group can discuss). One member raised the question on what the deliverable for operations might look like to the BCC with so much unknown.*

*Tom Hoby reiterated the structure of what this group should report to the BCC: What are uses that will serve greatest number of folks?; on operations: how will this facility be designed 3 or 4 feasible sites (if possible); how does this group feel like this facility should be operated? Manned, unmanned, etc.?; We need some concurrence on whether this is strictly outdoor or does it have indoor too?; how will this get paid for land acquisition and capital development; this can be in a general way; no site plan needs to be developed just bigger picture in preparation for July if there are sites to vet, a public improvement process would need to be developed that will take time; BCC wants to take advantage of the February CPW Shooting Range Grant Program.*

### Site Exploration/Scope of Facility Subgroup:

*Lead: Gene Adamson*

*Joy Lucisano*

*Janet Shangraw*

*John Litz*

*Russ Clark*

*Nancy York*

*Karey Baker*

*Reid Dewalt, as a resource*

### Design & Operations Subgroup:

*Lead: Bob Swainson*

*Lloyd Ackerman*

*Gene Adamson*

*Dave Davenport*

*Karey Baker*

### Financial Subgroup

*Lead: Reid Dewalt*

*Mike Poindexter*

*Joy Lucisano*

*Nancy York*

*Karey Baker*



## 2014 Jefferson County Public Shooting Range Working Group

March 12, 2014

11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

*Mark Loye, Devin Rau and Jenna Ambacher will facilitate groups; need to work on meeting schedules, location, etc.; larger working group meetings are once a month; Wednesday from 11am-1pm monthly; have preliminary report from each subgroup; we'll select out one of the topics to focus on.*

*WEDNESDAY APRIL 9th 11am -1pm is next meeting at the Open Space building (700 Jefferson County Parkway, Suite 100, Golden, Colorado).*

*One member wants to see an organizational structure to see what group's purpose is; between now and next month, including a timetable; report draft who is doing what, etc.; Nancy York can develop a draft project charter and subgroup missions for consideration.*

*Mark Loye, Lead Facilitator: subgroups report back and larger group discusses how to go forward is the plan.*

---

### **Parking Lot Question (from March 12<sup>th</sup> 2014 meeting):**

1. Are we limited to one mega-site? Or can we have several sites which meet criteria for that discipline? (e.g. pistol range separated from shot gun)