



JEFFERSON COUNTY
 2014 PUBLIC SHOOTING RANGE
 SITE EXPLORATION SUBGROUP

March 25, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Jefferson County Open Space Office
 700 Jefferson County Parkway, Suite 100
 Golden, Colorado 80401

Working Group Member in Attendance	Organization
Mark Loye, Lead Facilitator	Jeffco Mediation Services
Gene Adamson, Lead	Interested Citizen
Tom Hoby	Jeffco Open Space & Parks
Joy Lucisano	Jeffco Open Space
Steve Snyder	Jeffco Attorney's Office
Nancy York	Jeffco Open Space
Russ Clark	Jeffco Planning & Zoning
Janet Shangraw	Jeffco Open Space Advisory Committee
Bill Jewell	City of Lakewood

AGENDA	
Welcome, Introductions & Ground Rules	5 minutes
Facility Scope	20 minutes
Site Constraints & Opportunities	30 minutes
Discussion of Feasible Locations for Range	60 minutes
Wrap Up	5 minutes

Meeting Notes

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

Transcribed notes (from Nancy York) appear in italics

Welcome, Introductions & Ground Rules

Mark Loye, Lead Facilitator, began the meeting by asking everyone to reintroduce themselves. He also reiterated the agreed upon ground rules for the group, noting that #13 allows for "parking lot" written notes from observers in attendance at any public meeting as well as a 10 minute comment period at the beginning of each plenary Working Group meeting. This will allow members of the public a chance to voice their concerns/opinions.

Facility Scope

Site Selection Sub Group Mission Statement was discussed.

Mark Loye, Lead Facilitator, mentioned the interrelated nature of the subgroups for this effort; mission statements (draft) were discussed; Mark asked if there's anything that should be added, deleted, etc. One member of this subgroup asked that Lead Abatement be included in the discussions at the Financial Subgroup since it is a long-term financial prospect for any properly managed shooting range.

Timeline for Reporting: Scope first – Maybe minimum & maximum to give to design group

Another member asked about this group's timeline to have work done for larger working group. Mark Loye reiterated that we have April, May and June to do our work and have a report of findings presented to the Board of County Commissioners in July of this year. Reports from subgroups can be done at the plenary Working Group as they are all inter-related. For example, the Operations Subgroup needs to know the facility scope in order to do their work effectively; If not a final scope, a preliminary scope....this should be a deliverable from this meeting.

One member expressed concern that if this group identifies a facility scope, then possible sites are automatically eliminated. If we want to look at sites that might not accommodate the offerings, then we need to be flexible...minimum and maximum acreage is desirable. The group agreed on this.

One member asked if we are talking about one shooting range facility or multiple, based on what we want to offer; he's offering a field trip to see Lockheed Martin range and how it's laid out. He also wanted to poll the group and find out where are people coming from on what we want out of a range. What experience do people of this Subgroup have with ranges and shooting.

Subgroup member needs to know where everyone has been & wants to go with scope.

This member of the Subgroup stated that depending on what we want, it will dictate site and acreage desired outcome; he mentioned that a facility with 60 positions for rifle is more of an army facility, not public shooting that is feasible in Jefferson County.

Group experience is mostly shooting on private property & some state facility lands.

Each member of the subgroup took time to discuss their background with shooting and ranges.

Tom – Shouldn't get too far ahead of ourselves; Don't jump to the end & perhaps alarm landowners in one area; Range of options; Tom – Really hard to locate a facility; The bigger the scope, the tougher to site a facility; Right niche – What is necessary?; Can't be everything to everyone.

Tom Hoby, Director of Jeffco Open Space expressed the importance of not getting too far ahead of ourselves and looking at locations and looking at specific pieces of land; he mentioned that we need to be sensitive to rights of private property owners, and those who live adjacent to open areas; he suggested we go through process while recognizing this and the process will hopefully lead to logical sites and be more fruitful than getting out ahead of ourselves and getting a particular site on the radar. The outcome of this group could be to come up with many alternatives, one being that there is no suitable location; or that there are 3 to 5 sites that require further study and scenarios in between. Once this working group is done, there is a great deal that would need to be done for a site; this is really the feasibility phase of the effort. There's a reason there's no site in Jeffco now...it's a formidable challenge. The bigger the scope, the less feasible it is; What's the right niche for a public facility in Jeffco? Landscape might be sensitive. This is really to serve the general public; we can't be everything to everyone. Tom shared a comparison to youth sports, 90% of kids are accommodated with what's at public park and recreation centers; however, if these park and recreation districts were to support expensive, resource-heavy, competitive, traveling teams...40% of resources could be spent supporting 5% of kids; with a public shooting range, what's 90% of the niche for us? (e.g., family shooting center with rifle and pistol only?)

The group began to discuss ideas for a preliminary Facility Scope (what types of shooting will be proposed to be offered and what are the dimensions/acreage minimum requirements for each?). The following is a rough summary of the discussion among Site Exploration Subgroup members present.

- **Note: Sporting Clays require very different set-up.**
- **Up to 300 yards rifle – accommodate large numbers; size vs. use balance**
- **Pistol & rifle first, then maybe shotgun users; minimum 100 yards**
- **Mid-range facility**
- **Minimum Scope**
 - **Pistol Range – 10 bulls eye shooting lanes**
 - **2 acre targets: 50 yds long & 20 yds wide**
- **Individual Stations**
 - **15 Rifle lanes – 200 yards– Sighting in hunting rifles: bulls eye – 1.6 acres could get lane shooting competition – lanes 40 yards wide**
 - **Pellets & .22 shooting families**
- **Note: noise an issue**
- **Next level**
 - **Nice to have Trap & Skeet**
 - **Shotguns need fall area. There is a demand for this.**
 - **Set-up & operations for facility**
 - **Archery – This could be separate**
- **Note: This would be an outdoor use facility. Restrooms, storage, etc. Small temp buildings. May need better, more durable facilities on a public range - \$**
- **Sporting clays – More complex, maybe not good cost/benefit based on user demand. Only if a big site selected – future possibility**
- **Total acreage – Minimum w/parking, amenities & actual shooting facilities & safety buffer – 4 to 5 acres. Maximum 10 acres (shotgun) minimum**

Minimum scope:

1. Pistol range: 50 yards x 20 yards for each lane; 15 to 20 bays; could be configured (flexible); 50 yards max for kids; assuming bulls eye shooting: 10 lanes; 0.2 acres just for lanes.

2. Trap and skeet: Gene Adamson showed the group skeet and trap facility at Lockheed Martin facility via aerial map used during the meeting; the lanes are revetted and sound is quadratically reduced.

3. Rifle: Minimum 200 yards will take care of anyone who goes beyond 100 and up to 200 yards; bulls eye shooting; “siting in” and recreational shooting; hunting rifles?; what about multi-rounds?; Other kinds of competitive shooting and others is 40 yards wide; siting a hunting rifle one shot at a time is one thing, but it’s another to hear repetitive sounds, no?; magazine limit?; if you shoot a high powered type of course; you're shooting at the most 10 rounds at a time, 10 rounds in 70 seconds; for rest of courses, one round per minute per shooter; 20 shooters each shooting 20 rounds, you'd have 400 rounds in the end; 10-15 shooters minimum; 1.65 acres just for lanes; for kids and families; a pellet and 0.22 caliber...that's dedicated for them. This latter is a different

feature; cordoned off family area...22 caliber and pellet/bee bees; up to 300 yard rifle...smaller amount of these.

Lakewood facility has: 150 feet x 150 feet (or 50 yard square); covered rifle, roughly 275-300 feet long; 6 lanes.

Is this a minimum and are shotgun sports desirable? What's the market out there? Is this more of a private club sport kind of thing or is this more of a public offering?

Eastern plains have private facilities but no public; more or less ground needed for trap and skeet? More ground?; Gene Adamson said that this pursuit has a lot of demand.

One member asked if we want to put trap/skeet as a, "nice thing to have?"; Members agreed. Would be great to find a site that offers this too, but not a given; it will be an add on; and there are considerations for the facility to have accommodations apart from rifle and pistol.

One member asked, what about archery?; Another member commented that it's a quiet sport, and if we're going to do anything separate, can we do archery separately?

Bill Jewell from the City of Lakewood mentioned the archery range at Bear Creek Lake Park (owned by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and managed by the City of Lakewood); he says it's busy and that there's always someone there, but it's not overrun; questions whether that facility is adequate for archery in the area; someone asked if there's ability to do expansion if it got busier; another said that this facility is a good alternative to not constructing an additional one in Jeffco for now.

One member asked if we are talking strictly outdoor for a shooting range facility; and the members agreed that the answer is yes; one reason was to avoid competing with private indoor facilities in the area; this isn't direct competition with private operation; although the group agreed that some buildings would need to be built; the group agreed on an outdoor only facility that offers restroom, parking, a shelter, storage, etc.; Gene Adamson explained the "Tuft Shed philosophy" employed at Lockheed Martin facility: it has a range office, a place to store targets, etc; but no brick and mortar required; small temporary buildings ok; with exception of a 3-sided facility that acts as a cover for where shooters station. One member mentioned safety and security as a concern and that this, "Tuft Shed" approach might not work for a public facility; it would need to be brought to a commercial grade to handle the masses of people anticipated to frequent the facility. One member questioned what are we talking about in terms of amenities such as restrooms, storage, parking, etc.? Gene Adamson said that at the Lockheed Martin facility there are 60 parking spaces or so; parking requirement... 1/2 of an acre for parking; minimum 4-5 acres minimum.

Sporting clays not desirable; too much land and layout considerations to manage; however, one member expressed that if there's a site large enough to accommodate this, we could consider it...flexibility is required; if there's enough space at a possible site, the rest could be accommodated; if the site is big enough, all of the above could be accommodated.

One member talked about a shotgun area and that there's a required drop zone.

The group agreed on an overall acreage minimum (that includes the “nice to have” shotgun/trap/skeet offerings of 10 acres, but 4-5 acres for rifle and pistol is a minimum. Minimum acres: 4 to 5 for pistol/rifle; 10 acres minimum for trap skeet, shotgun; not less than this, but maybe more.

The Design + Operations Subgroup can massage this.

Site Constraints & Opportunities

- **Front Range Mountain Backdrop & Foreground – Included Preservation Areas – Visual, wildlife, natural resources**
 - **Ranking: Look at “Dented Chevy”. If already impacted by homes, quarries, water tanks, facilities, may not need to highly value preservation of immediately adjacent sites for a shooting range.**
 - **This preservation isn’t a legal mandate**
 - **Visual impact is a concern**
 - **Add Jeffco Open Space properties as a constraint**
 - **Add Denver Mountain Parks, Denver Water Board land**
 - **State school sections**
- **Preliminary Criteria – Existing List**
 1. **No**
 2. **½ mile from any homes, ideally**
 3. **Yes, ideally**
 4. **Not very important, relative to others. Shouldn’t eliminate a site.**
 5. **20% or less, balance**
 6. **Have some natural, existing backdrop like the backside of the hogback or a quarry**
 7. **Adjacent to County maintained road – highest score & lowers from there (e.g. improve road, construct road, etc.)**
 8. **Drive time – 30 minutes or less (find a number) from junction of I-70 & C470**
 9. **Distance from ecologically sensitive areas**
 10. **Distance from commercial activity Like #2**
 11. **Long range land use plans. Future compatibility**
- **Where do we go from here**
 - **Present today’s findings to 4/9 work group meeting – Discuss**
 - **Present findings to other sub-groups for 4/1 & 4/4 meetings**
 - **Meet again after 4/9 work group meeting to use criteria to explore county-wide opportunities for a range site**
- **Site specific considerations divided into opportunities & constraints revised list from Nancy**

- **Gene Adamson doing Power Point for 4/9 after reviews by subgroup.; Info to other 2 subgroups.**

The group discussed the Front Range Mt. Backdrop/Foreground Preservation Area; a 5 county effort dating back to the early 1990s; it includes several aspects of preservation...scenic, wildlife, natural resources, etc.; we discussed the “dented chevy” concept in real estate... that there are quarries, homes, highways, above ground water tanks, speedways, etc. within this preservation area along with rich natural resources; it’s important to keep in mind that there are opportunities and constraints with all properties in this areas when considering a possible location for a public, outdoor shooting range...one that we’ve heard people discuss that has merit if it utilizes a “natural backdrop.”

Mark Loye expanded on this idea: if there are already scars on the landscape, then something adjacent to that wouldn't be as objectionable compared to an areas that is pristine; important to note that the Front Range Mountain Backdrop/Foreground Preservation Area is not a legal mandate; the polygons in the study were done over 20 years ago with rudimentary methods and are broadly defined; “dented chevys” exist as do high value natural resources in the area.

One member wanted to ensure that visual impact is considered; one member mentioned visual impact for the slash collection site on Rooney Road was a concern, and thus, why it was shut down; the City of Golden holds the lease for this property and it is owned by Jeffco Open Space; another member asked about this property as a potential for a shooting range since from the Clean Harbors facility to the Hogback potentially lends itself to this type of use; it’s a landfill with methane being addressed; Lockheed Martin facility was built upon a landfill.

Site Consideration constraints and opportunities and preliminary site evaluation criteria utilizing the Northern Front Range Shooting Partnership were discussed by the group. The group agreed to remove that group’s 1 mile buffer criteria from municipalities and agreed that a minimum distance from residential should be 1/2 mile, and a 1/4 mile from recreational trails, campgrounds, etc.

Other criteria to consider: distance from ecologically sensitive areas (bald eagles/raptors), etc.: some distance to be defined; P&Z has degrees of wildlife sensitivity (e.g., elk calving, nesting sites, T&E, etc.) outlined in the Jeffco Community Plans; the group discussed distance from commercial activity and impacts to humans... 1/2 mile for non-residential is also important; the group agreed to consider community plan land use recommendations and future compatibility; the agreed that ideally a natural backdrop would be good; old quarries not in use, potentially; The group discussed merits of meeting again to discuss feasible properties that meet the site evaluation criteria as we ran out of time to address this portion of the agenda.

Discussion of Feasible Locations for Range

No time remained for discussion. Will be addressed at an upcoming meeting TBD.