



SUMMARY REPORT

BASALT STATE WILDLIFE AREA SHOOTING RANGE

PUBLIC MEETINGS

HOSTED BY COLORADO PARKS AND WILDLIFE
AUGUST 2018



Overview

Purpose of Public Meetings and Report

This report is a summary of two public meetings hosted by Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) to provide information, answer questions, listen to suggested solutions, and find common ground with Roaring Fork Valley residents concerned about the future of the Basalt State Wildlife Area Shooting Range. The report synthesizes the verbal and written comments provided by invited speakers and the public at each meeting. The report does not attempt to draw conclusions nor offer recommendations; it is intended as a summary of the meetings and reference of public comments as further discussion and decision-making regarding the range move forward. All comments and perspectives reflected in this report represent the views of the individual speaking or writing. This report was prepared by Keystone Policy Center (www.keystone.org), a non-advocacy, non-profit organization contracted by CPW to provide independent support for the design, facilitation, and documentation of the meetings.

Public Meeting #1 (August 21, 2018)¹

The first public meeting included welcome remarks from CPW, agenda and ground rules overview by Keystone, a presentation by CPW on the history of the shooting range and management options, a Question/Answer panel regarding the shooting range and the recent Lake Christine fire with CPW and other agencies/departments, brief invited stakeholder remarks providing additional factual information and context, and an open comment period during which the public was invited to provide brief verbal suggestions for solutions for the range. At the close of the meeting, participants were also invited to provide written feedback via flip chart/post-it note on 1) Solutions to address concerns associated with the range; 2) Priority issues/concerns associated with range; 3) Expectations and suggestions for future process of engaging community; and, 4) Questions participants would like to see addressed at the next meeting. Participants were also invited to provide additional written comments via comment card and/or via an online form hosted on the CPW website.² 286 participants signed in at the first meeting; others did not sign in and attendance was estimated above 300. See the summary of attendance by place of residence later in this report for more information.

Public Meeting #2 (August 27, 2018)

The second public meeting included welcome remarks from CPW and a Basalt Town Council member, agenda and ground rules overview by Keystone, a presentation by CPW on the history of the shooting range and management options, brief invited stakeholder remarks providing additional factual information and context, and a 'solution station' session in which participants rotated to various stations to provide feedback on: 1) Range location, 2) Interim operations strategy, 3) Rules and operation, 4) Supervision, enforcement and education, 5) Fire mitigation, 6) Noise Mitigation, 7) Interaction with neighboring development, and 8) Community engagement. At each station, participants were asked to provide feedback on specific options for possible solutions, pros and cons of the options suggestions, information/data needs, criteria for decision-making, and partners that need to be engaged. A general comment box was also provided. Participants were also invited to provide their contact info if interested in contributing to future discussions on the particular topic.³ 170 participants signed in at the second

¹ The August 21 meeting was recorded by Grassroots TV and the recording is available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W06OV5foBrg>

² Online form submissions are not summarized in this report.

³ To protect participant privacy, contact information for those interested in contributing to future discussions has been provided separately to CPW.

meeting; others did not sign in and attendance was estimated near 200. See the summary of attendance by place of residence chart in this report for more information.

Ground Rules

The following ground rules were established for each meeting:

- Speak and write respectfully; no personal attacks.
- Listen respectfully and empathetically to different points of view.
- Respect time limits to enable others to speak; be succinct when agreeing with prior remarks.
- Promote joint, community problem solving: offer solutions rather than complaints.
- Focus on the topic at hand: solutions for the shooting range. This is NOT about gun rights.
- This meeting is about sharing ideas, not showcasing numbers.
- Speak to interests, not positions.
- Let the facilitators facilitate.

Documentation: Meeting Summaries, Attendance, Agendas and Slides

1) Public Meeting # 1 summary	Page 4
2) Public Meeting #2 summary	Page 17
3) Synthesis of Solution Station feedback from Public Meeting #2	Page 22
4) Public Meetings #1 and #2 attendance by residence summary	Page 40
5) Public Meeting #1 agenda	Page 41
6) Public Meeting #2 agenda	Page 42
7) Public Meeting #1 slides	Page 44
8) Public Meeting #2 slides	Page 49

Public Meeting #1 Summary

Basalt State Wildlife Area Shooting Range
August 21, 2018, 7-9 p.m.
Basalt High School, 600 Southside Drive, Basalt, CO
Convened by Colorado Parks and Wildlife

Purpose: Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) planned and hosted two public meetings to provide information, answer questions, listen to suggested solutions, and find common ground with Roaring Fork Valley residents concerned about the future of the Basalt State Wildlife Area Shooting Range after the Lake Christine Fire started at the range on July 3, 2018.

Welcome and Introductions

The meeting began with a Pledge of Allegiance led by a few local Boy Scouts.

CPW Northwest Regional Manager JT Romatzke welcomed more than 300 people, including four CPW commissioners, to the meeting. He said although CPW hosted town hall meetings during the Lake Christine Fire, tonight's meeting is CPW's first opportunity to talk with the public about the range since the tragic event, which destroyed three homes, burnt roughly 13,000 acres, and cost about \$17 million to fight. He acknowledged first responders and expressed appreciation for everyone who helped with firefighting efforts. CPW has logged more than 2,000 hours of staff time dealing with the fire, and he expects staff will log many more hours as they work on a path forward for the Basalt shooting range. Romatzke said his goal was to work toward solutions that work for Eagle County, Basalt, and the whole Roaring Fork Valley and do what's right for both the valley and sportsmen in Colorado. Everyone attending the meeting was affected by the fire, he said, and he recognized that the shooting range is a divisive issue and that people have thoughts, wisdom, and anger that is "not lost on us."

Colorado Department of Natural Resources executive director Bob Randall briefly introduced himself and his role overseeing CPW and five other divisions. He thanked the crowd for engaging in discussion and committing to work through the shooting range issue. He also thanked CPW for staff's efforts during the fire. He said he looked forward to a meaningful conversation, and he was dedicated to making the process open and transparent.

Romatzke said CPW wanted to bring in an outside facilitator to help create a more productive path forward.

Keystone Policy Center senior policy director and facilitator Julie Shapiro introduced herself and her nonprofit organization, which aims to bring diverse perspectives to bear on decision making, works independently regardless of funding, and is dedicated to a transparent process inclusive of all interests. She described the overarching goal of moving from contention to collective problem solving and the corresponding structure of the two public meetings. Tonight's meeting would focus on factual clarification and brainstorming solutions, and no decisions would be made. She read aloud ground rules and described the variety of ways to submit comments and engage: verbal comments during meeting; written comments before, during, and after meeting; online comments; and future task force discussions under development by CPW.

History of the Shooting Range and Future Management Considerations

CPW Area 8 Wildlife Manager Perry Will emphasized that CPW is here to listen and all options would be considered. He encouraged participants to comment and said their help was appreciated.

Will gave an overview of the history of the range. CPW acquired it in 1940. A former local game warden named Bob Terrell said in 1969 that he couldn't remember a time there wasn't shooting in the current range location. The range was a 527-acre, \$8,000 purchase. Will showed satellite images of the range in 1951 and 2017, pointed out some nearby development, and emphasized that little has changed at and around the range in roughly 60 years.

Will went over a list of range management considerations CPW has received from the public -- including enclosure, relocation, signage improvements, noise mitigation, public-private partnerships, etc. -- and acknowledged funding and logistical limitations to some of the options as well as some options CPW has already been pursuing. While much future action remains unknown, he said, CPW leaders do know they want to develop an advisory group or task force following the second public meeting. CPW must manage a variety of thoughts, beliefs, and interests and try to balance them as the agency considers the range's future. He concluded by emphasizing noise and safety as the community's top concerns and calling the range a community asset, especially for youth and other groups who use the range.

Question/Answer Period with Panelists

Panelists included: JT Romatzke (CPW Northwest Regional Manager), Perry Will (CPW Area 8 Wildlife Manager), Ryan Mahoney (Basalt Town Manager), Scott Thompson (Basalt Fire Chief), Cleve Williams (Basalt Fire Deputy Chief), Mike McWilliams (Eagle County Undersheriff), and Scott Fitzwilliams (USFS White River National Forest Supervisor).

Two microphones were arranged on either side of the room for participants to ask panelists questions. Everyone who approached the microphones was given 30 seconds to ask one or more questions. The following questions and answers are not presented verbatim nor in the order they were asked. Rather, they are lightly paraphrased and grouped by topic for ease of navigation of the topics discussed:

CPW Mission and Operations

Q: How does the shooting range fit within CPW's overall mission and mandate? How does the range impact wildlife management and conservation, which seems to be CPW's primary mandate?

A: Romatzke said the agency manages many ranges in Colorado to provide safe opportunities for shooting sports. Yes, the agency's mission is to preserve, protect, and manage wildlife.

Shooting Range History and Operations

Q: Where would the funding come from for mitigation or relocation of the range?

A: Romatzke said CPW is a cash-funded agency with enterprise status and therefore doesn't receive any money from the state general fund. CPW is funded primarily by sportsmen and sportswomen through the Pittman-Robertson Act excise tax revenue on firearms, ammunition, and other things. That state funding is then directed to conservation work, T&E [threatened and endangered] species, wildlife management, property acquisition, and other things. Shooting sports has fallen off many game and fish agencies over the last few decades, and projects like the Cameo range are a direct reflection of the need to provide safe shooting places for youth and others as federal lands are being closed to shooting sports or other prohibitions are placed on shooting sports. That's generally where the funding comes from for infrastructure needs, changes, maintenance, and operation. *[Post-meeting clarification from CPW: The*

range is funded by sportsmen through the purchase of hunting and fishing licenses and through federal aid (Pittman-Robertson)]

Q: What's the total value of the assets currently on the range?

A: Will said the number is difficult to calculate but roughly \$500,000 including the cost of noise mitigation efforts and land enhancement ('dirt work').

Q: Out of all the wildfires in Colorado, this year and in the past, how many started from gunfire?

A: Thompson said two other fires besides the Lake Christine Fire have started at gun ranges in Eagle County. Of those, the only one that wasn't quickly suppressed was the Lake Christine Fire.

A: McWilliams said all three fires of those wildfires were caused by unlawful shooting with incendiary rounds or exploding targets.

Q: How has the closure of this range affected other ranges? Some range operators are on leases and have to pay to use the range. Those operators might be losing money if the range isn't open.

A: Romatzke said the ranges CPW manages were closed to ensure the agency did its due diligence, and it has had a direct effect on private ranges and other public ranges on Forest Service land and other places. CPW may be the big person in the room with a lot of shooting ranges and outdoor recreation and other things, but there's a cost to those decisions. Given the fire season the people and wildlife are facing in Colorado, CPW has an obligation to the natural resources and to make sure the agency assesses things properly to figure these things out. There's ramifications to every decision.

Shooting Range Location

Q: If the current range didn't exist, and this valley needed one, would you put it in its current location?

A: Will said without question the Basalt and Roaring Fork Valley populations have grown, and in a perfect world there could be a better place for the range, but the range is there now.

Q: What contingencies do you have for hunters this season, such as at the South Canyon range, and can you speak about the Cameo range, that public-private partnership, and the need for a world-class facility, which could be possible in a location a couple miles outside of the town of Basalt?

A: Romatzke said with the Basalt range closed, there is a local deficit of places for people to shoot and prepare for hunting season. Though people shoot safely on federal lands every day, CPW doesn't want to push people to federal lands. Other CPW facilities available include the range in Rifle, which offers free public sight-in days. CPW has also been talking with private shooting clubs about offering shooting and sighting in opportunities, and CPW acknowledges the need for those opportunities and wants to vet them. Cameo is a public-private partnership unique to CPW and Colorado that involves funding from grants, donors, and private businesses. Its ribbon cutting is Saturday and will include a competition with more than 200 shooters. "We're trying to drive economic development by something epic." CPW wants to consider future opportunities to partner with private entities to manage and operate ranges.

Q: What properties could the range be moved to in reasonable distance for shooters in Glenwood, Basalt, and Aspen?

A: Romatzke said though other properties could be costly, CPW should still consider them. "From a lead perspective, once we pull out of a shooting facility, at that point in time, we're on the hook to remediate any of the lead or environmental issues that are there now." *[Post-meeting clarification from CPW: Lead mitigation is required when a range is closed and/or abandoned.]* He said, "This is a solid place we have now, but if there's a chance to move it, let's do it." CPW would want a location that wouldn't involve conflict with future development, and he mentioned successful ranges next door to homes in other states. CPW should not dismiss opportunities to pursue alternative locations.

A: Mahoney said the town of Basalt would like to explore alternative locations, but the effort is limited as nearby communities might oppose the addition of a range. The town has researched a lease option

on private property in South Glenwood and spoken with CPW about property the agency manages that could be far enough from the existing range. The town has also considered an old gravel pit down valley from the current range that may not be a viable option. The town wants to do its due diligence in considering alternative locations.

A: Williams said if the current range was closed and shooters were redirected to a new facility, shooters could still legally shoot at the current range location, and they would do so especially if a new range was too far away. This could be more dangerous.

Q: Are you concerned that closing the range will push shooters elsewhere and be more dangerous to the public?

A: Romatzke said he will not criminalize shooters and recreational hunters who shoot safely every day. He emphasized that shooting sports cause fewer incidents than skiing.

A: Fitzwilliams said when people don't have a designated place to shoot, they go shoot on National Forest lands, and some take TVs and refrigerators and leave a large impact. The Forest Service has had incidents where people were shot at campgrounds, and beyond the safety issue, trash and fire problems have increased as mountain communities have developed and shooters have been pushed onto public lands. The Forest Service plays no role in management of the shooting range, but Fitzwilliams has advised CPW to consider the impacts of any decision on public land use.

Shooting Range Opening/Closure

Q: What are your criteria for opening the range, and do you have an estimated timeline for reopening?

A: Romatzke said CPW shut down every shooting facility in his region after the Lake Christine Fire to make sure staff could evaluate every facility and consult with local fire marshals. The agency reopened three facilities immediately and reopened two after completing some mitigation work. The Basalt shooting range is the only one still closed in the region, and reopening decisions would likely be made in the weeks to come after honest and open discussion with the community. Criteria for reopening has not been defined. He said he knows whatever steps forward the agency takes will not please everyone, so that is not CPW's goal. The goal is rather to bring the community together, create a steering committee, and find a meaningful way forward.

Q: Why is there a need to make changes at the range? Why can't you just open it and continue as before once Stage 2 fire restrictions are lifted?

A: Romatzke said Stage 2 and other fire restrictions don't prohibit the discharge of firearms on state lands including the Basalt range, so fire restrictions are not keeping CPW from opening the range.

A: Thompson said because fires have started at the range, he would like the range to implement strategies for preventing both future fires and illegal activity.

Supervision

Q: Have you considered adding a range officer to check ammunition and ensure shooters aren't using illegal ammunition?

A: Will said yes, that option is being considered, and when a volunteer range officer was present in the past, incidents were fewer.

Q: Why wasn't someone checking ammunition in the past?

A: Romatzke said some ranges have staff and others don't. The agency has never staffed every range. Volunteers have helped at ranges before.

A: Perry said shooting ranges have been used to educate children about responsible gun use, and those children who have already been taught proper usage don't need to be supervised.

Town Government Activities

Q: Is town government considering funding/subsidizing changes at the range?

A: Mahoney said one-time infrastructure costs could be funded through grants and state budgets. As town manager, he would recommend funding solutions agreed upon by the community to town council members within reasonable limits. For example, a \$300,000 town contribution would not be feasible.

Q: Are there any plans for town-hosted meetings or other meetings beyond the two CPW-hosted public meetings? Beyond the meetings, what other mechanisms are being used to seek input and solutions?

A: Mahoney said the town fully supports the two public meetings and overall process CPW is using to gather input, and the town does not plan to host any separate opportunities for engagement.

Mahoney is preparing a resolution about the future of the range that will go before town council.

Shapiro thanked the panelists and encouraged participants to continue to ask questions after the meeting and through the engagement channels previously announced.

Invited Stakeholder Remarks

Representatives of two stakeholder groups who were invited by CPW took the stage individually to speak. Shapiro emphasized this part of the meeting was not a debate but rather an opportunity to provide more information and context. Each stakeholder representative was given five minutes.

Larry Emery, a Roaring Fork Valley Sportsman's Association (RFVSA) board representative, thanked everyone and expressed the organization's heartbreak after the fire and hope for productive discussion that leads to solutions. He has personally had to evacuate twice because of wildfires. The association was created in the 1980s with a mission of funding and providing a safe venue for shooting sports and for learning and practicing safe gun handling for both members and non-members. The RFVSA has trained and certified range safety officers on staff who supervise all shooting at the RFVSA part of the range, which operates under a CPW lease. The RFVSA range is open to the public on weekends and open to law enforcement officers on weekdays. The association also hosts Boy Scouts, 4H, veterans, women's groups. In its 35-year history, the association has operated without incident or injury, he said. RFVSA supports the Basalt range as the only public range in the Roaring Fork Valley. The range concentrates sportsmen in a safe controlled environment and minimizes dispersed shooting. Its closure would push shooting into public and private lands around community which would greatly increase the potential for conflict. The safest location for a range is its current location.

Mike Luciano, representing a group called the Midvalley Residents, said he has lived in Basalt for 23 years and he and his son use the range. In 2010, he was part of a committee that worked on solving similar issues discussed at this meeting, and after town council made recommendations and resolutions about the shooting range that CPW agreed with, he said the state agency didn't follow through with most of the recommended actions. The shooting range is an intimidating topic, and many residents supporting its relocation are intimidated to talk about it. They represent the silent majority of people who live near the range and hope decision makers don't base their decisions on popularity, convenience, petitions, or polls. The group recognizes the merits of a shooting range but doesn't want a range at its current location. Use of the range has increased dramatically in the last 20 to 30 years. When he moved here in '94, he didn't know there was a range, but now he hears it seven days a week. He worries local children will become desensitized to the sound of gunshots because of the proximity to the elementary and middle schools. Citing school shootings over the last two decades, he said it's incumbent on government officials to eliminate the sound of gunfire from school campuses. Previous sound mitigation efforts were unsuccessful. Any decision to reopen the range should include a sunset date to force a conversation about closure.

After loud reactions from the audience, Shapiro reminded participants of the ground rules and to focus on brainstorming solutions.

Public Comment Focused on Solutions

Over the next 50 minutes, participants were invited to approach one of two microphones to comment with a time limit of one minute. Comments are not presented verbatim nor in the order they were spoken at the meeting. Rather, the comments have been lightly paraphrased and arranged by dominant theme for ease of navigation of the concerns and interests raised. A category for comments that addressed multiple issues is also included.

Comments that Addressed Multiple Issues

- There's a lot of great solutions on the table, and now we have to drill down which ones are viable or not. This whole thing started with an irresponsible decision, and it would be an irresponsible decision to make this range close while solutions are being worked on. My kids went to school here and never complained about noise. If people are concerned about lead, it could be worse if shooting was spread around the valley.
- We have world-class skiing, world-class fishing, world-class biking. Why not a world-class gun range? Make it safe, make it quiet, and make it fireproof.
- The 2010 document outlined the requirements for a safe range, and almost none of those resolutions were adopted. We have 45 years of accumulated lead up there right next to streams that drain into the Roaring Fork River. If they will just use that 2010 document, that's a really good way to figure out the problems and address the solutions. No one else has a gun range in their downtown. Every other community has figured this out.
- I'm a competitive shooter, instructor, and range officer, and I've used a lot of the ranges open on the Western Slope. Two suggestions for the fire issue: increase berms and make them a lot higher and a lot softer and add xeriscaping. Also recruit and staff the range with paid or qualified volunteer range officers.
- I might have a possible solution. Take the fire alarm thing at schools that notifies the fire department and everyone in the school and put one or two at the shooting range to notify the fire department or law enforcement about unlawful activity.
- I'm an RSO, and I work for the RFVSA, and I'm willing to work to help train and supervise people. The lead problem that you cite is a non-problem. There was a 10-year study that said there was no lead problem, and lead draining into the creek isn't a problem because the creek dried up a few years ago.
- I have lived in Basalt all my life, and I take exception with that Mr. Will said. I think the range was purchased in the '60s. I knew Bob Terrell and Rick Adams, and I shot up there before it ever was a range. I remember the pigpen, the calving shed, the grain silo. I was paid a nickel to shoot groundhogs out there by the Lucksingers. I knew Christine Lucksinger herself. I shot out there all the time since I was a young kid, and I shot groundhogs there when it was a cattle ranch. There's a lot of ways to make it safer for fire than it is today. We need to do them, and we need to keep it in the same place.
- It's clear moving the range is not a viable solution because of the money involved and the near impossibility of finding a new location in this valley. The range does not pose any greater danger today than it did six weeks ago. We need supervision at the range. If we put supervision at the range, the range could open immediately. My tax dollars are being wasted while the range is closed. The range needs to be open.
- I grew up here shooting and have shot here with my sons and grandsons. This problem was caused by one incident of bad, dumb behavior. You cannot eliminate bad, dumb behavior. The problem isn't

noise or the fire, which was devastating. I'm a strong proponent of keeping the range open and managing it with solutions.

- Solutions can only come if we have more community input sessions. Two short meetings is not enough. If we want to talk about losing money, one local business lost \$136,000 because of the fire. The solution is to close or relocate this range because of the noise and pollution. We live with the consequences of this shooting range. A lot of you don't live here in Basalt with the consequences.
- I've been a first responder in the valley since 1975, and I have been shooting at the range. Lead contamination is more a function of mining in this valley than shooting. Shooting and hunting is a billion-dollar industry in Colorado, we're right in the middle of it, and I think the town of Basalt should be aware and not shoot themselves in the foot by chasing our business away.

Location

- We hope you can come to a solution. We support you. We know you can. A lot of smart people are working on this. Please leave the range open.
- I have taught shooting for years at this range and the one in Rifle, and this is by far the better range. We teach safety. Please keep this range open.
- I'm all for keeping the range where it is for economic reasons. It must be a lot more expensive to buy a piece of property in this valley than to get a grant for sound and fire mitigation.
- I grew up shooting on this range and watched the range be a driving force for the community and for responsible men and women. The range is on land declared federal waste land and can't be used for anything else. If it's moved, people will continue to shoot at this location. The range has started only a few fires in about 80 years.
- My 17-year-old son never looks up from phone, but I can get him out the door to go fishing and hunting. We need a range.
- I've lived here 39 years or so and am one of the founding officers of RFVSA. That plot of land was designated as a shooting range, and that's unlikely to change. I don't have too much in the way of solutions other than let's legislate against stupidity.
- A lot of us live in this valley because of the public lands and the way we use them whether it's hiking, biking, or whatever. I operate a business with horses next to the shooting range, and I'm tired of hearing shooting and having bullets whizzing over my head and bothering the horses. Without a range, it's going to get a whole lot worse, so let's keep the range open.
- One thing we need to keep in mind is the distance of other ranges to a city. Basalt's first responders are just one or two miles away, and police and fire are quick to respond to negligence. I've been there personally when alcohol was in use, and they were called and were there in less than a minute, and I think that's something you all need to keep in mind. Three miles away – that's a big difference.

Interim Operations

- I learned gun safety at this range. A lot of people are coming from out of town who just want to take a shot with their firearm before they go shoot at an animal. Could we open something for a couple days to calm down those who want to sight their guns?
- Where would you like us to shoot tomorrow?
- For safety's sake, reopen the range. Have it monitored and supervised and work on resolutions while the range is open. Don't keep it closed.

Rules/Supervision/Enforcement

- The RFVSA has certified range safety officers and the ability to train more. The association is more than willing to work with CPW, the town of Basalt, and others to increase supervision at the range.

- Could a range supervisor position be funded by the same source that funds boat inspections or a similar mechanism?
- I've lived here 15 years and am concerned about the health and safety of the community. I'm part of the silent majority, and I posted my concerns and received a lot of negativity and not solutions or negotiation. I have a list of alternative options including installing 24/7 video monitoring, locking the range when it can't be supervised, and more. We've got to do those things.
- My kids grew up participating in the 4H club and shooting. How many people here are willing to join me and get trained as an RSO?
- I'm a fifth-generation Basalt resident and a trained RSO. I would like to offer my services to CPW to build better standard operating procedures for the range and help train volunteers.
- My son spoke as part of the 4H club, and I've watched kids and adults at the range. They run a tight ship there. It's impressive, but I could see where a knucklehead could show up and do what happened. I totally understand the concerns, and some solutions for making it safer are checking people and having more management. There is obviously something we need to do, but I think it could be a world-class shooting range. If you're not familiar with trap and skeet shooting, go out there and check it out. It's beautiful.
- Years ago, they required a license to use the range, and I saw change in attitude then. It was more professional. That requirement was dropped, and I could see a big difference.

Fire Mitigation

- We've talked a lot about solutions, but we haven't talked a lot about problem, which is fire. I had to evacuate in Carbondale. They should have been doing more fire mitigation. I'm not sure why there's been resistance to doing that in the past. They have addressed noise.
- I represent 4H and would like to keep the range open. My solutions are checking ammo, installing 24/7 fire hydrants, and encouraging shooters to tell someone if they see sparks or fire.
- If one knucklehead gets drunk and kills somebody, you don't close the roads. As for solutions and fire mitigations, you could add plastic lines and sod on the burn area, irrigate it, mow it, and keep it real nice. That would improve the shooting experience and help with fire mitigation.
- I've used the range and have a solution. A barrier. If someone had shot into that, the fire wouldn't have started. This was caused by someone shooting past that and into the woods. If we limit the distance the rounds could be shot, we could solve this.
- I've lived in the valley since 1963, and I haven't heard the ease with which water could be brought down from the irrigated fields about the range to mitigate the fire hazard and help with suppression in and on the range. That's a viable solution that should please a lot of the community.

Noise Mitigation

- I've lived in the valley since 1978. I was invited to a range where all shooting done with pistols and rifles was inside, so that created no noise. This was not out in the country and not in a gun-friendly state. If New Jersey can have a range like this, so can Colorado.
- I'm originally from London and used to be in the British military. We had a pipe range, and I'd be happy to discuss how that was used and managed.
- We've got a lot of youth here who are well spoken and don't seem too affected by the gunfire.
- I've been a Mid Valley resident for decades, and noise is a growing concern. Thirty years ago, people shot shotguns on the weekend occasionally, and now we hear semi-automatics and loud rapid fire. Can we take some actions to limit high-capacity magazines? Can we use subsonic ammunition? That would reduce sound impacts substantially. We should all try to get along.

- I grew up in Mississippi where we learned to buy silencers for our guns. You can buy them legally now, and they cost a bit of money, but I would like to see the range encourage people to use silencers. You'll solve a lot of problems with these people worried about noise.

Community Interactions and Engagement

- I remember back in the late '80s, maybe early '90s, a town council meeting in Basalt when developers were proposing building around the range, and at that meeting, they said the range would remain open in perpetuity, and the contractors got the ok to build in there on the condition that homebuyers would sign something that said we understand there's a range in there. Plus, the schools have been here forever. They haven't moved closer to the range.
- Solutions are going to come through communication. I urge CPW and Bob Randall to get together with core community groups. We have a lot of info to share. Communication is the only way. I encourage you to help us with that and meet with the town manager.
- I want government officials to discuss with the community. I had to evacuate again and relive what I lived 16 years ago, which was devastation.

Environmental Mitigation

- I've lived here since 1974. Most of these comments aren't about solutions. Your mandate is to take care of the wildlife. The shooting range has been accumulating lead since 1940 with no mitigation. Where's the accountability for the wildlife? Lead-based ammunition is likely the greatest source of lead in the environment in the US and is a significant health risk to humans and wildlife.
- I've lived here for 50 years and have been shooting at the range for 48. Some mitigation possibilities you could do are dig up the area, make a barrier, make a cache of ammo shot, and pull it away every five years. A lot of people seem to have that issue with the lead. Maybe we can do something with that.

Closing Comments

CPW representatives returned to the onstage microphone to say a few closing words.

Romatzke said closing the range may be the easiest solution but maybe not the right solution and reopening the range immediately may not be the right solution either. He said he took away solutions from everyone that made comments at the meeting and encouraged participants to come to the next meeting, as hunting season starts soon and CPW wants to move forward.

Will thanked participants for commenting and said CPW will try to incorporate the solutions proposed. He emphasized that the youth presence at the meeting should demonstrate the importance of shooting sports in the area.

Meeting #1 Participant Feedback Transcribed from Post-It Notes and Comment Cards

Solutions to address concerns associated with the range:

- I would pay a nominal fee to have a full-time ranger. Even though I already pay tax on all my outdoor gear to support a gun range.
- Wildlife will get hurt without a range.
- For over 50 years the range has operated with little or no issues. Keep it open. It provides a safe place to teach youth gun safety BSA 4H.
- Publicly post things like fire hazard, fire ban status and specific details on what that would mean as it pertains to operation of the range.

Priority issues/concerns associated with range:

- More shooting on public land will stress wildlife
- Look at benefits of recreation asset to town – more amenities
- Open the range
- Why did they develop houses so close to an active shooting range?
- Open the range now!
- No viable alternatives for relocation
- Lead pollution 44 years of unmitigated shooting – shooting over the creeks
- To open for hunting season! Keep the shooting in a safe area
- The range existed before development – why did you choose to build so close?
- Fire hazard
- NOISE! Gun community unwilling to curtail hours. Can be heard at school campuses.
- Why was residential development allowed so close to the range?
- Range had worked well for many years
- Open the range tomorrow. “The town is stalling.” There is no present fire danger, it is all used up. Hunting season starts Sat. Goat season Sept 4. The town will need to present funds to facilitate a change
- This is the only range in the valley
- Construct a rototill road “Fire Break” around the present range, maybe add sprinkler near road
- Please consider moving the range above the town and above the power lines further up the CPW land as right now there is no wildlife up there because the forest is dead and there’s no food for wildlife.
- The closure of this range might affect youth shooting sports in the area because they don’t have a range to shoot at.
- The range is: 1. Too close to residential area, 2. No enforcement, 3. No preparations in case of fire
- If you choose this range it will take away a big chance for us 4-H shooters to go to state and show our skills and it will take away kids and adult fun of shoot guns legally.

Expectations and suggestions for future process of engaging community:

- Shooting range is tremendous asset for our community. Policy changes could have negative consequences for tourism.
- All shooting ranges should be: 1. Safe, 2. At least 5 miles from residential areas, 2. Should be 5 miles from commercial activities, 4. On site paid enforcement

- Supervision, irrigation
- Keep the range here. Keep the range open. Keep the range free. With volunteer management like “Bob”
- We need to monitor the range a bit better
- There should be fire plan and mitigation done at the range
- Educating the public about benefits
- We need to cooperate to move this range. Shooters and non-shooters alike
- We need to consider an additional range with growth of shooting sports a long-distance range would be a great addition.
- Better follow-up not like last time in not following up on town resolutions
- Small discussion groups

Questions participants would like to see addressed at the next meeting:

- Timeline to open
- The public lands consist of millions of acres. Why can't we find a spot for shooters that does not disrupt the peace and harmony of their fellow men and women?
- Allow the range to irrigate the shooting areas from lake
- If not a range- what? Homeless camp
- This is about location. The silver lining to the tragedy of the Lake Christine fire would be to move the range. My form of recreation is gardening. I endure listening to gunfire 7 days a week/ I have also endured two fires that were started at this range. Basalt residents deserve the right to enjoy peace and quiet. Again, please move the range to a safe location out of town – this is the time. At the very least, enclose it.
- Is there any law or rule that would be violated by setting up a paper target and table to shoot near Maroon Lake? Shooting would be pointed away from people.

Written comments via comment card

- 1. Keep the range open, 2. Hire rifle/pistol range officers, 3. No shooting in the woods, only at the range, 4. Promote civilian marksmanship
- It's important to leave the range open or people will shoot in the mountain areas
- One way we could fund RSOs is create a 3-gun range for advanced classes and shooting courses. A portion of those profits could go to paying RSOs.
- The range is great. I love the shotgunning. Please open ASAP
- Great range
- I support relocating the range. Most importantly it must be supervised when open no matter where it is. Fund supervisions from the same source as boat inspection staff are funded at Rudi. Should not have to depend on volunteers.
- Why can't Basalt citizens vote on this in November? How are they not insured for these accidents?
- My total concerns are that the shoot range is relocated to an area more conducive with National Guide for Shooting Ranges. Remote, access by road and away from other activities. Which our Basalt Range is not. Also, to be noted in 1980 Basalt's population was 529 now in 2018 it is 3,982. Safe is my first concern.

- Reenact the rule that either a hunting license or habitat stamp is required to use the range. I have used the range for 41 years and saw a more respectful use of the range when it was a requirement to use the range.
- I have lived here since 1969 and have used the gun range for many years. Everyone was always polite and courteous with safety in mind. Bob was an asset as a volunteer – perhaps some of these sports clubs can offer volunteers to oversee the range – but we need to keep it open and keep it free.
- Keep the range here, keep the range open and keep it free!
- Have a suitable replacement done first pay for by the ones who don't want it moved.
- People who want the range relocated are scared to speak up publicly – we are the silent majority – please reach out to us
- Open range now. Now for hunters especially long term keep range open. Figure out how to have person/ranger when the range open.
- The arsonists/irresponsible gun-owners/users were never checked upon entry to this gun range. Had the DOW staffed this range during hours of operation, we may never have had this fire occur. Please staff the range when open. Please close the range with a gate/locked during off-hours. Please consider all fire mitigation efforts and improvements at the range. Don't worry about the cost- fire is much, much more expensive.
- Keep range open and safe pipe in H2O for hydrants etc. Safe sound mitigation, fix road. Great learning facility for kids, 4H, public, many roll models. Range officers.
- I'm a non-shooting grandmother. In the absence of a great deal of money, the natural basin housing the range is well chosen. Leave it there. The danger of dispersed shooting is much greater. Staff it more fully, it's great.
- 1.open the range ASAP, 2. Mitigate berms, enclose, 3. Must have range safety officer on public side.
- 1. Concrete/acoustic barriers, 2. solar powered kiosk with gate and 360-degree real time video and credit card entry.
- 1.Better fire mitigation, a. fire hoses, sprinklers, b. xeriscape areas around range no brush nearby; no natural fuels, 2. better sound mitigation, a. could we use the kinds of sound barriers used in construction? b. build berms around range to absorb sound. 3. Keep range hours same, but (to appease people complaining about noise) possibly a "small arms Sunday" one day a week where only small caliber firearms are allowed? 4. We will likely need to have the range staffed full-time with a range officer. There can be all the rules imaginable, but someone/people will still violate them. A range officer could help mitigate that. Volunteer – who organizes and how? Paid – how pay for? Range fees? Basalt \$\$ contribution for range officer.
- 1. The Town of Basalt, residents of the Wilds, etc. all had full disclosure of the gun range before allowing development, 2. The gun range is now "mitigated" for the next 25 years, 3. Aspen Times today had an article about the reopening of the Gypsum Gun Range and had excellent ideas on hours and supervision, 4. Hunting season is upon us which is necessary for our economy and we must have supervised gun range to allow people to site in their rifles, 5. I live on Cedar Drive and was evacuated on 7/4. I stayed at a friend's house in Old Snowmass, and one morning the property manager called and asked if I heard gun shots. Two guys had set up targets on the private land and were doing target practice. She called the sheriff, and they were arrested (one

had a record) and “believed” it was BLM land. If the gun range is closed all together, people will go into BLM and national forest land to shoot which is a bad idea. I am for keeping the gun range.

- I’d like to begin with something that I believe that we all agree on. This fire is a tragedy. A tragedy that was caused by two people that broke existing laws, and they will be punished severely for breaking those laws. The Town of Basalt has proposed relocating the range, but to my knowledge, no viable alternatives have been presented. The challenges of existing property owners and environmental impacts make relocation effectively impossible. Many people that advocate closing the range in the name of fire safety are the very same people that pushed to close the range due to noise in the past. I feel this is disingenuous. Let me ask – would these same people prefer to encounter responsible marks men and hunters while on a hike or bike ride? Because that is what will happen if the range is closed. Ethical hunters rely on the accuracy of their rifles and closing the range will force them onto public lands. If the opposition truly wishes to prevent fires, closing the range is the least practical option. Further, what will be the impact on our already stressed wildfire if marks men are forced to shoot on public lands. For these reasons, I respectfully ask that you not punish the responsible hunters, families and marksmen that legally use the only public range in this valley.
- Instead of addressing the issue immediately there was a litany of excuses. Ok here is what has to happen now. 1. Regulated hours, 2. Consistent supervision, 3. Full and complete fire control including automatic sprinkler system, fire control devices, 4. No public access. Everyone must be registered. Also proof of completing a safety course, 5. Community members on the board that are not gun owners, 6. 24/7 video with community access via web, 7. Range is not rushed to reopen on the Basalt owners, 8. Another incident, it is closed permanently with no appeal, 9. Range is closed automatically in increased fire conditions, 10. Barring this agreement, it is closed and moved now. This answers all questions.

Public Meeting #2 Summary

Basalt State Wildlife Area Shooting Range
August 27, 2018, 6-8 p.m.
Basalt High School, 600 Southside Drive, Basalt, CO
Convened by Colorado Parks and Wildlife

Purpose: Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) planned and hosted two public meetings to provide information, answer questions, listen to suggested solutions, and find common ground with Roaring Fork Valley residents concerned about the future of the Basalt State Wildlife Area Shooting Range after the Lake Christine Fire started at the range on July 3, 2018.

Welcome and Introductions

JT Romatzke (CPW Northwest Regional Manager) opened the meeting by introducing himself and asking participants who had attended last week's meeting. Most participants raised their hands, and Romatzke said he appreciated their dedication and willingness to continue this discussion about the future of the Basalt shooting range. He acknowledged two CPW commissioners, CPW executive director Bob Broscheid, Colorado Sen. Kerry Donovan, and Eagle County Sheriff James van Beek in the audience.

Over the last week, many CPW staff members were bombarded with emails, texts, and phone calls, Romatzke said. Most were positive, but a lot of the communications expressed frustration that the range wasn't open or that the process was moving too fast. Romatzke said CPW is trying to make the best decisions so that these public meetings aren't a common occurrence and so the kids have great places to practice shooting sports. Though issues remain – some perceived and some real – his job is to engage with individuals about options after being provided with a final report prepared by the facilitators and move forward with solutions. He asked participants for their patience and acknowledged though addressing the shooting range isn't easy, it is the top priority for him, the CPW executive director, and the CPW commissioners who believe the discussion is important not just for the Basalt range but also for the future of shooting ranges in Colorado.

Romatzke said he learned earlier in the day that the Basalt Town Council would be voting on a resolution about the shooting range the following night, which he felt was too soon as the public meeting process had not concluded. He encouraged meeting attendees to engage at the town council meeting as well as during the solution station activity later in the evening. Then he asked Councilman Bill Infante to speak about the council's efforts.

Basalt Town Councilman Bill Infante thanked CPW for hosting this second public meeting and said he didn't think it would be the last. He expressed the town council's commitment to finding and implementing solutions. Infante said he first saw the resolution draft earlier in the day as well and thought parts of it were good while other parts should be changed. To address concerns about moving too fast, he said the resolution was not meant to skip the community input process but to expedite solutions because hunting season begins September 1. He has personally spoken with people representing a variety of interests and concerns, which are real. Almost every shooter who spoke at last week's meeting said they were concerned about safety, so he encouraged participants to prioritize the safety issue later in the meeting. Short-term steps could include fire extinguishers and restricted hours. He hopes the long-term solution could be a world-class range that competes with the new Cameo range with longer distances to sight in and shoot that would satisfy growing demand. He has been

investigating alternative locations for the range with no luck, and he has asked Emery to see if any RFVSA members would be willing to donate land. Town council doesn't want the range closed while long-term solutions are discussed because of hunting season approaching and the safety concerns associated with dispersed shooting on public lands. At the same time, the council wants the range reopened when appropriate, and that criteria remains unknown. Councilmembers are continuing to talk with the fire chief and sheriff. Infante thanked Romatzke for keeping the range closed during Stage 2 restrictions and for working with town, county, and state entities. The council understands why the discussion involves emotions as people's homes were threatened by the recent fire and people want to shoot. Infante acknowledged that Romatzke has continually said he can't please everyone all the time. The town council's goal is to protect the health and safety of the community and protect the interests of range users, but ultimately the town doesn't have authority over CPW at the range.

Romatzke thanked Infante and said CPW looks forward to continued discussions with Basalt Town Council as a partner. He offered to stay after the meeting to talk with participants and introduced Julie Shapiro (Keystone Policy Center).

Keystone Policy Center senior policy director and facilitator Julie Shapiro introduced herself and gave an overview of the nonprofit organization's mission. She then presented the meeting format and the goal behind the solution station activity, which would take up the last half of the meeting. The activity aims to draw out and record more details around the solutions proposed at the previous meeting including pros and cons, criteria, and data and information needs as well as any additional ideas. She also read the list of ground rules for discussion and encouraged participants to provide comments in other ways as well, including general comment cards and CPW's online survey.

History of the Shooting Range and Management Considerations for Future

Perry Will (CPW Area 8 Wildlife Manager) said he would move quickly through the history and management considerations part of the meeting because of time concerns and because most attendees were at the previous meeting where he related the same information.

Will presented satellite maps of the shooting range from 1951 and 1994. He wasn't positive about the years. He said former local game warden Bob Terrell started the range and always called the land a perfect pocket for a shooting range. The range was promoted in the 1970s as a way to move shooters out of national forest and BLM land. He presented a slide of questions that CPW must consider in its decision making.

Will then presented a list of questions paraphrased from the first meeting. He read the questions and repeated the answers CPW provided at the previous meeting. When he got to a question about adding a range safety officer, he said the privately managed side of the range always had officers and the CPW-managed side has not but likely will in the future. He mentioned that the kids present at the first meeting are not at this meeting because they're at another range practicing for a shooting competition. Addressing a question about where to shoot while the range is closed, Will said CPW has received calls about people shooting all over local public and private lands. Will clarified that only one other fire has started at the range, in 2012, and that the location of the current range could be used for something else if the range was closed.

Will presented a list of assertions made by participants during the first meeting and addressed some of them. If the range was closed, the land would be managed as wildlife habitat. The range has an environmental stewardship plan like all CPW shooting ranges, and any questions about lead mitigation

would be handled separately from this public meeting process. Shooters do not currently need a license or other requirement to use the range. Hunting and shooting sports provide a huge economic benefit. Alcohol use and impairment are not allowed at the range.

The last slide Will presented was a list of questions submitted in writing from the previous meeting. Will addressed some questions. He wasn't sure why residential development was allowed next to the range and said it probably wasn't the wisest land use planning. CPW is looking at other public lands that could work for a range in the valley. He deferred a question about voting on the range's future to the town of Basalt.

Invited Stakeholder Comments

Shapiro described the stakeholder comment part of the meeting as not a debate but rather a way to present information from people who've been especially engaged on the issue that could help others think about solutions. Each stakeholder representative was given five minutes to speak. The stakeholder comments are not presented as verbatim but rather are lightly paraphrased.

Larry Emery, a Roaring Fork Valley Sportsman's Association (RFVSA) board representative, thanked first responders. At the previous meeting, he said, he spoke about RFSVA's history and benefit to local organizations – including 4H, Boy Scouts, veterans and women's groups, and CPW programs – and 35-year spotless safety record. This meeting, he said he would speak more about efforts to enhance the range experience and safety. He said when the range was established, there were no nearby developments, local communities and governments allowed that development, and people freely chose to move there. In 2012, a fire started at the range that burned a few acres and wasn't caused by shooting but rather a cigarette. CPW closed the facility, did fire mitigation that included creating larger, taller berms and adding vegetation, despite the fire having nothing to do with firearms. The range also was reduced to 100 yards. In 2010, Basalt Town Council passed a resolution about enhancements to the range. The noise mitigation, signage improvements, and reorientation of the trap and skeet shooting platforms that were recommended were completed. Studies by CPW and the town of Basalt agreed that noise levels were within acceptable limits, and CPW partnered with the town of Basalt and Eagle County to install noise mitigation that reduce sounds levels by 10 decibels. The range doesn't have a noise issue, and CPW has been more than a good neighbor about reducing noise, he said. The range noise is only slightly audible at the local schools according to the noise impact studies. RFVSA is dedicated to working with local government and CPW to ensure the shooting facility is safe, and keeping the range closed caused dangerous dispersed shooting behavior that all stakeholders wish to avoid. The safest action is to reopen the range as soon as possible, and the association is more than willing to partner to ensure safe operation.

Stacey Craft, representing the Mid Valley Residents group, said the groups wants the current range to stay closed and relocated as soon as possible because the range has outgrown its current location and is not safe for many reasons. The group is concerned the town of Basalt and CPW are rushing to reopen the range before determining the water and soil impacts of 50 years of accumulated lead waste, which, she said, is more likely to wash downhill because of increased flood risk after the Lake Christine Fire. There haven't been any lead testing results or mitigation reports. Shooting sports are also increasing in popularity and use of the range is increasing, so there's a need for a larger facility that would drive more tourism and provide more economic benefits to the community. Craft referenced prior safety issues that weren't addressed and the group's desire to not be ignored again. The range also doesn't meet CPW's criteria for rifle sighting, and with hunting season coming up, it's vital for hunters to be able to adjust their rifles before each hunt for a specific distance, including 100 and 200 yards. After the 2012 fire, Will

was quoted saying targets were found farther than the 100-yard limit of range. If people are already shooting past 100 yards and want to sight in rifles past 100 yards, it should be important for CPW to find a range location where shooters could sight to 200 yards. She asked why CPW would consider reopening a range that doesn't meet its own criteria. She said all stakeholders could work together to turn the issue into something positive and meaningful. She cited the new Cameo range as a model example with lots of amenities the Basalt range doesn't have including more space and a longer range that make that range more attractive for shooting competitions. An alternative location for the Basalt range doesn't have to be on the same scale as the Cameo range, but sportspeople should demand a world-class shooting facility. The Basalt range has proven to be a hazard multiple times with fire, noise pollution, lead waste, water hazards. Craft said we can continue to band-aid a solution or roll up our sleeves to find a new solution. The solution could be a land swap or finding vacant land. Another community put a range on a defunct coal facility. As the second fire in six years, the Lake Christine Fire should be a wakeup call. The town is constantly updating facilities, and the shooting range should be no different, especially given the population has increased from 500 people to 4,000. Craft concluded that CPW should consider the health and safety of our town, and making decisions before considering those concerns is grossly negligent.

Shapiro thanked the speakers for sharing those perspectives.

Solution Station Activity

Shapiro gave participants instructions for solution station activity and reiterated the goal of diving deeper into the details of proposed solutions. She instructed participants to think about pros and cons, criteria, data and information needs, and partners to engage and to remember that solutions are not mutually exclusive and could potentially apply at a shooting range irrespective of location. Participants should then post their ideas and read others' posts to try to avoid repeating ideas. She also encouraged participants to ask questions, listen, and talk with others at the meeting about ideas. Now is the time to bridge divides in understanding, she said. Participants could go to the stations of their choosing and stay at one station for the entire hour if they desired. CPW staff members would be at each station to help draw out specific ideas. She read aloud the eight solution stations on the agenda and said participants would have about an hour before the meeting's official end time to rotate around the stations.

After the meeting, she said, all the ideas and comments would be compiled by Keystone Policy Center and submitted to CPW in a final report about the public meeting process. She described the solution stations:

1. **Location** – specific options, criteria
2. **Interim operations strategy** – criteria for reopening, temporary hours/days of operations, alternative locations for interim access
3. **Rules and operation** – signage, fees, limited hours, types of firearms/ammunition allowed, private-public management partnership
4. **Supervision, enforcement, education** – video, volunteer or paid range officers, arms and ammo inspection, emergency response, shooter education
5. **Fire mitigation** – fire breaks, berms, soil sterilization, water for firefighting capability, automatic closures during fire restrictions
6. **Noise mitigation** – enclosures (indoor/outdoor), pipe range, firearm/ammo limitation, silencers
7. **Interaction with neighboring development** – building codes, community outreach
8. **Community engagement** – task forces and/or other mechanisms community to further exploring, refining, evaluating and/or implementing proposed solutions

Following her description of the activity's structure and goals, Shapiro answered questions:

- Ideas at each station should be focused on long-term solutions apart from Station #2 Interim Operation Strategy.
- Participants would not reconvene to summarize the activity because of lack of time and the large number of participants, but the comments would be included in a report for CPW.
- Keystone Policy Center is contracted by CPW, so the report would be provided to CPW, and then the agency could decide to share the report.

Romatzke also stepped onto the stage to answer questions:

- CPW plans to provide the final report to the town of Basalt before making management decisions about the range. CPW plans to continue working with the town.
- CPW would communicate those decisions through press releases, its website, and possibly more meetings.
- CPW wants to consider input from the meetings before deciding on a timeline. The timeline would also need to factor in finances and partnerships that CPW needs to consider further.
- If Stage 2 fire restrictions continue, CPW will rely on local fire districts and sheriff's offices recommendations and will close the range if those partners advise that action. Firearms are still legal to use on public lands during fire restrictions.
- Other CPW managed ranges are available for people to use while the Basalt range is closed. CPW can't speak specifically about private ranges, such as the South Canyon range, but those may be available as well.
- The legal authority of a range safety officer at the Basalt range is as yet undetermined. Funding a paid RSO could take more than a year. CPW ranges have been operating safely without RSOs for more than 100 years, but CPW would like to have some kind of supervision at the range to promote safety.

Participants then dispersed to post comments and questions at the solutions stations and engage with CPW staff and other meeting participants – *Comments and questions are synthesized below beginning on the next page.*

Closing Remarks

Romatzke thanked participants for attending the meeting, engaging with CPW staff, and providing input.

Synthesis of Feedback from Meeting #2 Solution Stations

All participant feedback provided via post-it note or comment card is provided below. Comments have been transcribed as written with the exception of removal, where it occurred in rare instances, of personal contact information or of expletives. Comments have been transcribed to the categories of flipchart headings or sub-headings to which they were originally posted with the exception, in rare instances, of comments that clearly applied to a different category or heading. At each station, participants were also invited to provide their contact info if interested in contributing to future discussions on the particular topic; to protect participant privacy, this information has been provided separately to CPW.

Station 1: Location

Specific options (with pros and cons as applicable)

- Current Location
 - Temporary open range immediately for hunting season. Check our gravel pit for location.
 - The Basalt range has never been safer from fire!! Open it now!! (Please)
 - Keep it where it is.
 - Pros to current location: Centrally located in valley, already in shooting configuration with minimal wildlife impact, proximity to first responders in Basalt and good cell service, fuels have been burned up for short term.
 - We should leave it in the established location. Much investment has been committed and improvements can be made to enhance.
 - Keep the range where it is. It is easily accessible for many community members and can quickly be accessed in emergency situations.
 - Leave as is but much needed attention to usage and noise mitigation required. Look at WY culvert tyres to eliminate “miss” fire.
 - Add length to range by digging into hill and utilize standing burnt dead to retain dirt.
 - Location is fine. It has been clearly improved. An automatic weapon can be zeroed as 25 to 100 yards.
 - Keep it where it is. It works and has become safer and has been improved. CPW is showing great responsibility.
 - Keep it where it's at! It's well located in the valley so everyone can use it.
 - It's safe as is.
 - Keep in current location. It's safe, convenient for all users.
 - Leave at current location and: utilize RSOs (volunteer to start), utilize excavators in valley to increase berms and create larger back and top, install fire hydrant from 2 Rivers Road to range, use styrofoam to add sound block at shooting stands.
 - Leave the range where it is. Real estate is very expensive in this valley! Does Basalt have any.... Locations?
 - Current range is great asset and provides great economic benefit to Basalt.
 - Keep it where it is.
 - Keep it where it is!!
 - Leave the range where it is. Improve berm height and sand backstop.
 - Reopen soon. Work towards a long-term plan, safer, etc. Keep it where it is.

- The present location is probably the safest around for many miles. The only other possibility is out west of Carbondale.
- With improvements to the range, the present location is fine. Close to emergency responders. Mid-Valley location.
- Stay close to emergency help and access. Quick response is important.
- Perfect location - now – mid valley and available to all, welcoming to all.
- It is not safe. Needs to stay closed until due diligence is done. Based on facts.
- New Location
 - Relocate the range away from Basalt. Possibilities: Forest Service land, BLM land, intergovernmental land swaps, gravel pits, landfills.
 - Realistically, where is a viable location in the valley? The Colorado legislature created Sec. 25-12-1906 to ensure established shooting ranges would not be moved by development.
 - Move it to more suitable location!
 - If you move the site, needs to be easy access for everyone. No need for world class indoor.
 - Away from the electrical sub-station! That affects the whole valley. Thousands of acres have been burned. Find an area there.
 - Safe location, away from human habitation and watersheds, that are manned and supervised with permits and gun safety classes.
 - Move it and build a world class bigger range. Preferably indoor.
 - Can a submerged site be developed on the flat top above the lake?
 - Gravel pits that have been reclaimed?
 - Keep any new site away from existing recreational and wildlife areas.
 - As a rifle shooter, I would like to see extended ranges greater than 100 yards.
 - This range can never be safe unless they totally enclose it or move it to create a safer range.
 - It seems that an alternate location option has been discouraged due to lack of private party donating the land. You have explored giving incentive to a landowner (reduced property taxes). Money could be raised easily to make first-class facility. Many nonprofit donors would contribute. Explore this option.
 - Partner and coordinate with Town of Basalt and Eagle, Pitkin, and Garfield Counties to find a different location. Partner with Basalt re: cost of relocation.
 - We need a timeline for the new locations and a timeline for the new location.
 - Needs to be moved to a suitable location for 2018. The range is not used the same as it was in 1960!
 - Relocate. However, set time limit. If no suitable location is found, go full blast for creating world-class range at present location.
 - Move it. It is not up to today's standards.
 - Privately owned. Coal basin area.
 - Please move this range that does not even meet CPW standards!
 - If it has to move we should use our open space and trails
 - Thousands of acres have been burned. Find a place to relocate.
 - Wexner property; Sopris mountain ranch indoor range?
 - Relocate it and allow mountain bikes on Basalt Mountain Road. The fire has caused more destruction than mountain bikes ever could.
- Additional/New Ideas
- Install shotgun & rifle racks on RSFTA buses

- There is a moratorium on all new fire insurance policies. There is also a huge increase in the works for existing policies.
- We don't need to have everything "world class" here in RFV. A lot of people practice to keep up skills for self-defense or hunting. Keep it as is.
- Replant with fire resistant fauna, which will aid in sound mitigation.
- If the range has to move, the Open Space has a lot which we own??
- Obey post laws. Punish criminal activity not law-abiding shooters.
- Stiffer penalties for criminals.
- No smoking at range.
- Think in terms of additional range(s) not replacement.
- Would love to see longer distances ~1000 yards.

Data and information needs

- Timeline for proposed new range development, funding, and will the existing range operate until a new one is functional.
- How is location going to help fire problems?
- Picture showing development around range 40 years ago and now is irrelevant. Given path of recent fire, should include El Jebel, Willits, Missouri Heights. Geographic breakdown of attendees of meetings, please.
- New location to be able to handle traffic so as not open up another area to cars and unneeded traffic.
- Why no mention of other areas and counties? I did not hear El Jebel, Missouri Heights, or Carbondale. I view only scorched. How far is considered reasonable to travel to another shooting range?
- *Someone posted a letter from Bobbi Hapgood, Crystal Ranch Corp. manager, that read: "Thank you for your inquiry regarding usage of the Crystal Ranch Corp.'s Powers Pit for a shooting range. While we appreciate your predicament in needing a new location, we do not feel that a shooting range would be the best use of our land, nor would it be a compatible use for the ranch, Powers Art Center, or for the neighbors."*

Criteria for Decisions

- Must serve the entire area not just one town or burden another community. Hint: Basalt is in the middle.
- Propose, locate, build, then and only then, move the range.
- Must have rules. Must have supervision. Must have accountability from users.
- If this location remains, and you determine it's an important and valuable part of Basalt, it must be treated as such!! Otherwise, needs to be relocated to a remote area and supervised during hours it's open!
- Convenience #1. No long drives. Close to Mid-Valley as possible. Keep it local. Old range should not be closed before the new one is operational.
- Funding from users.
- Funding private vs. public. Come together. Find a solution. Current location should be considered temporary only. New site needs to space for distance and space for growing use to park. Enclosed/underground to mitigate noise.
- If a new location was determined, the current range needs to remain open with current hours and operation.
- If relocation is the outcome, a minimum 200-yard lane is needed. 300 yards preferred.
- Old range should be closed until new one is operational.

- Due to importance of range (economic benefits to guides, outfitters, local businesses, hotels, restaurants), it should be opened immediately and run until a new location is constructed and opened. Range is only public range within 1.5 hours of Aspen. Needs to be centrally located.

Partners

- Partners: Town of Basalt, Eagle County, Pitkin County, Users
- If the range has to move, we have Open Space and Trails which could help???
- Funding options: How did Cameo do it? Other organization participation? DU (Ducks Unlimited)
- Partnering with Pitkin County or Eagle County Open Space.

Station 2: Interim Operation Strategy

Specific options (with pros and cons as applicable)

- Temporary days/hours
 - 7 days / 9 a.m. to dusk
 - Resume hours as pre-fire. Pro: get economy moving again, give hunters place to practice.
 - Normal operation as the hours were already reduced from previous agreement.
 - Try to keep range open as any hours as possible to avoid crowding. Crowding is a definite safety hazard!
 - Open the range now, normal hours.
 - Open only after restrictions lifted. Open 3 days per week, 4 hours per day. Mandatory supervision CPW. Coordinate with fire department for coverage while open. Require registration of any user.
 - Reopen 7 days, same hours, volunteer range officer.
 - Hours need to reflect workers' schedule (like now). Limited hours concentrate use and make usage less safe or push users into public lands.
 - Open range and have hours daily done in block -- early am then break, noon then break, evening then break -- three hour intervals with limited bench time per person (maybe have fire truck on site during shoot)
 - Open 7 days a week. Less concentrated shooting. More opportunities for busy schedules. Do not wish to travel as more highway traffic.
 - Operate during Stage 2 during hours of higher humidity or post-precipitation events when moisture levels are safe.
 - Gun club organize their members to monitor gun range while still at this location. Hours available would determine hours of range.
 - Days and hours: Sunday -- Saturday, 9 a.m. -- 6 p.m. or dusk.
 - Paid range officer. RFVSA membership 1) long guns, pistols 2) shotgun sports members have longer hours to pay for range officer. Public shorter hours.
 - Hours: 11 a.m. -- 7 p.m., 7 days a week. Limited the hours to business hours doesn't allow everyone a chance to use.
 - Don't change anything! One illegal act should not dictate the future of a very safe range.
 - Stage TOB fire tanker at rifle range during sight-in days.
 - Staff resource officer. Keep the range open.
 - When a fire is caused by a camper or backpacker, do we restrict or close trails? Do we put up video surveillance on trails? Do we require their gear to be inspected? No, we reopen the area when the fire is over. Please re-open this range.

- For the safety of hunters and wildlife, sighting in is critical. Rifle is too far away, and Glenwood is not convenient for out-of-state visitors. Open range with RSO.
- Conditions too dry to open range. More info needed and better safety regulations installed.
- No info needed. It's our rights to bear arms and practice our sports without any personal info.
- Paid range officer with law enforcement authority. Open ASAP.
- Open range now. Use certified RSOs from valley to supervise (volunteer). Have firetruck, gator, water tank on site to manage fear of fire.
- Reopen ASAP to keep target shooting out of recreational areas like Crown and Dinkle.
- Open the range now. The longer it is closed, the less chance it will ever be opened. Open it and regain the upper hand in negotiations.
- Fire suppression. Fuel mitigation. BTW fire did that.
- Con - Keeping it closed create shooters going into open space. Pro - Open ASAP to allow practice.
- Short term opening with long term solution? How much will all this cost? How much has state got now? Raise money!!! Until then -- keep it closed!
- Open the range with supervision. Post rules on sign.
- Open range then look to placate people who moved to a shooting range and want to close it.
- Pro to reopening: range is ready to go, fire danger is down, range operates safely.
- Available fuel is minimal at this time. Reopen range immediately.
- Reopen soon with goal of working towards a long-term plan.
- Alternative locations
 - Get a user friendly agreement for hunters to use South Canyon for sighting ASAP please.
 - Pros: Keep the noise down. Cons: Where?
 - Alternative location con: Time! Construction is not realistic.
 - Keep range open until alternate solution ready to go.
 - The cost to relocate can be applied to improving the current range. I don't agree with relocating.
 - Mid-Valley location to satisfy needs of entire valley population.
 - Alternative location should be convenient not some long drive. Any relocation should be completed first before the current range is closed.
 - Keeping same location due to infrastructure investment. Improve sound mitigation.
 - Alternate - long-term focus needs to be on "now"
 - Higher berms
 - Keep open until new range is created and opened
 - Will LC be left open if determine to move while being built?
 - Sec. 25-12-1906 of the Colorado Revised Statutes provides protection for established ranges. Keep it where it is and provide range officers and fire suppression.
 - Outgrowing current location. Time to put effort into finding new location. With the number of gun enthusiasts, one must have the needed connection.
- Additional/New Ideas
 - A huge increase in fire insurance is in the works. If the range is opened again, the increase will be much higher.
 - Video feed into Basalt dispatch.
 - Video monitoring. Apex? Dispatch?

- Ask for RFVSA staff or range safety officers to monitor public rifle and pistol on the weekends.
- Open range. Short-term 30 min before shooting have BFD come and spray down range to address fire concern.
- Open existing. Look for second range not a replacement!

Data and information needs

- 1) Independent study if there is a lead problem due to the potential mudslide. 2) Interim - close until a) full-time supervised b) study of environmental and health hazards c) intergovernmental partnership
- What provisions will be made so that homeowners won't continue to live in fear of another fire?
- Range should remain at the same location until any other suitable location is found.
- Liability for volunteer range officers.
- JT - This is the reminder to create a website with a fact sheet.
- If range is closed, where are preferred alternatives.
- Qualifications for range officer. What is needed?
- Do not collect permanent data on users. This can and will be used against us.
- Do not reopen temporarily until lead studies and mitigation have been completed.

Criteria for decisions

- Volunteer range officers.
- Money in the immediate is required to mitigate any concerns.
- All ideas of reduced hours, supervised, manned, and permit required with drivers license ID, certification in gun they are using.
- Hours of operations and supervision of who and what shot.
- No change in hours.
- Needs to stay closed until all data is collected. Lead studies most important!
- All the ideas you presented were good: reduced hours, supervised always, license required, remains locked.
- Supervision at all times, including inspection of weapons. Strict adherence to recommendation of fire authorities.

Partners

- NRA, RMGOA
- Sportsman Alliance, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Ducks Unlimited, Colorado Trappers Association
- RSVSA and private entities will provide staff and training for RSOs. There is enough volunteers to staff, and range could open immediately.
- CPW, local law enforcement, fire departments, town of Basalt

Station 3: Rules and Operations

Specific options (with pros and cons as applicable)

- Fees
 - We already pay a fee by Pittman tax on all firearm/ammo. No additional fee should be started.

- No fees. Individuals pay through hunting/fishing license. Possible fee for special events, groups events.
- Why would the general population pay a fee to use the range when there is free use of federal lands immediately available?
- No fee
- Fees will discourage use of the range. Funding can come from other sources.
- No fees. No weapons inspections. Proper attitude. Lead don't push.
- Con: Fees will push many users onto public lands
- No fees -- as it has been fine for years financially
- No fee. We pay 11 percent already.
- No fee
- No fees. No personal information for use of range.
- \$10-15 range fee use will help support cost of upkeep and range officers.
- Could we have a land use fee again (hunter safety stamp) that would be required for use at range.
- Fees and hunter education cards. Certification in specific gun in use.
- Fees: Cover cost of insurance for incident such as fire, Cover cost of supervisor who would manage trained volunteers.
- Pay to play
- "Pay to play:" No more free riders, people using public lands, leaving lead waste behind for us to deal with
- Fees -- Yes, especially if state doesn't appropriate funds.
- Fees need to be reasonable of course, but people must pay for range use.
- A certified range supervisor is good. Inspection of arms and ammo. Funding through fees.
- Gate locked with card access. Must be certified and pay a fee!!!
- Charge a fee to maintain the range and improvements to the range.
- Require hunter ed cards or equivalent
- Inspection of weapons upon entry.
- Check in with resource officer. Check out with resource officer.
- Range safety card (a la hunter safety)
- Drivers license checks. Safety officer at all times. Firehoses installed like Gypsum range.
- It's inevitable there will be illegal uses. If this location remains 2,000 feet from downtown, it must be supervised during hours it's open. Otherwise shut it down!
- Open 7 days a week. Less consolidation. More opportunities.
- CPW has challenges keeping Reudi boat ramp open. Where will this money for staffing a range officer come from?
- Be careful about collecting personally identifying information: identity theft, firearm theft, etc.
- Public/private management
 - Have a range safety officer -- whether paid or volunteer -- present during all operating hours.
 - RFVSA will help provide management on a volunteer basis with need to enforce current rules as we have a spotless 35-year record.
 - Paid range officer ASAP with law enforcement authority.
 - Staffing at all times.
 - Must be staffed at all times.
 - Mandatory sign in-sign out. Follow firearms safety certification requirements.

- Public video monitoring.
- Range operator: If they do not have power to put them off range, give them radio or number to contact someone with power, such as police, to do so.
- Provide range officers at all hours of operation, bring water from upper hayfields for fire suppression.
- Limited hours. Must present ID. Supervised by CPW at all times. No automatic weapons. Clearly posted rules. No alcohol consumption at range.
- Open it!
- Needs fire suppression system
- Regional facility that needs to be opened.
- Signage
 - Sign in and sign off on rules that “must” be followed.
 - Easy -- Put up signage as needed.
 - Could we have a “skier responsibility” like contract/agreement required before use could occur
- Firearms/ammo
 - Allow 54 cal muzzleloaders to shoot. Currently a 50 cal restriction!
 - So are you going to build a bigger range for sighting in rifles?
 - Restrict gun to only those allowed by state for hunting
 - There are not that many fully automatic (or select fire) firearms around. (They are legal to own.) However, if they are excluded from the range, one option is to go out into public lands to fire them.
 - Restrict A/R type rifles to specific days and times.
 - Keep current regulations.
 - No automatic weapons. No incendiary rounds. Supervision is a must.
 - AR-15 rifles are not any more dangerous. No restricting. Restrict and punish criminal activity.
 - Should be able to shoot anything you can own under the law!
 - Public info campaign against tracers and incendiary rounds.
 - No restrictions beyond current CPW regulations.
- Hours
 - Reduced hours and manned gate
 - Woody Creek residents complained about shooting noise from police range. Their hours M-F 9-noon only.
 - Hours of operation: M-Sat 10-6, Sun closed. Con: Closing on Sunday would make Saturday very congested and busy. Pro: Gives neighbors a break on noise.
 - Reduced hours. Supervised always.
 - Short term -- Opening hours should be two days a week, 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Long term -- Can have days and hours after relocation.
 - Temporary hours: MWF 7:30-5, Sat 9-3, Sunday closed.
 - The more hours are restricted the more people moving to public land to shoot.
 - The hours have already been restricted. No further reduction of hours.
 - Hours have been reduced already to accommodate noise abatement. Range gets congested the more hours or days are cut.
 - Hours have been compromised previously. Hours should remain the same.
 - The greater the restriction on hours the more it pushes use to public lands and makes range more crowded and potentially less safe.
 - Keep range open as many hours as possible. Crowding is a definite safety hazard.

- Make it so working people can use range.
- Additional/New Ideas
 - Put up some basic flood protection to prevent water/flood spread of debris.

Data and information needs

- Registration/require with photo ID so that we know who uses the range and how many people use it. Require for temporary and after relocation.

Criteria for decisions

- Do what is good for all residents not Basalt residents only.
- No matter the options, all require money.

Partners

- NRA & RMGOA
- People whose houses increase in value should pay a tax to the extent their property increases because of limits on range.
- RFVSA partners and members are willing to volunteer time in any capacity to expedite the reopening of the range in a timely fashion.
- Sportsmans Alliance, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Ducks Unlimited, Colorado Trappers Association

Station 4: Supervision, Enforcement, Education

Specific options (with pros and cons as applicable)

- Supervision - general
 - Do not have RSO's collect fees/\$\$\$. They need to focus on range safety. Fund them through hunting license/habitat stamp fees.
 - If CPW is not capable of providing supervision make the range private.
 - Must have paid Range Officer on site at all times the range is open. This was requested in 2010. If this had implemented, this would not be here today.
 - There is no con for a range officer. There should be limited hours. Emergency response must be improved.
 - My suggestion is that if supervision in the form of a range officer must be in place that he possess a level of authority where he can not be disregarded in his duties.
 - Full time supervision
 - Must be supervised all hours that the range is open! If CPW need assistance with funding, user fees should be implemented. Do not open until it's supervised!
 - Range officer present for all shooting - bring water to the ranges for fire suppression
 - At times the shooting is rowdy - sounds like a bunch of kids unloading their guns as fast as possible. Supervision needed.
- Range officers - paid/CPW
 - Supervision most important, funded by town, county, Go Colorado, Gun Club, CPW
 - No \$ for range officer unless Town of Basalt would like to subsidize it (A reminder that skeet and trap already always has an RSO)
 - If the Town of Basalt wants a range officer, they can pay for it.
 - Supervision by CPW at all times; coordinate with Eagle Sheriff and Basalt Police for enforcement

- A new person is not always easy to get funded. Sounds good until you ask the legislators for more money.
- Range officers - volunteer
 - Volunteer RSOs: absolute authority to eject attendees/shooters; certified; staff range designated hours (e.g. Fri-Sun); able to use range at other times if RSO and taking responsibility; liability protected by CO
 - Volunteer RSO's could be scheduled tomorrow with the assistance of RFVSA
 - Volunteer Range Safety Officers can still be effective with limited authority. The current location allows for quick backup response time when needed.
 - Have a public person be covered as a volunteer so they don't get sued.
 - Full backing and protection against lawsuits from CPW
- Shooter education
 - Require a Hunter Ed card or equivalent firearm training course card.
 - If you can afford to target shoot, you can afford a \$10 ticket to pay for better safety
 - Requires - whatever gun is, you need certification
 - Provide a test to get on the range. Once passed give a pass like our bus passes.
 - More graphic and clear signage w/ worst infractions highlighted
 - Encourage education and training; everyone become a steward by leadership.
 - Offer classes at the range
 - Online classes or hunter safety card - clear to shoot or w/someone qualified if beginner, not card
 - Provide training (online and classes) give out cards that show proof of competition (like hunter safety) that show you have proper knowledge to be at range
- Video
 - Wireless cameras to sheriff department
 - Live feed video from range to fire/police 24 hours/7 days a week
 - Video monitoring
 - Video might prevent abuse
 - Video feed directly to Basalt and Eagle Dispatch
 - Update video and make it accessible
- Arm/Ammo inspection
 - Ammo inspection would avoid abuse
 - Cons: who will inspect? Are they qualified? Will violator willingly show forbidden ammo?
- Sign-in and registration
 - Photo ID required and proof of that the person shooting owns the gun. Ammo inspection also.
 - Registration required before anyone can use range.
 - Con- Personal info. It has been proposed that everyone needs to provide personal data to use the range, phone # and age, DL #. That is sensitive info. Who has access, how is it stored, for how long, how is it protected. Is it even effective?
 - Con - sign in data - it has been proposed
 - Be careful of information leakage/liability of video feed of people; logging license #'s, etc.; id theft/burglary
 - Do not create a registry or database of users. 1st step to taking away guns.
- Additional/New Ideas
 - No commercial outfitter
 - [Video, arm/ammo inspection] Yes! Yes! And Yes!

- Too many nanny ideas. Laws are the glue society.

Data and information needs

- How many people use the gun range? Does range have any info on shooters?
- Provide list of certified trainers on website; state certify trainers

Criteria for decisions

- Funding private sector vs. public: Who is going to pay \$\$

Partners

- School districts; inform people who want to be informed; allow young people of our area to be educated about firearm safety and techniques
- Pay to play
- NRA and RMGOA
- RMGOA, NRA
- Rocky Mountain Eld Foundation
- Ducks Unlimited
- Sportsman's Alliance
- Safari Club International
- Colorado Trappers Association
- Town of Basalt funding
- RFVSA and members are willing to partner to provide training of staff and volunteer to provide anything necessary for enforcement and education

Station 5: Fire Mitigation

Specific options (with pros and cons as applicable)

- Closures during fire restrictions
 - Automatic closure of range - Level 2 fire restriction - NOT have to wait for CPW permission to close. YES!
 - Respect fire level closures. Be subject to closure when deemed advisable by local law enforcement and fire protection officials. Basalt Fire on notice any time range is open.
 - Closure during fire restrictions is always a good idea it is respectful. YES!
 - Range operation to coincide with State guidelines to keep activity in safer location (range) when danger is higher
 - Closure of the range under fire restrictions should only be put in place if all other ranges in the state of Colorado are shut down under same circumstances
 - As a shooter, if firearms are banned during a fire ban, then close the range. Stage 3? (public can go on public lands to shoot for stage 2).
 - Stage 2 does not prohibit the firing of firearms. If the state does not shut down neither should we.
 - Stage 1 and 2 don't require closure used properly can remain open. Again use of illegal ammo cause loss of paid income.
 - If the range is closed during fire restriction, people will go right to state land to shoot. Stage 2 does not prohibit discharge of a firearm.
 - Fire danger is a reality throughout the valley - especially when people are arsonists. Are we focused on something unpreventable?

- The problems is there are people who make bad decisions
- Fire breaks, berms, sterilization
 - Sterilization- yes. Berms -yes. Fire breaks -yes. Other backstop technologies out there?
 - Larger berms; enclosing range/or rooftop; clearcut
 - Talk to local excavator to get volunteer work for berms, backstop and potentially dig lower
 - Use standing burnt dead trees to make larger, taller backstop at range and uphill
 - Camp fires go out when the fuel is gone. Sounds like the fire did that. Open!
 - Overhead beams that restrict the trajectory of shots from the fire line and maintain an outdoor range instead of indoor.
 - Put sand in the back, concrete the rest.
 - Are there 'eco' grants available to help with costs of sterilization (Aspen Ski Co?)
 - Keep the range where it is and make it so vegetation does not grow there.
 - Softer, bigger berms
 - Increase berms
 - Agree with soil sterilization
 - Remove all flammable foliage; build up end of range behind targets
 - Facilitate brush and vegetation management with volunteers and local interests.
 - Bigger berms
 - Plant fire resistive fauna such as aspen trees. Will also assist with noise mitigation
 - Basic protections at cost-effective prices may be worthwhile.
 - On-site water tank.
 - Remove grass. Add sand backstops. Add fire pumps
 - Add shed so not able to shoot 200 yards.
 - East to do - remove brush; cover with rock and sand. Controlled burn at RFVSA
 - Larger berms, enclosing range/rooftop on range, clearcut range
 - Share lead test results
- Water for firefighting capability
 - Pipe water down from above and fill a large water tank. And possibly partner with the town on the construction and use of a water tank.
 - Purchase and distribute fire extinguishers around range. Shovels could also be placed.
 - Add fire hydrant from lower road; have water tank filled from hydrant; install sprinklers and run every 'x' hours during ops
 - Bring water down from the upper hayfields to the ranges for fire suppression!
 - Could a simple above ground irrigation system be considered?? Around the perimeter of the 'danger zone'?
 - Bring water from ditches above the range
 - Cost/benefit analysis? Is this needed/worth it? Don't spend money needlessly.
 - There seems to be little info available on how much water is available for fire protection - need to publicize this.
 - Rather than fixed water tank/pump, utilize a truck/trailer as a water pump source.
 - Stage Town of Basalt fire tanker at the rifle range during site in day
 - Build water tank for Basalt water storage with pipe to range
- Additional/New Ideas
 - Hunting season campers will be setting campfires as no way to monitor. Educate at gun ranges!! This dry season above and beyond.
 - Limit where firearms can shoot via buffers; therefore, no risk
 - Pay to play!

- Require full fire suppression system.

Data and information needs

- Yes - weekly update on progress on your website!

Criteria for decisions

- It's all about the money. Everyone can be happy with money.

Partners

- Public and private sector must come together to solve financial problem
- Manufacturers guns and ammo; local/non-profit partners 'adopt' a month to subsidize volunteer policy
- State of Colorado state laws on purchasing tracers/incendiary rounds
- Basalt is 'shining star' in instigating the best, safest, totally community-based firing range
- Develop a plan that can present a picture to reach out to industry and other non-profits interest groups
- Will Town of Basalt step up to help fund safety measures? Range officer

Station 6: Noise Mitigation

Specific options (with pros and cons as applicable)

- Enclosures (indoor/outdoor)
 - 1) Cover inside of shooting stands with thick styrofoam (like used for docks) to deaden noise. 2) At shooting stands build backstop behind benches like baseball to direct noise downrange - use standing dead from fire - it's free. 3) Create higher berms (use local excavators, they will donate time and materials). 4) maybe dig floor of range deeper. 5) Again - use the standing burned dead from fire and build wood walls on top of berms to direct sound. 6) Use natural resources- cost effective, engages locals to build and have ownership. 7) INDOORS ARE EXPENSIVE and require big \$. 8) Using metal could reverberate and maybe not help?
 - Create engineered sound attenuation barriers. Plant additional fire resistive fence for sound mitigation. Aspens are natural fire break.
 - Noise baffling covering.
 - Fixed pipe to shoot through; higher berms.
 - Bunkers that are environmentally safe- they do exist! I'm researching!
 - Indoors is safer!
 - Sound proof indoor facility
 - Only way to mitigate noise is to enclose it! Or relocate it!
 - Indoor range puts extreme limits of number of people able to use and is significantly more expensive
 - Con: not with skeet, trap and 5- stand
 - Improve impact area with sand berms to reduce noise
- Pipe Range
 - Culvert - shooting out of OR into
 - Sound traps - shoot thru 'silencer'
 - Not a bad idea but very expensive. How to get targets downrange? Less safe w/other shooters unable to see downrange.

- Silencers
 - Doesn't this require a federal permit? And cost \$ (class III, \$200 one time)
 - Price - over \$500, federal tax stamp \$200, wait time for approval is 6 months to over a year
 - Requires additional license and information on person applying
 - Encourage suppressor ownership (no such thing as a silencer). Mufflers for firearms - your car has one.
 - Encourage the use and purchases of suppressors - join the American Suppressor Association.
 - Educate yourself about the Hearing Protection Act - suppressors
 - Encourage suppressors
 - Silencers are good.
 - Pro- silencers. But they cost a lot.
 - When 'sighting on' a hunting rifle does a silencer affect accuracy?
 - Legal and good solution.
 - Noise mitigation has been done look at the data below decibel level
 - Please support the HPA Hearing Protection Act that would allow sound suppressors to be bought like firearms currently they are strictly regulated by NFA.
- Firearm/Ammo limitation
 - No automatic or semi-automatic weapons; supervision is needed to stop this
 - Automatic are already banned at the range
 - Keep current rules of types of firearms allowed.
 - 50 cal. Restrictions
 - Temp 1-2 months hunting ammo and firearms only
 - Foam ear plug stands in Basalt
 - Sound proof range; no automatic weapons; limit hours of operation; no Sunday opening
- Additional/New Ideas
 - Colorado State Statute states a gun range cannot be closed due to noise - look it up
 - Continuous noise monitoring www.enrgconsultants.com
 - If people absolutely object to any noise, no mitigation would help
 - Further noise mitigation is needed
 - When we shoot it makes noise. If you don't like it buy ear plugs.

Data and information needs

- Open range begin study ASAP through December '19 to learn: when shooting occurs, how long, how loud, w/sensors at BES, BMS, BHS, City Market, Ceboose in Basalt to record 'noise' impact (needs to measure shots and other ambient noise to have data vs. opinion of 365 24/7 opinions. Also can do specific tests to rule out ambient noise via synchronization/or with time stamped video to noise recorded. Please, let's seek data vs. opinions to address concerns (whether real or opinion).
- I taught at the middle school for years and the noise was not significant. Students knew hunters were practicing and were not traumatized.
- Need to change abatement level by/in state law. Then we need to comply w/new regs.

Criteria for decisions

- It's all about the money; everyone could be happy. Private and public sector have to come together for funding solutions.
- Noise does currently travel and is disturbing.

- I live in town and I hear this noise everyday. It's not just the subdivisions near the range.
- Should DIA move because people moved out there because businesses popped up? Not so much.
- What is considered an acceptable level of noise for the people of the town? When already making less noise than exhaust breaks on the highway.
- At what point does the noise become the right level?
- Read the law on noise abatement. Ranges are exempt from normal government interference.

Partners (blank)

Station 7: Interaction with Neighboring Development

Specific options (with pros and cons as applicable)

- Building codes
 - N/A - no chance of neighboring development
 - Plant fire resistant fauna to neighboring developments to aid in sound mitigation. Aspen trees as an example.
- Community outreach
 - Sounds to me like 15DB noise reduction (already been done) is pretty good. What more is to be done?
 - Move next to a gun range - don't reasonably expect it to be removed
 - I am a Wilds resident. And don't at all mind the range where it is so long as it is supervised and improved. However, outreach to residents to solicit opinions would be good.
 - Invite neighbors and friends to learn and participate in shooting sports.
 - New homeowners in the vicinity of the 'range' should be 'informed' about the range.
- Additional/New Ideas
 - Keep range open. If some people don't like range move or pay for new range
 - Why all [who are complaining] about this range contribute some of your own money to get the changes you want?
 - Keep range open. limit the population

Data and information needs (blank)

Criteria for decisions

- Funding \$\$\$ where is it going to come from
- Funding should be from state CPW

Partners

- Real estate agents. Title companies. They should be clear in their disclosures.

Station 8: Community Engagement

Specific options (with pros and cons as applicable)

- Structure
 - Small focus groups. 1 or 2 times a year to relay to the town what going on in the shooting, hunting, etc.
- Timeline
 - Timeline - sooner is better. Make this process timely and not let one entity grad this process out when there are needs to be met. Set "x" # of weeks and stick to it. Before hunting season. Don't let drag out seeking 100% ground. My opinion - 2 weeks and implement early/short term solutions. Then do a better study of use #'s, time of say, noise, over a 1 yr period - Jan 1, 19- Dec 31, 19.
 - All facts should on presentation in an unbiased fashion based on factual research and before solutions should be discussed as well as reopening.
- Focus
 - Diverse, inclusive, articulate, we are shooting rage is part of the rest of our area, not like East.
 - The entire debate about the gun range is centered on a cultural divide. Locals are raised with guns and new residents and 2nd home owners from urban areas are raised in an environment, where their only exposure to guns is with criminals, thus their default position is fear and they don't want to live somewhere where they are scared.
 - (arrow to the above comment) CON - this is an education and training issue.
 - Laws such as those broken are not suggestions - they're the law.
 - Weekly focus meetings with Stacy's group, Larry's group, JT and local law enforcement to come up with shot and long term solutions to making a new Basalt Range the flagship range of the state.
- Additional/New Ideas
 - Basalt residents should have priority in task groups as they are affected the most since the range is in their town.
 - CPW Please . . . take input from Basalt, celebrate your history of accommodating their requests AND public land is for all, not one group, there is a greater community then just fire impact, seek data to make points and decisions, not opinions. Be an active part of Basalt process and meetings AND this affects Basalt AND surrounding communities. Earlier communication of meetings is helpful. Post on main CPW page - easy to find.
 - Gun range belongs to all Colorado residents - NOT JUST BASALT.

Data and information needs

- There are 4 thousand people in Basalt City limit 6 thousand who live within 3 miles but out of town. Include all
- 1. Work as a team with all agencies, 2. Return phone calls promptly to all agencies - 5 days later not one of reported 3 calls were returned to CPW, 3. Open communication. Planning meeting was surely one sided with Larry Emery allowed but not the town, 4. Communication needed. Update on Aug. 21 meeting for those who were unable to attend, 5. 8 locations for solution input from 6:30 - 8:00 is fine but no group awareness of all 8 groups. Why not have 5 mins from each of the 8 groups? 6. 2 meetings were publicized. At meeting 8/28 we heard criticism of tomorrow's meeting. Tonight we hear CPW state this is just the beginning of these meetings. State such to the media, no wonder town is acting quickly. 7. Respond to offers to volunteer in the realm of communications. Provide training to those who will return calls. 8. Speakers from

CPW need to communication as through their decisions have not already been made. Listen to the recording.

- What was the geographic breakdown of the attendees at these two meetings?
- Didn't see any residents from Wilds, El Jebel, Blue Lake. Examine attendance of two meetings might be helpful for setting up future meetings.

Criteria for decisions

- Do not put anti-gun people on the board.
- There are more people affected that are not in the Town of Basalt who are NOT represented by the town.
- Only immediate residents of Basalt and areas affected by fire should be on a task force.
- Rocky Mountain gun owners, local gun shops, local expert shooter, me.

Partners

- Basalt Firearms
- Basalt "voices" not being heard. As a resident of Basalt I am so sick of them saying "if you do not open the range, now, we will shoot in the woods"
- Eagle County Commissioners should be involved.
- I didn't get listening to the presentation that CPW supports moving it. It felt like the same old/same old.
- Timeline - no opening until we have a list of improvements and how much each improvement will cost. Long term solution. How long? No mention of time. Call the NRA and partner.
- The McKenny Group - we specialize in bringing "people, places and funding together" for the benefit of all involved.
- REVSA and members are willing to partner and provide input on task forces.
- I did not see CPW as willing to relocate it.

General Comments (Comment Cards)

- It is criminal not to close gun ranges during severe drought conditions. Just look up to see the consequences. There are people who don't read signs, don't play by the rules and make bad decisions. More supervision is essential.
- The range has been here before the developments, all of the 'safety' concerns are really noise complaints. A good point brought up is the fact that 100 yards is not ultimately sufficient for long gun sighting. One solution, relocate only the long gun part to a location where sighting to 400 yards is possible. It would need less land, less capital expense for land, etc., plus you are relocating the very loud long gun mitigating some noise propagation from Christine range. Keep the handgun and shotgun ranges at Christine. Public safety will be higher with only handgun and shotgun plus noise mitigation (tunnels, soundproof shooting stations) will be easier to create and design, and moving the long gun will lessen the real loud loads.
- Stay focused on the issue at hand: fire mitigation. The only reason the town of Basalt should be involved is because of the fire risk. The governor and congressmen and women are not interested in who bought next to a shooting range without any consideration for noise. CPW has already capitulated to the town on sound mitigation. Sound didn't start the fire. Move on.
- It's frustrating that people who are opposed to this range are coming up with every single little thing as to why the range can't reopen, even temporarily. The reason this range was closed was because of the fire. There have been numerous solutions proposed for fire mitigation, all of

which have been agreed upon to work and could be implemented within a reasonable time range to re-open the range much sooner rather than later.

- Non profit formed to managed paid and volunteer range officers.
- Why should we lose our gun range because of two irresponsible idiots? Moving the range will take time and money. Please keep the range where it is. Add higher berms and a volunteer safety officer. We need our gun range! Please keep it free and safe as it has been for years.
- I feel that staffing the range with Range Safety Officers may cost more than it's worth. Range is open 7 days a week and is not closed for holidays. Create a program that proves individuals are proficient and capable of operating safely.
- From one that uses the range more often, I would like to see the rifle range increase to 200 yards.
- Card activated electronic gate. Cards to be issued by CPW to: those meeting application requirements. Novice shooter required to show proof of shooter safety, ammo, range safety class, etc.
- The McKenney Group, located in Basalt, is a modern consulting company specializing in 'bringing people, places, ideas and funding' together for the benefit of all involved. I am very interested in offering my skills to further this process.
- What was the geographic breakout of attendees for these two meetings. Just a breakdown of the sign-in sheets would be fine.
- Thank you for the opportunity. We will get there!
- *[the following is all one comment card]* Communication concerns:
 - Reportedly there was a phone call message to CPW from another agency about closing shooting range. Unreturned call June 29; still unreturned June 30; still unreturned July 1; still unreturned July 2; still unreturned July 3 as of 5:50 pm fire.
 - Reportedly there were two phone messages to CPW from another agency about closing range. Unreturned July 2; July 3rd as of 5:50 pm fire
 - Offer to volunteer to return calls made to CPW after training has gone without response. Offer was made at 1st Lake Christine Fire meeting July 4 at Basalt HS. Offer was in writing to Perry Will. No response as of August 28
 - Meeting to plan agenda for public input was held at Basalt Library with town and county agencies. One group was barred from attending an agenda setting meeting. Representative, however, supporting groups using the shooting range was allowed to attend. Sounds fishy!
 - No website update on meeting 8/21 comments and presentation.
 - Website update on meeting 8/28 according to Julie Shapiro won't be available for week to 10 days.

Summary of Attendance by Place of Residence

Note: The following data are based upon Basalt SWA Shooting Range Public Meeting Sign-Ins; some attendees did not sign in

Town of Residence	Meeting #1	Meeting #2
Basalt	111	64
Carbondale - including Missouri Heights, Blue Lake, Cerise Ranch	69	39
Aspen	32	20
Glenwood Springs	23	8
El Jebel	13	12
Snowmass/Old Snowmass	10	6
Rifle	9	2
Snowmass Village	4	2
Merideth	3	3
Woody Creek	3	4
Emma	2	3
Grand Junction	2	
Fredericksburg, TX	1	
Meridian, MS	1	
Minturn	1	
Redstone	1	1
Redvale	1	
Fort Collins		1
Gateway Mesa		1
Ruedi		1
Superior		1
Unknown/Illegible		1
Vail		1
Total	286	170

Public Meeting #1 Agenda

Public Meeting #1

Basalt State Wildlife Area Shooting Range
August 21, 7 pm to 9 pm
Basalt High School, 600 Southside Drive

Agenda

Purpose: Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) is hosting two public meetings to provide information, answer questions, listen to suggested solutions, and find common ground with Roaring Fork Valley residents concerned about the future of the Basalt State Wildlife Area Shooting Range.

Schedule:

- 7:00 PM** Welcome, purpose, ground rules, agenda (CPW and Keystone Policy Center (facilitator))
- 7:15 PM** History of the shooting range and management considerations for the future (CPW)
- 7:30 PM** Q/A panel regarding the shooting range and fire with CPW and other agencies/departments
- 8:00 PM** Brief invited stakeholder remarks providing additional factual information and context (2 invited speakers; 5-minute comments)
- 8:10 PM** Public invited to provide verbal suggestions for solutions (time limited – 1 minute each)
- 9:00 PM** Adjourn – continued open opportunity to brainstorm on flipcharts/walls:
- Solutions to address concerns associated with the range
 - Priority issues/concerns associated with range
 - Expectations and suggestions for future process of engaging community
 - Questions participants would like to see addressed at the next meeting
 - Written comments via comment card

Ground Rules:

- Speak and write respectfully; no personal attacks.
- Listen respectfully and empathetically to different points of view.
- Respect time limits to enable others to speak; be succinct when agreeing with prior remarks.
- Promote joint, community problem solving: offer solutions rather than complaints.
- Focus on the topic at hand: solutions for the shooting range. This is NOT about gun rights.
- This meeting is about sharing ideas, not showcasing numbers.
- Speak to interests, not positions.
- Let the facilitators facilitate.

Public Meeting #2 Agenda

Public Meeting #2

Basalt State Wildlife Area Shooting Range
August 27, 6 pm to 8 pm
Basalt High School, 600 Southside Drive

Agenda

Purpose: Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) is hosting two public meetings to provide information, answer questions, listen to suggested solutions, and find common ground with Roaring Fork Valley residents concerned about the future of the Basalt State Wildlife Area Shooting Range.

Schedule:

- 6:00 PM** Welcome, purpose, ground rules, agenda (CPW and Keystone Policy Center (facilitator))
- 6:10 PM** History of the shooting range and management considerations for the future (CPW)
- 6:20 PM** Brief invited stakeholder remarks providing additional factual information and context (2 invited speakers; 5-minute comments)
- 6:30 PM** *Solution stations:* Smaller groups to generate more detailed solution building on various ideas suggested at the first meeting. Each station will brainstorm and engage participants in discussion around:
- Specific options for possible solutions
 - Pros and cons of the options suggested
 - Information/data needs and/or criteria that should be considered for decision-making
 - Partners that need to be engaged
- List of stations and additional instructions provided on page 2 of the agenda*
- 8:00 PM** Closing comments and adjourn

Ground Rules:

- Speak and write respectfully; no personal attacks.
- Listen respectfully and empathetically to different points of view.
- Respect time limits to enable others to speak.
- Promote joint, community problem solving: offer solutions rather than complaints.
- Focus on the topic at hand: solutions for the shooting range. This is NOT about gun rights.
- This meeting is about sharing ideas, not showcasing numbers.
- Speak to interests, not positions.
- Let the facilitators facilitate.

Solution Stations

Each station will include participant discussion and utilize wall charts to capture written details regarding:

- Specific options for possible solutions
- Pros and cons of the options suggested
- Information/data needs and/or criteria that should be considered for decision-making
- Partners that need to be engaged

There will be 5 of rotations of 15 minutes each; participants choose which stations they want go to.

9. **Location** – specific options, criteria
10. **Interim operations strategy** – criteria for reopening, temporary hours/days of operations, alternative locations for interim access
11. **Rules and operation** – signage, fees, limited hours, types of firearms/ammunition allowed, private-public management partnership
12. **Supervision, enforcement, education** – video, volunteer or paid range officers, arms and ammo inspection, emergency response, shooter education
13. **Fire mitigation** – fire breaks, berms, soil sterilization, water for firefighting capability, automatic closures during fire restrictions
14. **Noise mitigation** – enclosures (indoor/outdoor), pipe range, firearm/ammo limitation, silencers
15. **Interaction with neighboring development** – building codes, community outreach
16. **Community engagement** – task forces and/or other mechanisms community to further exploring, refining, evaluating and/or implementing proposed solutions

Public Meeting #1 Slides



Basalt State Wildlife Area
Shooting Range
Public Meeting

August 21, 2018



CO COLORADO
Public and Wildlife
Department of Natural Resources



Basalt SWA
Shooting Range

Management Options
Going Forward



CO COLORADO
Public and Wildlife
Department of Natural Resources



Management Options Provided by the Community

- Keep it open with modifications
- Enclosed indoor
- Enclosed outdoor
- Water available for fire protection
- Manager and range officers (possibly law enforcement to start, then other manager over time)
- Lease of range to private concessionaire
- Improve signage of range rules
- Limit types of firearms used
- Additional fire mitigation measures, with fire breaks, soil sterilization on ranges
- Fee to use range (pay to play instead of free)
- Alternative range site in interim time period
- Video cameras to monitor usage
- Building code discussions for new construction near the range
- Form an advisory council or task force
- Reduced hours
- Automatic closure during fire restrictions
- Inspection of arms and ammo
- Additional noise mitigation
- Moving the range

Questions?



How do we manage a wide variety of thoughts, beliefs, philosophies and ideas?

What is the right thing to do?

Should one group give up a recreational activity because another group does not like it?



Solutions



Should be based on consensus.

We all live here.

We are a community.





Basalt SWA Shooting Range

Management Options
Going Forward



Basalt State Wildlife Area Shooting Range

Public Meeting #1
August 21, 2018



More ways to provide input



Written Comments: In the hallway (ends at 9:30 pm)

Online Comments: cpw.state.co.us
(linked from homepage; open thru end of next week)

Meeting #2: 6pm-8pm Aug. 27 (discussion-based)



Public Meeting #2 Slides



Basalt SWA
Shooting Range

Meeting 2 - Solutions Stations
August 27, 2018



Management Options Provided by the Community

- Keep it open with modifications
- Enclosed indoor
- Enclosed outdoor
- Water available for fire protection
- Manager and range officers (possibly law enforcement to start, then other manager over time)
- Lease of range to private concessionaire
- Improve signage of range rules
- Limit types of firearms used
- Additional fire mitigation measures, with fire breaks, soil sterilization on ranges
- Fee to use range (pay to play instead of free)
- Alternative range site in interim time period
- Video cameras to monitor usage
- Building code discussions for new construction near the range
- Form an advisory council or task force
- Reduced hours
- Automatic closure during fire restrictions
- Inspection of arms and ammo
- Additional noise mitigation
- Moving the range

Questions?



How do we manage a wide variety of thoughts, beliefs, philosophies and ideas?

How do we create solutions that balance the safety and health of residents with the needs of recreational shooting enthusiasts?

Should one group give up a recreational activity because another group does not like it?

What is the right thing to do?



Solutions



**We all live here.
We are a community.**

Questions asked during first meeting (paraphrased):

- How does shooting range fit within CPW's overall mission/mandate? How does range impact wildlife management and conservation, which seems to be CPW's primary mandate?
- How is the range funded?
- If the current range didn't exist, and this valley needed one, would you put it in its current location?
- Are you concerned that closing the range will push people elsewhere and be more dangerous to the general public?
- Have you considered adding a range officer to check ammunition?
- Why wasn't someone checking ammunition in the past?
- What's the total value of the assets currently on the range?
- What is your criteria for opening the range and estimated timeline?
- Is town government considering funding/subsidizing changes at the range?
- What other options do hunters have while range is closed? Where would you like us to shoot while range is closed?

Questions asked during first meeting (paraphrased) (cont'd):


- What properties could the range be moved to in reasonable distance for shooters in Basalt, Rifle, and Aspen?
- Are there any plans for town-hosted meetings or other meetings beyond the two CPW-hosted public meetings? Beyond the meetings, what other mechanisms are being used to seek input and solutions?
- What other fires started at the range, how were they started, and how were they addressed?
- Why is there a need to make changes at the range? Why can't you just open it and continue as before?
- Could we open something for a couple days to calm those down who want to sight guns?
- If moved range, could the current range's location be used for anything else?
- Is there a limit on high-capacity magazines already? Could that limit be increased or reviewed?
- Could a range supervisor position be funded by the same source that funds boat inspections or a similar mechanism?

Assertions made in first meeting that may need clarification:

- Property owners near the range had to sign something that said they were aware of the range and knew it would stay there before they bought their property.
- If the range is moved, its current location can't be used for any other purpose.
- The lead has been accumulating at the range since the 1940s, and no lead mitigation has ever been done, which has negative impacts on wildlife and risks to human health.
- There was a 10-year study on lead impacts that showed no problems.
- Lead impacts to wildlife, ecosystems, and human would be a greater problem if the lead was dispersed rather than concentrated.
- The types of firearms people are using has changed over the last 30 years, and people are using louder weapons more frequently.
- The range used to require shooters be licensed.
- Hunting and shooting sports is a billion-dollar industry in Colorado, and Basalt/the Roaring Fork Valley is the center of that economic activity.
- People can consume alcohol at the range. People can be impaired while using the range.


Questions submitted in writing from first meeting (as written):

- Why did they develop houses so close to an active shooting range?
- Why was residential development allowed so close to the range?
- The public lands consist of millions of acres. Why cant we find a spot for shooters that does not disrupt the peace and harmony of their fellow men and women?
- If not a range – what?
- Is there any law or rule that would be violated by setting up a paper target and table to shoot near Maroon Lake? Shooting would be pointed away from people.
- Why can't Basalt citizens vote on this in November? How are they not insured for these accidents?



Basalt SWA Shooting Range

Management Options
Going Forward



COLOGADO
Department of Natural Resources