

**Public Involvement Summary
April 2006 Open House and Community
Information Meetings Series
Northern Arizona Regional Shooting Facility**

Prepared for:

Arizona Game and Fish Department



Prepared by:



LOGAN SIMPSON
DESIGN INC.

June 2006

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Comments from the April 15, 2006 Open House	2
Comments from the April 25, 2006 Community Information Meeting	3
Comments from the April 27, 2006 Community Information Meeting	4
Comments Submitted Via Email/Website	5
Public Involvement and Meetings Summary	5
Appendix A. Exhibit Boards	A-1
Appendix B. Notification Materials	B-1
Appendix C. Open House Materials.....	C-1
Appendix D. Public Comments from April 15, 2006 Open House.....	D-1
Appendix E. Public Comments from April 25, 2006 Community Information Meeting	E-1
Appendix F. Public Comments from April 27, 2006 Community Information Meeting	F-1
Appendix G. Public Comments Received Via Email/Website.....	G-1

Introduction

The Flagstaff area is the largest community in Arizona without a shooting facility. Many shooting enthusiasts use local cinder pits and other informal sites in the forest for recreational shooting. The law enforcement community also lacks facilities for specialized training; this forces officers to travel to Phoenix for training or use existing shooting areas that provide substandard training opportunities. The Arizona Game and Fish Commission, through the Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD) wants to provide a modern facility to meet the needs of shooting enthusiasts and law enforcement community in a safe, convenient, and managed setting.

The AGFD held a series of meetings for the public to have questions answered and give comments on the proposed Northern Arizona Regional Shooting Facility project location near Willard Springs. The three meetings included an Open House and two Community Information Meetings. The Open House was held on April 15, 2006 from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. in the Fremont Room of the du Bois Center at Northern Arizona University. The format of this meeting was interactive and representatives from AGFD, Logan Simpson Design and the CNF were available to provide information and answer questions. Exhibits included boards showing the planning process; planning area; program elements for rifle, shotgun, archery, pistol, and other facilities; Level I exclusionary criteria; Level I exclusionary areas; user group preliminary locations; Level II and III exclusionary criteria and associated maps; and the preferred location that has been selected by the Commission. Appendix A contains a copy of the exhibit boards.

The Community Information Meetings were held on April 25 and 27, 2006 at from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. in The Showroom at the Pinewood Country Club and in The Canyon Room at Don Hoel's Cabins. Representatives from AGFD and their consultants made a brief presentation about the planning process and the preferred location. The presentation also included general operational aspects including, day-to-day functions, typical programs offered, and types of facilities to be provided with the proposed Northern Arizona Regional Shooting Facility project. The same information was presented at each meeting. The presentation was followed by an open house session so that the public could ask questions and seek detailed information on the facilities and next steps in the planning process for the facility. The same boards that were used at the Flagstaff open house were used at the community meetings with the exception of the few boards from the October 2005 open house.

The public was notified of the Open House and Community Information Meetings by means of newspaper notice, postcard, and press release. Specifically, the newspaper notice was published in the *Arizona Daily Sun* on April 1 and 9, 2006, and also in Sedona, Cottonwood and Camp Verde papers on April 5 and 12, 2006. Postcards were mailed on March 31, 2006, to 4,257 that were determined to be within 2 miles of the approximate boundary of the three primary locations. The mailing list consisted of names and addresses from the mailing list for the first open house meeting in October 2005 and names that had been added at the addressee's request through the website comment form. The property owners within two miles of the project area were identified from census tract information. A press release was faxed on March 31, 2006, to six radio stations and nine newspaper publishers. Appendix B includes a copy of the newspaper notice, postcard, and press release.

An information handout and comment sheet was available at the sign in table for everyone attending the three meetings. The handout discussed the reasons for considering a shooting facility for northern Arizona, the planning process, the preliminary proposed elements for the facility, the process for locating the facility, the preferred location and the next steps. Appendix C includes a copy of the handout and comment sheet. The comment sheet suggested that participants provide information about how they heard about the meeting, and their input regarding

the advantages and disadvantages of the preferred location or any other comments. Participants were asked to return the comment sheet to the comment box before they left the meeting or mail it to the project team within a couple of weeks of each meeting. An individual summary of the information collected at each meeting follows below. Appendixes D-F contain the comment sheets that were submitted by the public during the series of meetings. Also, comments were received via email and the AGFD website. These comments are summarized below and a copy of each is contained in Appendix G.

Comments from the April 15, 2006 Open House

Ninety-five people signed in at the Open House and eighty-four comment sheets were returned. Overall, 77 people are for the proposed plan, three people are against it and four people are undecided. Appendix D includes a copy of the returned comment and sign-in sheets.

The following written comments were submitted (the number of people making the comment is shown in the parentheses following each summarized statement): Some individuals provided more than one comment. Some individuals chose not to comment at the information meeting but provided comments by mail at a later date.

Comments Supporting the Facility Location and Activities

- The location selected is a great enough distance from existing residential areas. (14)
- The location provides easy access based on its proximity to main highways. (27)
- The area selected is a "good location." (35)
- The increased activity brought on by the shooting facilities will encourage economic growth in the area. (2)
- The area has been in need of shooting facilities. (16)
- The facility will provide a good variety of shooting opportunities. (4)
- An organized facility is a good way to maintain trash associated with shooting activities. (5)
- The facility will provide a place for local law enforcement to practice and hold classes. (3)
- The facility will provide a place to hold hunter safety courses. (4)
- The facility should be built in a timely manner due to the need for such services and the problems encountered by similar facilities in the past (Belmont). (12)
- An organized facility is a good way to maintain safety. (8)
- Local establishments and organizations should engage in fundraising activities to expedite the building process. (1)

Comments Regarding Concerns With the Facility Location and Activities

- The location experiences snowfall and dangerous weather during the winter months. (9)
- There is a potential for wildlife disruption and environmental destruction. (4)
- The location is too close to residential areas of Munds Park and will be disruptive. (8)
- There may be a negative impact on shared areas that are used by hikers, horses and others. (2)
- There is a lack of a natural backstop/mountain for high power rifle use. (2)
- The location is still very distant for many people interested in using the facilities. The initiation of several smaller satellite facilities has been suggested. (5)
- The use fees for such a large facility may be intimidating. (1)
- The utility costs for the facility have not been revealed. (1)

- Other locations may be better suited for such facilities; San Francisco Wash, Winnona, Twin Arrows, and Cochrane Hill have been suggested. (7)
- There is a preference that the facility not face south. (1)

Open House Survey Results

A survey regarding the notification of the Open House was included on the comment sheet. In response to the question, "How did you hear about today's Open House?": 19 people saw the newspaper notice, 34 people received a flyer in the mail, 15 people heard a public service announcement on the radio, and 17 people mentioned that they heard about the Open House from some other means. From these 17 people: seven received notice from the National Rifle Association (NRA), six people received an e-mail from either the AGFD, Bill Gow, or an undisclosed source; two people visited the AGFD web site, one person received notification through the Flagstaff Shooting Association.

Comments from The April 25, 2006 Community Information Meeting

Sixty-two people signed in at the Community Information Meeting and forty comment sheets were returned. Overall, 35 people are for the proposed plan and five people are against it. Appendix E includes a copy of the returned comment and sign-in sheets.

The following written comments were submitted (the number of people making the comment is shown in the parentheses following each summarized statement): Some individuals provided more than one comment. Some individuals chose not to comment at the information meeting but provided comments by mail at a later date.

Comments Supporting the Facility Location and Activities

- The location selected is a great enough distance from existing residential areas. (5)
- The location provides easy access based on its proximity to main highways. (6)
- The area selected is a "good location." (21)
- The increased activity brought on by the shooting facilities will encourage economic growth in the area. (3)
- The area has been in need of shooting facilities. (4)
- The facility will provide a good variety of shooting opportunities. (1)
- An organized facility is a good way to maintain trash associated with shooting activities. (5)
- The facility will provide a place for local law enforcement to practice and hold classes. (4)
- The facility will provide a place to hold hunter safety courses. (2)
- The facility should be built in a timely manner due to the need for such services and the problems encountered by similar facilities in the past (Belmont). (1)
- An organized facility is a good way to maintain safety. (5)
- The facility will provide a good place for family entertainment. (1)

Comments Regarding Concerns with the Facility Location and Activities

- There is a potential for wildlife disruption and environmental destruction. (3)
- The location is too close to residential areas of Munds Park and will be disruptive. (7)
- Noise will be a major factor for the residents of Munds Park. (3)
- The increased flow of visitors may cause traffic congestion in the area. (3)
- There is a higher risk of forest fires with an increased number of people camping in the area. (1)

- Hours of operation should be coordinated thoughtfully to minimally disrupt the area residents. (6)
- There may be a negative impact on shared areas that are used by hikers, horses and others. (2)
- The location of the facility may decrease area property values. (1)
- The location will suffer difficulties similarly suffered by the Belmont site. Reconsider location. (1)
- Other locations may be better suited for such facilities; Winnona has been suggested. (3)
- The location is good during the summer; however there could be access problems during the winter.
- There is concern that the facility would impact the hunting in the area.

Community Information Meeting Survey Results

A survey regarding the notification of the Community Information Meeting was included on the comment sheet. In response to the question, "How did you hear about today's Open House?": 10 people saw the newspaper notice, 17 people received a flyer in the mail, 7 people heard a public service announcement on the radio, and 13 people mentioned that they heard about the Community Information Meeting from some other means. From these people: 7 people received notice from the NRA, four people received information by word of mouth, one person received notification through the Pinewood Fire Department, and one from an undisclosed source.

Comments from the April 27, 2006 Community Information Meeting

Twenty-six people signed in at the Community Information Meeting and fourteen comment sheets were returned. Overall, 14 people are for the proposed plan, zero people are against it and two people are undecided. Appendix F includes a copy of the returned comment and sign-in sheets.

The following written comments were submitted (the number of people making the comment is shown in the parentheses following each summarized statement): Some individuals provided more than one comment. Some individuals chose not to comment at the information meeting but provided comments by mail at a later date.

Comments Supporting the Facility Location and Activities

- The location selected is a great enough distance from existing residential areas. (5)
- The location provides easy access based on its proximity to main highways. (3)
- The area selected is a "good location." (14)
- The increased activity brought on by the shooting facilities will encourage economic growth in the area. (3)
- The facility will provide a place to hold hunter safety courses. (2)
- The facility will provide a good place organized competitions. (3)

Comments Regarding Concerns With the Facility Location and Activities

- There is a potential for wildlife disruption and environmental destruction. Elk fencing should be considered in order to keep animals off of the shooting ranges. (1)
- The location is too close to residential areas of Munds Park and will be disruptive. (2)
- Noise will be a major factor for the residents of Munds Park. (2)

- Hours of operation should be coordinated thoughtfully to minimally disrupt the area residents. (2)

Community Information Meeting Survey Results

A survey regarding the notification of the Community Information Meeting was included on the comment sheet. In response to the question, "How did you hear about today's Open House?": one person saw the newspaper notice, five people received a flyer in the mail, no one heard the public service announcement on the radio, and eight people mentioned that they heard about the Community Information Meeting from some other means. From these people: five people received notice from the NRA, two people received information by word of mouth, and one person received notification through an ATA business.

Comments Received Via Email or Website

Information on this project was also available online at the AGFD Web site. The Website included current information on the selection study, general project area maps, public input comment form, and contact information for people with specific questions about the ongoing study. Some people who were unable to attend the Open House or Community Information Meetings submitted comments electronically using the public input comment form and email. A total of 37 comments were received in this way. Overall, 13 people are in favor of the proposed location and eleven people are against it. Five messages supported the idea of a shooting range but in a different location. Twenty-two of the 37 emails received were sent via the NAZSRF Public Input form on the AZGF website. Three were received via regular email. Some individuals provided more than one comment. Copies of these comments are included in Appendix G.

Comments Supporting the Facility Location and Activities

- The area selected is a "good location." (3)
- An organized shooting facility is a good idea. (1)
- The facility will provide a good place organized competitions. (1)

Comments Regarding Concerns With the Facility Location and Activities

- There is a potential for wildlife/game disruption and environmental destruction. (4)
- The location is too close to residential areas of Munds Park and will be disruptive. (2)
- Noise will be a major factor for the residents of Munds Park. (5)
- The location of the facility may decrease area property values. (1)
- The location of trash disposal for Munds Park will be affected. (1)
- The increased flow of visitors may cause traffic congestion in the area. (1)
- Other locations may be better suited for such facilities; Winnona, Show Low, Verde Valley and Sedona have been suggested. (5)

Public Involvement and Meetings Summary

The AGFD held a series of meetings for the public to have questions answered and give comments on the proposed Northern Arizona Regional Shooting Facility project location at Munds Park. The three meetings included an Open House and two Community Information Meetings. The

combined total attendance for the three meetings was 183 people. The breakdown of attendance for each meeting is: April 15, 2006: 95 attendees; April 25, 2006: 62 attendees; April 27, 2006: 26 attendees.

The total number of comments received during the meetings and via email was 129 comments. The breakdown for each meeting is: April 15, 2006: 60 comments; April 25, 2006: 32 comments; April 27, 2006: 16 comments. Thirty-seven comments were received via email. The total number of comments in favor of the proposed location was 110 comments. The breakdown for each meeting is: April 15, 2006: 58 comments; April 25, 2006: 28 comments; April 27, 2006: 14 comments. Ten comments in favor of the proposed location were received via email. The total number of comments against the proposed location was 16 comments. The breakdown for each meeting is: April 15, 2006: 1 comment; April 25, 2006: 4 comments; April 27, 2006: 0 comments. Eleven comments against the proposed location were received via email. The total number of undecided comments was three: April 15, 2006: 1 comment; April 25, 2006: 0 comments; April 27, 2006: 2 comments. No undecided comments were received via email.

The majority of those that attended the meetings are in favor of the proposed location citing the area's need for the facility, the location and the ease of access as major factors contributing to their support. Of the major concerns of the attendees, even of those in favor of the proposed location, are the minimization of any negative effects that may impact the local residents and wildlife/environmental protection.