

FINAL REPORT

Tucson Basin Shooting on Public Lands
Workshop Project

June 2006

Prepared by the
U.S. Institute for Environmental
Conflict Resolution
Tucson, AZ

FINAL REPORT

Tucson Basin Shooting on Public Lands Workshops Project June 2006

1. HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

In May, 2002, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Tucson Field Office, first contacted the U. S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (the "Institute") to discuss opportunities for resolving shooting issues that could be included in the planning process for the Resource Management Plan (RMP) for the BLM's Ironwood Forest National Monument (IFNM). Shooting had emerged as a controversial issue in the RMP process, and it was anticipated that this issue might become quite sensitive. However, recognizing that these issues could best be addressed by taking a basin-wide approach, BLM asked the Institute to assist in bringing together all relevant agencies and affected stakeholders in developing a common vision and, potentially, appropriate shooting management guidelines, both for the IFNM as well as for the Tucson Basin as a whole. These guidelines would include informal shooting (such as plinking) and formal shooting (in specified ranges).

Multiple landowners occupy the geographic area around Tucson including the BLM, the USDA National Forest Service (Forest Service), the National Park Service, the City of Tucson, the State of Arizona, Pima County, private lands, and various small communities like Marana and Vail. With a rapidly increasing urban population, land managers are faced with a plethora of issues related to urban expansion, including a growing interest in shooting. Given the limited and dwindling number of locations where shooters can pursue their activity safely, shooting on public lands raises both resource management and public safety issues that must be dealt with, both on an interim basis as well as in the long-term planning for the Tucson Basin. These issues cannot easily be resolved if each agency or land manager takes the approach that the activity should be restricted on its respective land without appropriate consideration of alternative solutions or locations. If one agency eliminates shooting, it becomes another agency's problem. For this reason, there was a perceived need to bring agencies and stakeholders together to consider developing appropriate guidelines and alternatives for the entire Tucson Basin. A situation assessment was determined to be an essential first step.

2. PHASE I –SITUATION ASSESSMENT

The BLM asked the Institute to conduct a situation assessment and solely funded this initial phase of the project. During the assessment, a range of affected stakeholders with an interest in this issue were interviewed, in order to determine the range of issues that exist and identify recommendations for potential future actions. Affected stakeholders included federal, state, tribal and local land management agencies, representatives of the shooting community, other recreationists, local residents, law enforcement representatives, Congressional and State representatives, representatives of the environmental community, other recreational users, and other people who shared an interest in this issue. The U. S. Institute contracted with a neutral

assessment team (Mette Brogden and Elizabeth Taylor, of the University of Arizona's Udall Center for Studies in Public Policy), and between May and November, 2003, the team conducted interviews with a wide array of stakeholder representatives; they also organized several meetings of participants to discuss their findings. Their report, *Recreational Shooting in the Tucson Basin: The Potential for Collaborative Dialogue and Action* (completed in January 2004 and attached as Appendix 1), concluded that there was widespread support for convening a public dialogue related to shooting on public lands in the Tucson Basin. The report recommended organizing a directed, outcome-oriented process with few meetings and clear, tangible outcomes. Participants in this dialogue were to include representatives from all affected stakeholder groups, and "they would be encouraged to work together to identify, analyze, and resolve issues, developing specific action steps that can result in concrete outcomes." (The full report is also available at http://www.ecr.gov/pdf/Tucson_Basin.pdf).

The report identified four major topics for resolution in this dialogue:

- Locations for shooting activities, including the criteria for identifying appropriate zones for formal and informal shooting opportunities:
- Safety and enforcement issues (to protect all users of public lands)
- Resource impacts (e.g., vandalism, litter, resource damage, etc.)
- Education (including firearm use and safety, opportunities for education about shooting activities on public lands, etc.)

3. PHASE II –PUBLIC DIALOGUE

Co-Sponsoring Agencies

In January 2004, after reviewing the findings of the assessment, several of the key land management agencies (the Bureau of Land Management, the USDA Forest Service, and the Arizona Game and Fish Department) sponsored a series of working group and public meetings to define a common vision for resolving issues related to shooting on public lands in the Tucson Basin. Beginning in February 2004, the Institute began assisting these agencies, along with a broad-based group of representatives of affected parties, in a series of organizing meetings to jointly establish the best approach to address these issues with the public.

The Organizational Committee

An Organizational Committee was created from a cross-section of individuals who participated in the Phase 1 assessment, along with additional individuals who expressed interest in participating actively in the project. Pima County Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation Department also played an active role in the Committee activities. Approximately 25-30 members regularly attended Organizational Committee meetings over the ensuing months. (List of Participating Agencies and Stakeholders – Appendix 2).

One of the first matters of business was to establish a definition for the "Tucson Basin." The group decided on the geographic area within a 30-mile radius surrounding the junction of I-10 and I-19. This designation has no legal, political or topographic significance, but was created by the Organizational Committee solely to define a geographic area to focus the discussions. The

group also decided that a public workshop was the best way to solicit input on the four major topics identified in the Assessment: Locations, resource impacts, safety and enforcement, and education. Working groups were then created for each of these four issues, and from February to May 2004, these stakeholder representatives met a number of times to prepare for the public workshop (See Appendix 3 for a meeting schedule summary). The working groups met separately to discuss specific workshop session goals, presentations, and discussion questions for the public on each of the four issues. Additionally, they worked to pool a substantial amount of information (including maps, technical guidelines, and other resources). The Arizona Game & Fish Department generously provided the Organizational Committee with meeting facilities for many of these critical planning meetings.

Participation by Governmental and BLM RAC Members. Representatives from the Offices of Congressman Kolbe, Congressman Grijalva, Senator Kyl, and the Arizona Governor's Office actively participated in the Organizational Committee discussions throughout the process. Additionally, BLM RAC members, Frances Werner and Lee Aiken volunteered considerable time to the process as well. The valuable input from these participants was critical to the ultimate success of the project

Public Workshop #1.

Workshop #1 was held on May 22, 2004. Approximately 350 people attended. The meeting represented a considerable amount of preparatory work on the part of Organizational Committee members and their designees. Notices of various types, press releases and radio spots were provided to inform the public about the workshop. (See Appendix 4).

To set the stage for Workshop #1, the following philosophical “givens” were presented to participants:

- It was agreed that shooting is a legal activity on public land; and, the group was not there to debate the legality of shooting in general—it was agreed that there are other forums for that discussion.
- The Organizational Committee determined that they wanted to use this important time to gain insights on the four critical issues that evolved from the assessment: safety and enforcement, education, resource impacts and locations issues.
- Land managers have the legal responsibility to regulate their managed lands and that they must manage public lands for the enjoyment of all users. They indicated that they were calling on participants to help shape these decisions.
- The land management agencies emphasized that they were asking participants to assist managers in coming up with creative solutions to management challenges stemming from unlawful shooting activities by those who do not obey safety rules and/or laws respecting or protecting public land resources.

At Workshop #1, the Organizational Committee was able to gather a large number of creative and useful ideas from participants. These ideas were focused on the four issues described in the situation assessment (specific comment lists are attached in Appendix 5):

Education:

Participants provided information and ideas about how to better educate three primary audiences - the shooting public, land management agencies, and other public lands visitors - about shooting opportunities, shooting safety, visitor responsibilities, and existing regulations.

Locations for Shooting:

Participants provided information regarding many informal shooting areas that were not described on maps of public land. They suggested a number of additional mapping resources that they considered were needed to address multiple use issues. They also provided a list of various locations within the Tucson Basin that they felt needed additional formal ranges and indicated what types of shooting opportunities they would like to see at those ranges (e.g. rifle, pistol, and shotgun). They also responded to a question about their experiences concerning the appropriateness and safety of informal shooting activities occurring on public lands.

Resource Impacts:

Participants described what they viewed as important resource impacts that resulted from irresponsible shooting, and offered suggestions for helping resolve these problems. Additional ideas were provided to improve resources for clean-up and remediation of damaged areas as well as contributions they would be willing to make to help address these issues.

Safety & Enforcement:

Participants focused on short and long-term challenges that they believed relate to safety and enforcement issues and offered a range of ideas for dealing with these challenges. They also provided some creative ideas for addressing enforcement penalties and how to potentially increase law enforcement presence on public lands.

Preparation for the Next Public Workshop

Following Workshop #1, the Organizational Committee (largely comprised of a number of dedicated volunteers), continued to donate significant time to synthesize the information received, and develop some well-crafted recommendations based on workshop input. (A summary of the Organizational Committee meetings is located in Appendix 6). A Project Update was sent out via e-mail and regular mail to Workshop #1 participants and other interested parties. (See Appendix 7)

On December 13, 2004, Congressman Kolbe requested a special meeting with the Organizational Committee to obtain an update on the activities relating to the Tucson Basin Shooting project. A number of Committee members attended, including representatives from the relevant federal, state and local land managers. They shared the status of a number of activities underway in conjunction with formal and informal shooting on various public lands. Congressman Kolbe encouraged their active participation in the resolution of these challenging issues.

Public Workshop #2

On June 11, 2005, Workshop #2 was held at the Lew Sorenson Recreation Center, a facility donated by the Pima County Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation Department. Over 150

participants attended Workshop #2. Notices of the workshop were posted in public locations and e-mailed and sent out to prior workshop participants. Additionally, a press release was sent out to a large number of news outlets (see Appendix 8). This second workshop was designed to provide feedback to the public on the Committee's synthesis of the four major areas of interest:

Locations:

This synthesis focused on educating the public about short and long-term planning processes on public land, along with details about how the public can be involved early on and at various junctures in these planning processes to assure that they have input into decision-making about public shooting issues on public land. The land management agencies presented information on special use permits and other processes, as well as the procedures to apply for permits to build shooting facilities on public land. Pima County presented information on the status of their formal shooting facilities. The Forest Service also announced that discussions were underway regarding the identification of a potential shooting facility in the Reddington Pass area of the Coronado National Forest.

Resource Impacts; Safety & Enforcement and Education:

Information from all three of these working committees was synthesized and presented by Organizational Committee members. The focus of the Resource Impacts subcommittee was on a volunteer registration program in which interested individuals could add their names to a database of individuals who could help with clean-ups on public land. In response to safety and enforcement challenges, the group created a wallet-sized resource card containing a list of emergency numbers for citizens to call to make reports. Copies of the card were made available for Workshop #2 participants. They discussed the variety of existing education materials and how people could access them. A major educational focus was the idea of making a website available that would act as an easily accessible public clearinghouse for resources and information on shooting issues. The website information would include a copy of the emergency phone card, a procedure for volunteering to participate in public clean-up campaigns and educational activities relating to shooting on public lands, and links to other federal, state and local resources.

4. PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The Assessment Report identified the four major topics that interviewees that interviewees hoped to resolve through facilitated dialogue. All of these are challenging issues and are encumbered by a variety of fiscal resource limitations. Despite those limitations, significant headway was made on each of the four issues. The Organizational Committee realized the need to be as creative as possible in light of these limitations, and developed ideas that emphasized a reliance on the public to volunteer in a number of ways in order to achieve progress. They also recognized the need for continuing dialogue and active participation of the various land managers and the public in order to assure that momentum can be maintained on these continually evolving challenges in the Tucson Basin.

1. Locations for recreational shooting, including the criteria for identifying appropriate zones for formal and informal shooting opportunities.

While this emotionally charged issue was the most difficult of the four to address, a significant amount of information was gathered from the public about potentially appropriate locations, and noticeable progress was made. This list has already been used as a resource by Pima County to help them develop their shooting facility plans. Additionally, active dialogue began between the Forest Service and the Tucson Rod & Gun Club regarding a new public shooting facility in the Reddington Pass area of the Coronado National Forest. This issue had been an extended challenge for both parties; they have now identified a potential site and are moving forward on a mutually agreeable location for a facility. An additional benefit of the dialogue was the recognition of the need to further educate the public about opportunities they have for participating in agency planning processes. This information was provided by the BLM and the Forest Service at Workshop #2, and links to this information will be made available on the website as well.

The second aspect of this issue identified in the assessment was the potential development of a “criteria for appropriate zones for formal and informal shooting opportunities.” Subcommittee dialogue and discussion initially focused on determining whether this concept could be addressed. After significant debate, the subcommittee participants determined that a general criteria would not be useful to help the various agencies locate and manage shooting locations on public land.

2. Safety and enforcement issues

Most users of public lands have concerns about safety and enforcement. Some are concerned that there isn’t enough enforcement coverage while others are concerned that unsafe shooting may be occurring (this is true for other shooters, as well as hikers/bikers) and that enforcement is a high priority. This subcommittee included agency and local law enforcement representatives, as well as other stakeholders (including the shooting public and other user groups).

Several creative ideas were discussed, and at the workshop the Subcommittee presented a safe alternative—the creation of a phone contact resource that people could carry to allow the public to observe and report illegal activities to the property law enforcement units without putting themselves in jeopardy. These cards are now in the hands of many shooters and can be reproduced using a template on the website (described in paragraph 4 below).

3. Resource Impacts

In addition to the safety and enforcement issues, resource impacts have presented many challenges to the agencies that manage public lands. Responsible shooters and other users of public lands are concerned about these irresponsible activities and how they negatively impact them.

The Resource Impacts Subcommittee discussed a variety of creative solutions, and ultimately focused on volunteer clean-up and educational activities through shooting clubs, other public

organizations, and agencies. Since Workshop #2, the land management agencies have seen an increase in clean-up activities in certain areas and are very interested in working together with the public to help further the volunteer program(s). For example, in 2006, the BLM hosted several productive volunteer clean-up programs.

4. Education (including firearm use and safety, shooting activities on public lands, etc.)

This subcommittee essentially joined forces with the resource impacts and safety and enforcement subcommittees to bring together the existing educational resources presently available. They focused their efforts on the creation of an internet site describing this project, and on providing contact information and links for anyone visiting the site to find information relating to participating agencies, their shooting regulations, planning processes, permitting processes, places to shoot, and other important information.

5. Other Major Accomplishments

As part of the agency debrief at the end of the Tucson Basin process, funding and supporting agencies defined two additional accomplishments that they felt were significant results from the dialogue over the past two years:

- **Dialogue:** All of the agencies agreed that holding the dialogue about shooting issues in the Tucson Basin had been an important accomplishment in and of itself. Despite the challenges of such a difficult conversation, education and communication about these issues expanded everyone's knowledge and understanding of the complexities and management challenges relating to unlawful shooting and behavior on public lands.
- **Relationship-building:** The agencies also agreed that in the context of the focused dialogue on shooting issues, they had the opportunity to develop greatly improved working relationships, communication, and a broader understanding of each other's mandates that have continued to prove valuable as they work on broad-scale land and resource management issues where coordination and cooperation are key.
- **Better Understanding:** Another important result of the dialogue is that now many more members of the Tucson public and key user groups have a better understanding about how public lands are managed and how land use planning is done.

APPENDICES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Tucson Basin Shooting Workshops Project

Appendices:

1. Assessment: *Recreational Shooting in the Tucson Basin: The Potential for Collaborative Dialogue and Action* (January 2004)
2. List of Participating Agencies and Stakeholders
3. Workshop #1 - Meeting Schedule Summary
4. Workshop #1 - Notices and Press Releases
5. Workshop #1 - Participant Input
6. Workshop #2 - Meeting Schedule Summary
7. Project Update
8. Workshop #2 – Notices and Press Release

APPENDIX 1

Assessment: Recreational Shooting in the Tucson Basin: The Potential for Collaborative Dialogue and Action (January 2004)

SITUATION ASSESSMENT

**RECREATIONAL SHOOTING IN THE TUCSON BASIN: THE
POTENTIAL FOR COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUE AND
ACTION**

January 30, 2004

Prepared by:

Mette Brogden and Elizabeth Taylor
in contract with:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction

- Background of the assessment
- Project scope and sponsors
- Assessment methodology

II. Caveats to Readers

- A report of stakeholder perceptions
- Terminology
- Representation of issues
- Significant findings of common ground

III. Issues Identified during the Assessment

- History and context of current controversies
- Safety concerns
- Shooting opportunities
- Management challenges

IV. Proposed Criteria and Solutions

- Criteria for solutions
- Proposed solutions to key issues

V. Analysis of Themes

- General themes
- Reasons for optimism
- Potential challenges
- Structuring the dialogue

VI. Recommendations

- General approach and process recommendations
- Key topics for discussion
- Specific recommendations (timeline, participants, host, sponsors)

VII. Appendices

- List of interview questions
- List of interviews and participants

I. INTRODUCTION

Background of the assessment

Land in the Tucson basin is owned by a variety of landowners, including the Department of Interior's Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the National Park Service, the United States Department of Agriculture's Forest Service, private parties, State Trust lands, county-owned lands, the City of Tucson and various communities such as Marana, Oro Valley, and Vail. With a rapidly increasing urban population throughout the Tucson basin, land managers are faced with a plethora of issues related to urban expansion, including considerable interest in recreational shooting. Given the limited number of locations where shooters can pursue their sport, recreational shooting raises both resource management and public safety issues that must be dealt with, both in an interim basis as well as in the long-term planning for the entire Tucson basin.

The Tucson Field Office of the BLM initiated this project in anticipation of the need for developing a management plan for the Ironwood Forest National Monument. At the outset of this planning effort, BLM staff underscored their mandate to manage for multiple uses, with recreational shooting being one among many public uses for the Monument. Based on their experience, the BLM had identified two categories of management issues concerning recreational shooting: (1) safety concerns and (2) resource damage.

Recognizing that recreational shooting issues in the Ironwood Forest could not be adequately addressed without taking a basin-wide approach, the BLM perceived a need to bring together agencies and stakeholders to consider developing appropriate management guidelines. BLM staff sought to identify opportunities to work with a wide array of stakeholders in order to define a common vision for resolving these resource management and public safety issues, both in terms of specific management actions on the Ironwood Forest (and other land management units), as well as more broadly within the Tucson basin.

To convene this broad-based effort, the BLM approached the U. S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (the U. S. Institute). The U. S. Institute is a federal program established by Congress to assist parties in resolving environmental, natural resource, and public lands conflicts. The U.S. Institute serves as an impartial, non-partisan institution providing professional expertise, services, and resources to all parties involved in environmental disputes, regardless of who initiates or pays for assistance. The U.S. Institute helps parties determine whether collaborative problem solving is appropriate for specific environmental conflicts, how and when to bring all the parties to the table, and whether a third-party facilitator or mediator might be helpful in assisting the parties in their efforts to reach consensus or to resolve the conflict.¹

The U. S. Institute contracted with the neutral facilitation team of Mette Brogden and Elizabeth

¹ For further information on the U. S. Institute, see www.ecr.gov.

Taylor from The University of Arizona's Udall Center for Studies in Public Policy (Udall Center) to conduct a situation assessment concerning the potential for collaborative dialogue and action on issues related to recreational shooting in the Tucson basin. The team was charged with:

- (1) completing a series of stakeholder interviews in order to understand issues around recreational shooting and
- (2) assessing the potential usefulness of a facilitated dialogue among stakeholders concerning recreational shooting opportunities and shooting safety in the Tucson basin.

The team was asked to interview individuals representing a wide range of perspectives on issues and concerns pertaining to recreational shooting. This document reports the results of the assessment.

Project sponsors and focus

The BLM provided the initial funding for the situation assessment. Early in the project, the USDA Forest Service's Coronado National Forest and the Arizona Game and Fish Department joined as sponsors of the assessment, confirming their view of the importance of looking at the situation from the broader perspective of land management within the Tucson basin.

Project sponsors determined in the beginning that the effort would specifically address "recreational shooting," defined for the purposes of this project as the discharge of any firearm for any lawful, recreational purpose other than the lawful taking of a game animal. This definition of issues draws a distinction between recreational shooting activities and hunting, which the project was not intended to address. The assessment team soon discovered that maintaining this distinction between recreational shooting and hunting is not always easy, since some activities such as sighting in hunting rifles may bridge the two categories.

When discussing issues related to recreational shooting, a distinction is also often made between formal and informal shooting activities. Formal shooting takes place at facilities specifically designed as shooting ranges, and a range master monitors the adherence to rules of the facility as well as providing information to users. Informal shooting activities take place in less structured situations and usually involves one or a small number of shooters shooting at targets. Informal shooting is a legal activity on public land.

Assessment methodology

So many people asked us about the methodology for the assessment that we decided to include this section describing the basic procedures for conducting an objective situation assessment; in short, what we did and did not do.

The assessment team tried to understand the range of concerns and interests of those interviewed without attempting to gather statistical information on the strength of support for an idea or observation. In other words, we did not try to develop a representative sample from which statistically valid tests of hypotheses could be accomplished, as would be the case in a scientific study. We made no attempt to count the number of people expressing an idea or issue. However, we do note where we discerned patterns and reported perceptions, for example,

- when a perception was expressed across interest groups, since this indicates significant common ground across groups; and
- when an idea was in significant dispute within an interest group or across interest groups, since this indicates a need for joint fact-finding so that a common understanding among stakeholders may be reached.

The assessment team undertook the situation assessment in three steps: 1) interviews with stakeholders and public officials, 2) analysis and presentation of the results to stakeholders and public officials in a series of meetings, and 3) preparation of this final report.

Interviews

The purpose of the interviews was to:

- (a) Provide an opportunity to introduce the project;
- (b) Hear what interviewees perceived to be the major issues and concerns regarding recreational shooting in the Tucson basin;
- (c) Ask whether stakeholders saw potential value in developing a collaborative effort among interested parties, and
- (d) Learn about stakeholder interests, ideas, suggestions, and recommendations for making such a dialogue productive.

We worked to identify and interview a broad range of individuals representing diverse perspectives on recreational shooting in the Tucson Basin. The categories of stakeholder interests we sought to interview included shooters and the shooting sports industry, public officials who manage lands in the Tucson basin, other recreational users of public lands, public lands permittees, environmentalists, representatives from congressional offices, real estate interests, and neighbors. An initial list of individuals to be interviewed was developed in consultation with project sponsors. Early interviews helped identify additional individuals to be interviewed.

Using a semi-structured interview guide, we completed 22 interviews with stakeholders, individually and in small groups, talking with over 50 individuals during the initial phase of the assessment. The interview guide used during the assessment is provided in Appendix 1; a full list of those interviewed who consented to inclusion of their name in the report is presented in Appendix 2.

The assessment team informed potential interviewees that information gathered from the interviews would be used to determine the potential usefulness of a stakeholder dialogue to address issues related to recreational shooting, including ideas for appropriate management of recreational shooting on public lands in the Tucson basin. At the conclusion of the interviews, the team indicated that it would report the information gathered without attribution and provide recommendations to the U.S. Institute on how to collaboratively engage stakeholders and the public in a process to address issues. The team also presented the results of the assessment, along with preliminary recommendations, to interviewees for comment before finalizing the recommendations below.

Analysis and presentation of the results for feedback

Upon completion of the interviews, the team analyzed what we heard about stakeholder interests in order to identify possible points of agreement and potential areas of controversy. We then considered whether a dialogue process to build collaborative support for resolving issues associated with recreational shooting would be valuable and constructive. There was strong support from stakeholders for proceeding with a collaborative dialogue, and overall agreement on the key issues to be addressed and on general guidelines on how this collaboration should occur. Based on this input, the team formulated some recommendations for the design of such a process.

Consequently, during October and November 2003, the results of the interviews were summarized into a Power Point presentation and shown at three separately conducted meetings for (1) public officials, (2) shooters, and (3) other public land users and neighboring property owners. In order to present a clear and accurate representation of stakeholders' perspectives, the team solicited feedback at each meeting as to whether we had "gotten it right." While the meetings with public officials and shooters were well attended, the meeting with other public land users was not. The team sought additional feedback via telephone and email communication with this last group in order to make sure that they were kept fully informed about the progress of the project and to ensure that their interests and concerns were accurately represented.

The assessment team completed further analysis of their results following the three stakeholder meetings, and then invited all stakeholders who had been contacted and/or participated in the situation assessment to attend a meeting at the U.S. Institute on December 16, 2003. At this meeting, a final set of analyses and recommendations presented. During this well-attended meeting, the team also asked whether the stakeholders present would be willing to participate in a collaborative dialogue in order to make progress toward resolving issues. All stakeholders and public officials present indicated that they would be willing to participate in a limited number of focused meetings with well-articulated, tangible objectives.

Preparation of the final report

This report captures the results and recommendations of the situation assessment and the next steps that were developed at the meeting of stakeholders held on December 16, 2003. The first section of the report describes how the assessment was accomplished. Subsequent sections report the assessment team's synthesis of issues expressed by interviewees. The final sections of the report present the team's analysis of its findings and recommendations: i.e., that a short, focused set of facilitated meetings be jointly undertaken by the various stakeholders.

We have tried to capture accurately and fairly the range of issues expressed by interviewees, as well as our own assessment of how these concerns may be addressed in both the short and long term. Though every effort has been made to accurately and sensitively reflect the respective needs and views of stakeholders, the assessment team assumes full responsibility for any remaining errors and inaccuracies in this report.

II. CAVEATS TO READERS

A report of stakeholder perceptions

Since stakeholder perspectives largely determine the potential usefulness of a collaborative dialogue, the assessment team considered its principal task as seeking an understanding of these viewpoints and reflecting back stakeholders' own perceptions of issues, interests, and how their concerns might be resolved. The team did not attempt to make a determination about facts or synthesize the extensive amount of information about firearms and recreational shooting that is available for analysis. The topic is enormous, and it would have been nearly impossible for the team to attempt to establish the facts around issues within the time frame of this project.

More importantly, differences in perception rather than "the facts" are often at the heart of conflicts, since these perceptions reflect differences in values and priorities as well as differences in stakeholders' understandings of the situation. Once these differences have been identified and understood, dialogue may become possible.

The language we have used to report the issues and concerns of those we interviewed reflects this approach. We note throughout the report that stakeholders "perceived" or "reported" or "felt that" in order to indicate that we are reporting perceptions, not "facts."

Most public issues involve unknowns as well as facts that are in dispute. Experienced mediators working on public-policy conflicts have learned that in many cases it is far more useful for stakeholders to undertake joint fact-finding as part of a collaborative dialogue than for an independent party to make a judgment about facts.² Using this procedure, stakeholders can begin to develop a common understanding of the array of information available, what is known and not known, and what facts are in dispute. Disagreement or lack of information need not prevent progress on resolving issues where facts are not in dispute or action is required in the

² See Adler et al. *Managing science and technical information in multi-stakeholder processes*, available at: http://www.ecr.gov/pdf/ecr_papers_2.pdf.

absence of complete or widely accepted knowledge.³ Parties can establish at the outset how they will proceed in the absence of information and/or agreement about what is actually known about a topic.

For all of these reasons, we wish to underscore that what follows in this report is an explanation of the perceptions that the stakeholders with whom we spoke shared with the assessment team regarding recreational shooting issues.

Use of the term “recreational shooting”

Some interviewees in the shooting community objected to the use of the term “recreational” in characterizing lawful shooting activities on public lands or in formal shooting ranges. Their objection stemmed from a concern that the term implies something that is optional, frivolous, not serious, and which therefore may be eliminated. Citing the Bill of Rights’ guarantee of the right to bear arms, they asserted that the opportunity to learn to shoot and maintain skills through practice is necessary in order for the right to have any meaning, as well as for shooters to maintain their knowledge of safety protocols.

While acknowledging this objection, the assessment team has used the term “recreational shooting” throughout the situation assessment, as it was the term used to identify the project from the outset. The team worried that changing the terminology midstream in the assessment could create confusion. However, the assessment team recommends that when considering future work with stakeholders, sponsors may wish to assess their use of the term “recreational” in light of the objections expressed by some of the shooters interviewed.

Fair and balanced representation of issues

Throughout the project, agency personnel and other stakeholders repeatedly stated their concern about bias and fairness in the process of the situation assessment. The persistent expressions of concern about bias are an indicator, we believe, of the high level of controversy, polarization, and mistrust around management of recreational shooting on public lands in the Tucson basin. Interviewees indicated to us that the polarization resulted from historical as well as recent decisions that loom large in the social memory of the parties. We have attempted to address this concern by interviewing individuals from the wide range of interest groups identified to us. We have also worked to understand all viewpoints and report them accurately.

However, it is important to note that the people interviewed for this assessment who are active shooters had many more detailed reactions, facts, and points to share with us because this activity is an important part of their lives. Many of these individuals spend a significant amount of time shooting, and they understand that changes in management may directly impact their ability to continue shooting. For other land users, shooting issues may constitute a smaller portion of the array of issues about land management with which they are concerned. They would simply like the issues that concern them about shooting to be resolved. Those whose

³ We would argue, indeed, that most decision-making occurs with imperfect knowledge, whether in management of public lands, businesses, public policy, medical treatment, weather forecasting, or any significant human activity.

livelihoods or lifestyles are negatively impacted by safety and resource-damage that may be associated with shooting are very concerned that these issues be resolved.

Public land managers occupy a slightly different category than that of other stakeholders because of their statutory responsibilities for management. Theirs is a complicated task because it is their charge to manage the lands for all users and they must seek to maintain a balanced approach. They work from a set of regulations and procedures that serve their mandate to protect the “public interest,” which includes looking out for both current and future generations and addressing conflicting demands from various sectors of the public. Their “voices” within this report may appear to be less represented, and we want to underscore that is largely due to their intermediary roles as managers, rather than stakeholders advocating for a particular position or outcome.

Given the increasing alienation expressed by the shooting community and our role as neutral mediators, our way of helping this interest group to re-engage with other stakeholders and public agencies productively is to be sure that shooter concerns are reflected fully and accurately. Since other interest groups and public land managers expressed fewer numbers of concerns and issues, the amount of text in this report devoted to concerns of the shooting community may appear greater than those of other interests. This outcome does not mean that the concerns expressed by other stakeholders and public-land managers are of lesser importance, however. Finally, to avoid giving the impression that one set of interests should be considered before others, we have attempted in each section of this report to vary the order in which we present interests and concerns from the spectrum of interested parties.

Significant findings of common ground

It was interesting to discover the significant common ground that exists among the stakeholders we interviewed, regardless of interest. Across interest groups, there is a strong commitment to safety. This was perhaps not as surprising as the shared recognition of the need for shooting opportunities to exist to meet the demand from members of the public who want to engage in this activity. No one that we interviewed advocated elimination of shooting opportunities, even if they did not use, or particularly support the use of firearms. All recognized the Second Amendment guarantee of the right to bear arms. We also repeatedly heard from individuals across every interest group that the vast majority of recreational shooters behave responsibly, and that it is their perception that a small minority of irresponsible, unorganized shooters causes the problems with safety and vandalism that have been reported on public lands. All interviewees expressed the desire for resolution of issues rather than elimination of shooting activities.

III. ISSUES IDENTIFIED DURING THE ASSESSMENT

In this section of the report, we present a summary of the issues that interviewees and meeting attendees mentioned when asked about their concerns about recreational shooting in the Tucson basin. We have attempted to be exhaustive in our approach by including all issues that interviewees and others identified during the initial interview process as well as our subsequent meetings with interest groups and the meeting of stakeholder representatives.

We have organized stakeholder perceptions of issues into five broad categories:

1. History and context of current controversies
2. Safety concerns
3. Shooting opportunities
4. Management challenges

History and context of current controversies

This theme highlights issues that relate to the history of recreational shooting management in the Tucson basin. Many of those we interviewed, particularly those who are shooters, indicated that past events (some occurring as long ago as the mid-1960s) continue to affect their current perceptions and concerns about recreational shooting. This is typical of many situations where conflict arises - it often has seeds in the past. To effectively address contemporary concerns, it becomes necessary to review and understand the history shaping current perceptions.

Issues reported under this theme can be grouped into four broad categories:

- A) The history of management decisions and actions concerning recreational shooting in the Tucson basin and greater Arizona,
- B) Decreased education related to firearm safety,
- C) Changes in cultural attitudes toward firearms associated with changing demographics in the Tucson basin, and
- D) Reports of increased and competing demands for use of public lands following the September 11 terrorist attacks.

A. The history of decision-making around management of recreational shooting in the Tucson basin and other areas of Arizona has resulted in a sense of impaired trust among stakeholder groups and public decision-makers. Interviewees who belonged to several stakeholder groups mentioned several key historical events that they felt had created this mistrust.

Relocation of Tucson Rifle Club. The earliest event commonly cited by shooters as a cause of concern and worry, if not mistrust, was the relocation of the Tucson Rifle Club (TRC) to the Three Points area because of encroaching urban development. The Club's original site was located where the West Campus of Pima Community College now sits. Relocation to the Three Points area was reported to have been accomplished with the assistance of Arizona Game and Fish Department's acquisition of two sections of BLM property through a land swap for the

current site in 1965. All shooters that we interviewed spoke very favorably of the Three Points facility because of its excellent design. It provides opportunities for a variety of shooting sports

(action, target, and cowboy). However, moving the facility from its original location left lingering concerns among the shooting community that even long-established formal shooting ranges are vulnerable to urban encroachment and that real estate development will “always be favored,” even though “shooters were there first.” Given the large expense of constructing new ranges, concern about tenure for formal shooting ranges in the face of urban development pressure is significant for shooters, shooting clubs, land managers, and public officials.

Closure of the Tucson Rod and Gun Club at Sabino Canyon. The 1997 decision by the USDA Forest Service Coronado National Forest Supervisor to close the Tucson Rod and Gun Club at Sabino Canyon was seen by almost all interviewees as extremely controversial and was frequently cited as a major cause of mistrust among those interviewed. The details of the closure decision were much discussed by many of the interviewees, particularly public-land managers and shooters. Many mentioned specifics of the decision notice, including safety, noise, and environmental degradation issues as reasons for the closure, though opinions varied widely as to their validity. Parties also told us that they participated in an attempted mediation of the issues by the U.S. Institute. Shooting club members and others in the shooting community reported that they committed significant amounts of unpaid time to the mediation but the outcomes did not meet their needs, making them reluctant to commit more time to further mediated dialogue. The decision is currently being litigated and many interviewees indicated that this created an ongoing source of tension and distrust, particularly between land managers and the shooting community. For many in the shooting community, exhaustion of the appeals process and final closure of the Tucson Rod and Gun Club at Sabino Canyon would constitute another example of displacement of a long-established formal shooting range in the Tucson basin due, in large part, to urban encroachment and competing uses. Interviewees from the shooting community specifically mentioned that this case differs from the relocation of the Tucson Rifle Club because no alternative site was provided. Land managers and other public officials also expressed concerns about the impact this situation has had on their ability to work with the shooting community.

Closure of 86,000 acres of the Tonto National Forest near Phoenix to recreational shooting. This decision by the Forest Supervisor of a National Forest near another urban area was reported to have occurred in the context of a multi-stakeholder process in which shooters also gave unpaid time. Interviewees reported that the Forest Supervisor’s decision cited similar reasons for the closure: safety, resource damage, and environmental hazards. Many interviewees expressed concerns about the extensive area of the closure. Mistrust reportedly resulted from the circumstances in which the decision occurred. Some interviewees perceived that the decision was sudden and unilateral, and that it occurred during a stakeholder dialogue process designed to address issues and arrive at mutually acceptable solutions.

Redington Pass and increased competition among multiple uses. Hikers, permittees, and shooters reported that the closing of the Tucson Rod and Gun Club has pushed shooters into Redington Pass, though agency officials reported they saw no evidence that more shooters are using Redington Pass as a direct result of the closure. Competition among multiple uses in Redington Pass has led to a perception of unsafe conditions for both the public and agency personnel. Some

shooters suggested that safety issues have not been proven to occur at Redington Pass. Other shooters, as well as some recreational users, permittees, and agency staff indicated that their perception of safety problems is based on reported incidents and their own experiences; they asserted that something must be done to address unsafe conditions.

Non-shooting users of Redington Pass indicated that the Forest Service is at great risk of a lawsuit should anyone get shot in the area, since they have repeatedly warned the agency about safety issues and asked for closure of some areas of the Pass to shooting. One interviewee told us in November that conditions had in fact worsened since our initial contact five months earlier.

Shooters worried that widespread displacement of shooting could occur here, and they do not want a large-scale closure to occur as it did on the Tonto. Some shooters commented that if closure were considered as a solution to safety issues, it should be limited, and before one area is closed an alternative area of allowed use should be designated.

The assessment team viewed the array of conflicting comments and demands by users about conditions and recreational opportunities in Redington Pass as a strong indicator of the level of pressure being exerted on the Forest Service from all sides as they manage use in Redington Pass.

Bond issue passed by voters in 1997 dedicating funding for the establishment of an additional shooting range in the Tucson basin. Some shooters cited this event as significant because “no dirt has been shoveled.” Lack of action is seen as an additional reason for mistrust of public officials. One interviewee indicated that it appeared as though whenever controversy or pressure increased over events associated with the closing of the Tucson Rod and Gun Club, Pima County officials would indicate that there was progress toward establishment of an additional shooting range. The perception is that once the controversy passed and media stories abate, nothing concrete occurs toward the establishment of a new shooting range.

B. Perception of a decrease in education related to firearm safety, and the impact this may be having on the problems associated with undisciplined and unsafe use of firearms on public lands. We heard stories from interviewees representing all interest groups of their going out as a child with their families to learn how to shoot safely. This kind of education about firearms was reported to have decreased, particularly in more urban settings. This perceived trend is of particular concern to members of the shooting community, who feel that well-established and accepted rules about safety are no longer widely known. Shooters suggested that children appear to be getting their education about guns through television and movies, rather than from parents or approved classes in schools. The interviewees raised concerns that young people and other unorganized, undisciplined shooters who know little about gun safety are shooting on public land.

C. Changes in cultural attitudes toward firearms coupled with changing demographics in the Tucson basin have led to shooters’ perception of a bias against recreational shooting. Some interviewees felt that a more urbanized population in the Tucson basin, with little education or exposure to firearms, seems to want to apply blanket regulations regarding shooting. They noted that such regulations are an anathema to responsible shooters, who self-regulate and see gun

safety as part of the responsibility of owning and using guns. Some shooters cited an increasing cultural bias against guns as eroding their right to bear arms. They view this cultural bias as leading to uninformed perceptions being taken as facts. An example provided was how, for some, simply hearing a gunshot may create a perception of being unsafe, when in fact the activity is occurring safely. Shooters told us that they see this bias manifested in such societal changes as the elimination of shooting clubs and ranges in schools, and the termination of gun safety education in schools.

D. Increased and competing demands for use of public lands following the September 11 terrorist attacks. A perception of increased competition among recreational uses was reported across interest groups. Agencies and other recreators note that the events of September 11 have led to increased visitation to public lands to commune with nature as a way of coping with stress. Shooters interviewed during the assessment reported that husbands are taking their wives onto public lands to teach them how to shoot; they suggested that the fastest growing group of new shooters is women. Data from Arizona Game and Fish are said to support this assertion; however, this trend may have begun prior to September 11. When the perception of increased usage was presented for feedback, some questioned whether the increase was a result of September 11 or part of a longer-term demographic trend.

Safety concerns

At the outset of this project, agency officials stated that a number of incidents had been reported in which shooters had not utilized adequate backstops and stray bullets had created unsafe conditions for other users, livestock, and nearby residential areas. Several confrontations had reportedly occurred between shooters and ranchers. Others had expressed concerns to land management officials over shooting safety issues related to hiking, OHV use, horseback riding and other uses.

Interviewees identified the following concerns about unsafe shooting that they assert are occurring on public lands:

- People shooting across roads.
- Shooters using improper setups
- Ricochets and stray bullets
- Reports and some evidence of near misses, including gunshots through the windows of a moving car; a hole in a hat that was attributed to a bullet.
- Some perceived that improvements in shooting technology have resulted in the availability and use of high powered, fast, and far-shooting firearms on public lands, while the rules establishing shooting as an allowed use of public land were made in an earlier era. Others assert that this is an incorrect perception—the technology for today’s firearms was developed in the 1800s. An example of a concern raised about shooting technology was the impact of bullets that can travel two to three miles—these interviewees wondered, how can shooters who do not use an adequate backstop be sure of where their bullets are landing?
- Informal recreational shooting and incompatible forms of recreation are occurring in the same place.
- Redington Pass was repeatedly cited for unsafe shooting without effective backstops in a

place where other kinds of recreators (especially hikers and mountain bikers) are concentrated. This concern was noted across all interest groups; some also commented that other recreators besides shooters were not following safety rules, creating potential safety problems for both shooters and other recreators. For example, one person reported setting up with a proper backstop, and in the middle of their session, suddenly a mountain biker “came out of nowhere” and whizzed through their direction of fire, creating a safety hazard.

- In Ironwood Forest National Monument, few naturally occurring backstops are evident to some interviewees. An interviewee showed one of the assessment team members a spot where hundreds of bullet casings lay on the ground. The interviewee had observed shooters stopping by the road and shooting in the direction of the ironwood trees, assuming that these were effective backstops when they could not have known what was in, among, or behind the trees.

Clear rules about shooting safety were reported as widely known within the organized shooting community. All shooters we interviewed knew the basic rules associated with safe shooting.⁴ However, neither the rules themselves nor their existence appear to be widely known outside the organized shooting community, including hunters and agency personnel. Interviewees from the organized shooting community noted that safety issues arise due to lack of awareness of rules, breaking all of the rules at the same time, or other recreators breaking rules associated with their activity (for example, not staying on trails).

Shooters told us that the perception of a safety problem where none actually exists may be attributable to lack of knowledge about the rules of safe shooting. Others indicated that even a perception that there is a safety problem has implications for management. For example, merely hearing shots may lead non-shooters to believe that they are in danger. Some interviewees noted that Tucson is a destination for international tourists, and we heard at least two stories of international tourists abruptly terminating their stays or expeditions when they assumed they were being shot at, resulting in economic loss to tour operators.

Across interest groups, interviewees suggested that the problems with unsafe shooting are largely attributable to a small minority of unorganized, uninformed shooters. Several noted that activities they attributed to this subset of shooters nevertheless threaten the continued availability of the activity for responsible shooters. We must hasten to add that this set of the public was not encountered during the situation assessment and their views are not a part of the results we are reporting. Any future work on recreational shooting in the Tucson basin will need to incorporate methods for reaching this set of the shooting public.

⁴ Rules reported by all shooters we interviewed relating to gun safety were:

1. Never point a gun in a direction in which you do not intend to shoot, and know what lies in the direction that you intend to shoot.
2. Always assume that a gun is loaded until you have checked to see that it is not loaded.
3. Do not put your finger on the trigger of a gun until you are ready to pull the trigger.
4. Always have a backstop behind the target at which you are shooting that will stop the bullet and not create ricochets or other unsafe conditions for the shooter or bystanders.

These rules, like many safety systems, exhibit the characteristic of multiply redundancy. You must break all four rules at once to hurt someone by accident.

Shooting Opportunities

This section reports the nature of the demand for recreational shooting, as characterized by interviewees. Shooters had the most to say about this demand, but other interviewees also contributed observations based on their own experiences.

Across interest groups, interviewees reported an increased demand for shooting as well as for other recreational opportunities on public lands, which they recognize creates competition among users. Across interest groups, interviewees noted that when a site that has been used for shooting is eliminated, as happened with the Tucson Rod and Gun Club, shooters must find other places to shoot, and so they are pushed into other areas. This circumstance is what led the BLM to suggest taking a basin-wide approach to looking at the issues.

Recreational shooters told us they want a variety of shooting situations, both unstructured and structured, to be available at low cost. Some shooters reported their preference for organized, formal shooting ranges because of convenience: they do not have to look for a suitable safe place with a backstop, and they enjoy the amenities immediately available in a designed facility. Other shooters reported their appreciation of unstructured situations, ideally where there are no other people and no structures nearby. Shooters said they need opportunities for both stationary and action shooting, and want both indoor and outdoor shooting ranges to be available; however, several shooters indicated a preference for outdoor shooting ranges.

Shooters we interviewed want shooting opportunities within a 15-30 minute drive from home. They note that everyone is busier now, and they feel that recreational and skill practice opportunities should be as convenient as other sports and recreational activities enjoyed by the public. However, interviewees did not think that all types of shooting need to be available within a 15-30 minute drive. In other words, for specialized shooting activities, shooters are willing to drive farther.

Currently, structured opportunities are not readily available in every area of the Tucson basin. The assessment team conducted an informal exercise during stakeholder caucuses to identify and locate current formal shooting facilities in the Tucson basin, as well as the types of facilities and who is eligible to use them. This exercise highlighted the fact that there is no longer an open facility in the northeast quadrant, and facilities are limited in the northwest and west parts of the Tucson basin. The Three Points facility in the southwest quadrant is excellent but a distant drive for many shooters.

Management Challenges

We have categorized the management challenges reported by parties into seven major areas other than the basic issues related to safety and provision of suitable facilities discussed above. These challenges are listed and discussed below (please note that they are presented in no particular order of priority):

- a. Vandalism of signs, water tanks, vegetation, livestock, and apparent retaliation for complaints about shooter- caused vandalism

- b. Litter and trash magnetism associated with shooting
- c. Noise
- d. Resource destruction through erosion and hazardous waste (particularly lead)
- e. Property values on lands adjacent to shooting areas.
- f. Competing uses
- g. Funding for development of new shooting ranges
- h. Liability for injury or damage to private property

A. Interviewees informed us that they had seen repeated vandalism of signs, water tanks, vegetation, and livestock. The assessment team was shown an agency sign regarding shooting on public lands with at least 50 bullet holes. Some interviewees reported that in some areas shooting damage is observable on native vegetation, especially saguaro cactus. Cactus and trees evidence repeated use as targets or for hanging targets. The level of damage to vegetation was reported as significant and extensive. Some expressed concern about the shooting of livestock and water tanks, and reported that some complaints about vandalism from shooting had been met with apparent retaliation from shooters. The shooters we interviewed were also concerned about vandalism by irresponsible shooters, and felt that the laws needed to be enforced.

B. A number of interviewees reported that the litter and trash associated with recreational shooting on public lands is significant. Unwanted refrigerators, televisions, car batteries, tin cans and bottles have been targets of choice. Several noted that the large numbers of expended shotgun hulls, rifle and pistol shell casings, and non-recovered target parts constitute important and growing litter impacts. A number of the shooters we interviewed questioned the attribution of large-item dumping to the shooting community, commenting that it seems unlikely that someone would haul a refrigerator onto public lands simply to use it as a target. However, they did allow that if something is dumped, it can be an attractive target for shooters. The problem of litter does not seem contested, only the question of who is responsible for (a) dumping and (b) not picking up after themselves. A number of interviewees suggested that shooters' contribution to the problem is largely attributable to the undisciplined, unorganized population of shooters—again, a minority of shooters.

C. The noise associated with shooting activity was reported as a concern to other users of public lands for three reasons: First, it creates apprehension that the user is in the line of fire. Second, it disturbs the recreational experience of other users, making it an issue of competing use. Noise associated with outdoor shooting ranges was also cited as a problem for nearby neighborhoods, as a general annoyance, and for the perceived negative impacts on property values for homes located near this activity (see below).

The issue of noise was viewed as highly controversial because it has been one of the hot-button issues in the closure of the Tucson Rod and Gun Club. Parties told us about numerous decibel-level tests comparing the levels of sound associated with shooting and with (for example) the running of the tram through Sabino Canyon. We were told that sound mitigation designs for shooting ranges do exist, but the complete elimination of sound outside of facilities is only possible if they are completely indoor facilities. As noted above, shooters we interviewed do not want outdoor shooting opportunities to be eliminated.

D. The lead in ammunition was reported by some as leaving hazardous waste that can contaminate soils and water or be ingested by wildlife. The potential for lead associated with shooting to constitute a health or resource hazard was contested by others. Erosion associated with informal shooting was of concern to resource managers. Shooting in washes and driving through washes to get to shooting sites were also perceived as causing erosion.

E. Lowered property values on lands next to shooting ranges or sites was another concern expressed by some interviewees. The impact of the noise associated with shooting as well as the potential for stray bullets to land on private property were cited as potential devaluation issues. Again, this was a contested topic among interviewees because of the association with issues involving the closure of the Tucson Rod and Gun Club, especially the notion that stray bullets from the Club were landing on private property. Another concern expressed was that no “taking” of the value of property near shooting ranges should occur because landowners are prohibited from developing the property for some kinds of incompatible uses.

F. Competing and incompatible uses of public land in the same locations was cited by virtually all interviewees as a problem, whether for reasons of aesthetics, safety, or simply the zero-sum nature of this competition. Shooters we interviewed were strongly opposed to the erosion of their opportunities to shoot because of competing uses; they feel that recreational shooting is the activity that tends to be curtailed on public lands. Some shooters expressed concern that even if areas were designated for use or posted as shooting areas, if a hiker ventured into the area and was shot, it would be shooting that would likely be suspended as a result. Other recreators commented that shooting appears to trump other uses on public lands, because in locations where shooting takes place, no other recreational activities can occur.

Several perceived that competition among recreational uses has increased as urban areas have expanded near public lands, as well as after the September 11 terrorist attacks, as mentioned earlier in the report. A number of interviewees noted that the increasing pressure of use on public lands means that all users will be affected. The rural nature of at least some of the public lands in the West is changing, and with it, adjustments of activities will also have to occur.

G. Funding for development of new shooting ranges is reportedly an issue because of the large initial outlay for a facility, including land acquisition and facilities development. Interviewees suggested that a lack of commitment or allocation of funds on the part of government agencies (not simply federal) indicates a lack of commitment for the actual development of new ranges.

Who should pay for the establishment of new ranges was a controversial question. Shooters indicated that hunters pay significant amounts for wildlife management through the Pittman Robinson Act. Shooters perceived that no other recreational activity is taxed like shooting. Others wondered whether other recreational users are required to pay the costs associated with their activities, such as trail development.

H. Liability issues were also a key consideration for agency managers and decision makers. A concern that needs further exploration is liability for injury or private property damage that may result from the activity being conducted on properties they manage. Higher level decision makers missing “could potentially” reverse agreements or recommendations forged between

stakeholders at a local level thereby undermining local collaborative or consensus processes if the issues is not addressed early in the process.

IV. PROPOSED CRITERIA AND SOLUTIONS

During the course of the interviews and in the group meetings, the assessment team asked stakeholders to suggest their ideas for resolving issues outlined in the previous section. Interviewees suggested some basic criteria for considering proposed solutions related to recreational shooting issues and offered possible solutions to some of the key issues they had identified.

Criteria for solutions

Stakeholders identified the following criteria for assessing the usefulness and advisability of potential remedies for issues (these criteria were not identified by or agreed upon by all interviewees, and they are not listed in any particular order of ranking or priority):

- A need for some guarantees about the tenure of shooting ranges
- The protection of natural resources, including vegetation, soils, water, and wildlife
- Management of competition among desired uses of public land
- No net loss of access for shooters, and/or increase of opportunities for shooting
- Safety of public employees and the public, including shooters
- Adequate enforcement of existing laws
- Recognition of economic interests involved, including the shooting sports industry, permittees on public lands, property values, and non-prohibitive costs for access and exercise of recreational values
- Self-regulation wherever possible
- Multiple use of public lands by the public while protecting the resource for enjoyment by future generations

Proposed solutions to key issues

The assessment team asked stakeholders to provide their ideas for resolving key issues. Interviewees suggested the broad approaches and rationales listed below. All parties recognized that concurrent use of several solutions would be required — none of the solutions proposed would, by themselves, be adequate to solve the range of issues identified.

Strengthen educational efforts. More opportunities for effective and credible education about firearms and safe shooting was a frequent recommendation for mitigating some of the irresponsible and unsafe shooting that is occurring on public lands. Values education about responsible shooting may help irresponsible shooters to begin to self-regulate. Stakeholders suggested also preparation and distribution of interpretive signage and education materials on public lands as another means for educating shooters and other recreationists.

Increase enforcement. Vandalism, resource destruction, and illegal or unsafe shooting could be addressed, many suggested, by increased enforcement of existing laws rather than adding more regulations that might also be inadequately enforced. Some suggested that enforcement efforts do not need to be undertaken continuously at a high level, rather, periodically and unpredictably, just as traffic enforcement is currently practiced. Penalties for breaking the law need to be meted out.

Establish zones for management. Safety issues and conflicts resulting from competition among uses and incompatible uses occurring in the same areas can be addressed by creating zones of allowable activities. There are clearly better and best areas for informal shooting that are identifiable using well-accepted rules about safe shooting. Different kinds of shooting activities (action vs. stationary, for example) may also be provided in different zones.

Consider limited closures. Some interviewees proposed limited closures in areas where shooters have a hard time maintaining safe conditions, such as has been described in Redington Pass, where recreational use of all types is high and there is competition among incompatible uses. This solution is viewed as more acceptable to stakeholders if the closure is accompanied by designation of an alternative area where shooting is allowed. Shooters in particular thought that if this principle (i.e., no net losses) was adhered to by agencies, it would go far in helping to re-establish trust among interest groups.

Establish new formal shooting ranges. Public land users—both shooters and others—thought that the use of informal sites on public land for shooting would decrease if formal shooting ranges (especially outdoor ranges) were conveniently located throughout the Tucson basin. However, this is not to say that the demand for and problems associated with informal shooting will be eliminated by establishing more formal shooting ranges.

Study/explore existing models for managing irresponsible and undisciplined recreators. One interviewee suggested that other recreational sports have experienced similar kinds of problems perpetrated by a small number of undisciplined enthusiasts and have taken actions to manage the problems rather than wait for regulations to be imposed by others. For example, scuba divers must show evidence of passing safety and resource protection courses in order to purchase oxygen for their tanks. Another person suggested investigating what the OHV (Off-Highway Vehicle) community has done to handle transgressors.

V. ANALYSIS OF THEMES

Based on an analysis of the interviews with stakeholder representatives, the assessment team offers the following summary of the major themes that stakeholders would need to address in order to make progress on resolving issues around recreational shooting in the Tucson basin. In this section, we also present our analysis of whether a stakeholder dialogue would be useful in addressing issues related to recreational shooting in the Tucson basin. We discuss below some of the reasons for optimism as well as some potential challenges to facilitating a collaborative process to address these concerns. We also suggest some ideas about how best to organize the issues, as well as specific recommendations regarding structuring a collaborative dialogue so that stakeholders may work together effectively to make progress on these issues.

General themes

- a. **Trust issues due to history around recreational shooting in Arizona.** The extended and somewhat controversial history of decision making around issues of recreational shooting has led to disagreements and mistrust among various stakeholder groups. This impairment of trust among stakeholders will need to be acknowledged and addressed if stakeholders are to work together constructively to resolve issues.
- b. **There is encouraging common ground regarding shooting issues among participants in the interviews and the caucuses,** i.e., an awareness of the need for safety and responsible use of public lands, disapproval of vandalism and illegal activities, and a recognition of the need for development of more opportunities for recreational shooting in the Tucson basin. There is also a general sense among interviewees that many of the problems associated with safety and illegal or irresponsible activities are attributable to a minority of shooters who do not affiliate with shooting organizations. Given this general concurrence on many of the key topics related to recreational shooting, the issues seem tractable even though historically they have been quite contentious.
- c. **There is a perceived need for increased opportunities, especially formal shooting opportunities around the Tucson basin** in order to meet what has been reported to be an increasing demand for convenient shooting opportunities.
- d. **There is a clear acknowledgement of the need to address safety concerns** generally, whether due to perceived or actual unsafe shooting, and to address these issues in specific locations where safety is a concern.
- e. **There is also an awareness of the need to address the impacts of irresponsible shooting on public lands, including vandalism, illegal shooting, and resource destruction.** There is a strong recognition among interviewees that vandalism and resource destruction are illegal and should be identified and addressed as such, rather than associated with lawful recreational shooting. There is also an understanding that the issues of safety and vandalism will impact the continued availability of informal shooting opportunities on public lands unless effectively managed.

The assessment team noted that significant common ground exists across interest groups in respect to:

- concerns for safety issues,
- acknowledgment of the need for development of more opportunities for recreational shooting in the Tucson basin in order to meet demand,
- censure of vandalism and illegal activities, and
- recognition that many of the problems associated with safety and illegal or irresponsible activities are attributable to a minority of shooters who are not affiliated with shooting organizations.

Reasons for optimism

The assessment team is optimistic about the potential for stakeholders to partner effectively in addressing the issues they identified, based on the following observations and analysis:

- a. The issues have “ripened” to the point where all interviewees desire concrete actions and outcomes to resolve issues. All interviewees want the situation to improve and they recognize that the status quo is unacceptable.
- b. There is a perceived need to understand issues and work together to develop approaches for management of multiple uses. Increased recreational use on public land is creating potential safety issues in some places where shooting is occurring, and an additional set of concerns where urbanization is encroaching.
- c. Opportunities exist to get traction on issues because the issues are well formed and have been investigated by various parties. Management planning processes for public lands are scheduled and will provide an excellent opportunity to work together to develop common understandings of these issues through joint fact-finding and through the collaborative development and implementation of practical solutions to issues.
- d. There is an awareness of the value of taking a basin-wide approach to seeking solutions that resolve issues and concerns and there is growing commitment and increasing coordination among land management agencies to work together on these issues. There is also, a growing awareness that no single agency or group can adequately address issues working alone.
- e. Everyone we spoke to understands that organized shooting ranges will need to be part of the solution.
- f. Positive outcomes appear possible because of an obvious commitment on the part of all those we interviewed to firearm safety and individual responsibility.
- g. For informal shooting opportunities, there are clearly better and best areas for shooting that are identifiable using well-accepted rules about safe shooting.
- h. At the December 16 meeting of stakeholders, everyone attending affirmed their willingness to work together on issues, provided that the dialogue is highly focused and efficient.

Potential challenges

While we are optimistic about the potential for parties to work together to resolve issues, we do not wish to overlook the challenges that parties may face in creating a successful collaborative effort. From the interviews and discussions with stakeholders, we were made aware of the following potential challenges:

a. *The polarization of issues between the shooting community and natural resource managers due to recent decisions.* Mindful of this history, some in the organized shooting community stated their willingness to work together with the BLM, but remain wary about working with the Forest Service. This position would preclude the ability to take a basin-wide approach that seems critical to success. The recent change in leadership at the Coronado National Forest may provide an opportunity for rebuilding trust.

b. *Impaired trust.* Recent decisions closing areas to shooting have fostered mistrust, and the shooting community has reacted by wanting to block any actions that they perceive may result in a loss or closing of areas to shooting. Trust issues must be acknowledged and tackled; it is also important for key land management agencies to recognize that closures of areas to shooting without designation of alternative areas will, in our view, further erode trust and encourage blocking behavior from the shooting community.

c. *Process fatigue and lack of binding agreements associated with dialogue.* Shooters in particular, report that they have volunteered a substantial amount of time to a mediation that did not meet their interests, to litigation in trying to resolve issues, and to a collaborative process that ended in a unilateral decision. Shooters are, therefore, skeptical of investing time in yet another “process” that could lead again to no progress. Should a group make progress on issues and create plans for effective solutions that are acceptable to all parties, some also wondered whether such outcomes would actually lead to different decision making in the future (when decisions within a dialogue are not binding on parties.)

d. *Changing demographics in the Tucson Basin.* The population in the Tucson basin is shifting to a more urbanized public inexperienced with firearms. When recreational shooting issues reach the larger public arena, the debate may turn into a polarized ideological argument of pro-gun vs. anti-gun sentiments that obscures the necessity of addressing practical management issues: shooting safety, vandalism, resource damage, competing uses, and increased demand for shooting opportunities.

e. *Limited stakeholder understanding of agency planning processes, decision-making procedures, and parameters.* Stakeholders may not be motivated to understand these procedures and parameters until their interests are threatened. Misunderstandings about these agency-based processes can contribute to mistrust of the overall decision-making process. In any dialogue about issues and solutions, agencies should provide -- at the outset -- a clear explanation of these processes and the relevant sideboards to their decision-making.

Structuring the dialogue

Historically, management decisions concerning formal shooting have had an impact -- as indicated previously in this report -- on informal shooting activities as well as on the ability of land managers to work collaboratively with the recreational shooting community in addressing any problems associated with informal shooting. However, problems associated with formal shooting ranges are rather different from those associated with informal shooting, and regulations concerning management may also differ.

For formal shooting ranges, issues include: location (i.e., distribution within the basin for ease of access); the costs involved in acquiring property, building and maintaining facilities and operations; the need for buffer zones and other technical design considerations stability of tenure, costs for use; and liability.

For informal shooting on public lands, issues include: vandalism, unsafe use, illegal shooting, resource damage due to activities of irresponsible shooters, urban encroachment, and the consequences of growing numbers of people using lands adjacent to the metro area.

Management of issues associated with informal ranges may be more tractable in the short-term than those associated with the development and operation of formal shooting ranges. However, we believe it is vital that a hand-in-hand approach which recognizes the distinction between management issues in each category but moves forward on issues in both categories will be helpful. The more immediately-realized progress on issues related to informal shooting activities can help to forge the relationships between stakeholders necessary to realize longer-term progress on establishment of additional formal shooting opportunities.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The stakeholders we interviewed feel that a more directed, outcome-oriented process would be preferred, with fewer meetings and clearer, more tangible outcomes. We therefore recommend organizing a few initial meetings (four would perhaps be ideal) involving a broadly representative group of stakeholders. In these facilitated meetings, participants would be encouraged to work together to identify, analyze, and resolve issues, developing specific action steps that can result in concrete outcomes

In discussions with stakeholders during the December 16 meeting, the following topics were identified:

- 1) *Locations for recreational shooting*: Define criteria to identify appropriate zones and locations for formal and informal shooting opportunities. Conduct a gap analysis and gather existing data of what facilities and opportunities currently exist.
- 2) *Safety and enforcement issues*: Identify and discuss immediate and long-term problems; determine recommendations for addressing these needs.
- 3) *Resource impacts*: Identify issues related to vandalism, litter, and resource damage; discuss prevention and mitigation actions.
- 4) *Education*: Discuss issues related to firearm use and safety; identify opportunities and needs for educating the general public about shooting activities on public lands.

The sessions would be organized with the following general assumptions about the process:

- a. All sessions would include representation from a wide array of stakeholder interests.

- b. Participants would be encouraged to commit to attending all sessions, so that they can see the connections among issues and work together to integrate specific recommendations into a broader approach to addressing recreational shooting issues. Such a commitment will help to establish a common understanding of all the issues associated with both formal and informal shooting activities, as well as make possible the development of effective collaborative relationships that will be necessary to sustain progress in implementing any recommendations.
- c. While the individual meetings would be brief and focused, there may be a need for topical working groups to meet independently to conduct joint fact-finding and develop more deliberate recommendations for individual issues.
- d. All agency sponsors should attend all meetings, in order to participate as appropriate in the discussions, present needed information about issues and decision processes, and develop stronger working relationships with participants that will continue into potential implementation phases.
- e. The meetings should emphasize a problem-solving approach, and use a range of practical tools and exercises (e.g., shared history, mapping, joint fact-finding) to identify and address issues.
- f. The meetings should be facilitated by a skilled, professional facilitator who has extensive experience with complex multi-stakeholder processes.
- g. We recommend that the meetings be convened as soon as possible, in order to maintain the positive momentum of the assessment and the meetings held to date and to demonstrate the commitment to solving issues of greatest immediacy.

Convening and sponsorship

The assessment team recommends that the dialogue described above be sponsored by all key land management agencies and other formal organizations that share concerns about recreational shooting and the management of public lands in the Tucson basin. Joint sponsorship indicates a common commitment to resolving these issues and would send a powerful message of this commitment to participants in the dialogue. Sponsorship may include either general institutional support and/or actual funding for the meetings; however, funding would not be a precursor for agency participation nor should it be perceived as indicating the degree of commitment or any expectations of outcome in a particular direction.

To ensure neutrality and continuity to the process, we also recommend that the U. S. Institute maintain its role as overall convener to the process. Given our suggestion that the meetings be convened as quickly as possible, we also advise that U.S. Institute staff members are well-qualified and can act expeditiously by serving in the role of neutral facilitator for the short, focused dialogue sessions envisioned above.

VII. APPENDICES

I. List of interview questions

II. List of interviewees and other participants.

Appendix A

Semi-structured interview questions

1. What is your involvement with recreational shooting? If a recreational shooter, where in the Tucson basin do you go to shoot?
2. What has been your experience with recreational shooting on public lands in the Tucson basin? Do you have any particular concerns? What options do you think should be considered for handling the concerns that you have expressed?
3. What do you think are the most important goals for managing recreational shooting in the Tucson basin? Which of these are most important to you?
4. What do we need to know about how recreational shooting in the Tucson basin has been handled in the past?
5. In light of what you know about your concerns and requirements, AND those of other people who might not agree with you, what do you think is possible with respect to meeting everybody's needs and concerns regarding recreational shooting?
6. Exploration of ideas about recreational shooting management in the Tucson basin:
 - How far are you willing to drive to shoot?
 - What are the best kinds of places to shoot (i.e., qualities of places, not specific locations)?
 - How do you feel about shooting ranges?
 - How do you feel about limited closures where there has been a safety issue?
 - What do you think are important educational approaches for shooting safety?
 - How do you feel about work weekends for cleanup of shooting litter?
 - Are there areas on public lands that you see as inappropriate for recreational shooting?
 - What kinds of restrictions do you see as reasonable?
7. What suggestions do you have for how we can engage stakeholders in this process?
8. What other critical stakeholders do we need to be sure we've spoken with during the situation assessment, realizing that we can only do a limited number of interviews?
9. May we list your name amongst interviewees for the situation assessment?

Appendix B: List of Interviewees in Situation Assessment who were willing to have their names listed in this report

Lee Aitken, U.S. Department of Interior's Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Resource Advisory Council
Gail Aschenbrenner, USDA Forest Service, Coronado National Forest
Kerry Baldwin, Arizona Game and Fish Department
Rick Batori, Desert Trails Gun Club and Training Facility
James Bertrand, Tucson Rifle Club
Lorraine Buck, BLM, Tucson Field Office
Don Burchin, Pima County Parks and Recreation Commission
Joe Carter, Arizona Game and Fish Commissioner
Bob Cote, Tanque Verde Guest Ranch
Carl Davis, Red Hills Neighborhood Association
Bill Dowdle, Arizona State Land Department
Diana Durazzo, Office of Pima County Supervisor Sharon Bronson
Lenny Gulotta, National Shooting Sports Foundation
Dave Hardy, Tucson Rod and Gun Club
Trevor Hare, Sky Island Alliance
John Heiman, Southwest Trekking
Tony Herrell, BLM Tucson Field Office
Chuck Hudson, Arizona State Land Department
Sue Kozacek, USDA Forest Service, Coronado National Forest
Steve Lehning, BLM Permittee
Jan Leshner, Southern Arizona Office of Governor Janet Napolitano
Leslie Liberti, Marana Planning Department
Alan Lurie, Southern Arizona Homebuilders Association
Liz Matty, Jensen's Arizona Sportsman
Shela McFarlin, BLM Tucson Field Office
John McGee, USDA Forest Service, Coronado National Forest
Kay McLoughlin, Office of Congressman Kolbe
Rafael Payan, Pima County Parks and Recreation Department
Gerry Perry, Arizona Game and Fish Department
Larry Raley, USDA Forest Service, Santa Catalina Ranger District
Todd Rathner, NRA
Ken Rineer, Arizona Gun Owners
Don Saba, NRA
Will Schmall, Tucson Rifle Club
Larry Shults, BLM Tucson Field Office
Ron Senn, USDA Forest Service, Santa Catalina Ranger District
Jonathan Tate, Western Gamebird Alliance
Ed Taczanowsky, Southern Arizona Homebuilders Association
Darrell Tersey, BLM Tucson Field Office
Frances Werner, BLM Resource Advisory Council

APPENDIX 2

List of Participating Agencies and Stakeholders

- 7th District - AZ U.S. Congress
- 8th District- AZ U.S. Congress
- Agua Blanca Ranch
- Arizona State Land Department
- Arizona State Rifle and Pistol Association
- Arizonans for Wildlife
- Az Game and Fish Commission
- Az Gun Owners
- AZ State Land Department
- BLM
- BLM - Ironwood Forest National Monument
- BLM RAC (Resource Advisory Council)
- BLM Tucson Field Office
- City of Tucson
- Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection
- Coronado National Forest
- Desert Trails Gun Club and Training Facility
- Governor's Office
- Jensen's Arizona Sportsman
- Marana Planning Department
- National Park Service
- NRA
- NRA and the Mule Deer Foundation Board of Directors
- NRA and Tucson Rod and Gun Club
- NSSA National Shooting
- Office of Congressman Kolbe
- Pima County
- Pima County Board of Supervisors
- Pima County Department of Transportation
- Pima County Natural Resources Park Division (PCNRPR)
- Pima County Natural Resources Parks and Recreation
- Pima County Sheriff's Department
- Pima County Supervisors Office
- Pinal County
- S. Az Office of the Governor Janet Napolitano
- Saguaro National Park
- Santa Catalina Ranger District Coronado National Forest
- Senator Kyl's Office
- Senator McCain's office
- Sky Island Alliance
- Sonoran Desert Mountain Bicyclists
- Southern Arizona Mountain Biking Association

- Southern AZ Homebuilder's Association
- Southwest Trekking
- Tanque Verde Guest Ranch
- The Good Gun Foundation
- The Nature Conservancy
- Tohono O'odham DPS and Environmental Protection Agency
- Tucson Audubon Society
- Tucson Rifle Club
- Tucson Rod and Gun Club
- U.S. Senate
- US Rep. Grijalva's Office
- USDA Forest Service
- USDA Forest Service Coronado Forest
- USDA Forest Service, Santa Catalina Ranger District
- USFS Coronado National Forest
- Western Gamebird Alliance

APPENDIX 3

Workshop #1 - Meeting Schedule Summary

Workshop #1 - Meeting Schedule

Early Agency Meetings with U.S. Institute

1/16/04

1/26/04

Initial Organizational Committee Meetings

2/3/04 - with small group

2/16/04 - with larger group (to begin workshop process design)

Organizational Group Meetings to Prepare for Workshop #1

3/2/04

3/16/04

4/12/04

5/4/04

Note: (Subcommittee meetings on Education, Safety & Enforcement, Resource Impacts and Locations occurred throughout this period. Each subcommittee established a vision of what they wanted to accomplish at Workshop #1 and the questions they thought would be useful to ask the public about each of the issues)

Workshop #1 was held on May 22, 2004

APPENDIX 4

Workshop # 1 Notices, Press Releases

Tucson Basin Recreational Shooting Workshops

Notice of Workshop #1

The U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution will hold a public workshop on Saturday, May 22, 2004, at the Doubletree Hotel at Reid Park, 445 S. Alvernon Way, Tucson, Arizona 85711. The meeting will occur from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

You are invited to attend Workshop #1, the first in a series of workshops focused on getting input from the Tucson Basin's recreational shooting community on four topics: 1) Issues relating to locations for recreational shooting; 2) Safety and enforcement issues; 3) Resource impacts; 4) Education. The workshop will emphasize a problem-solving approach, using a range of practical tools and exercises such as shared history, mapping, and joint fact-finding in order to solicit information and further clarify and address the issues related to recreational shooting in the Tucson Basin and the challenges of unlawful shooting on public lands.

The Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Forest Service, Arizona Game & Fish, Pima County, City of Tucson, City of Marana as well as members of a variety of groups, including the National Rifle Association, have worked together to organize this workshop series to address these important issues. The meeting organizers believe that these cannot be adequately addressed without taking a Tucson basin-wide approach. They are seeking the input from a wide array of stakeholders to define a common vision for resolving these resource management and public safety issues. The BLM, Forest Service and Arizona Game & Fish have jointly provided funding for these workshops. The next workshop will be held in late summer 2003.

This workshop series was organized as a result of a situation assessment relating to recreational shooting issues. In conjunction with that assessment, the sponsors determined that the project would specifically address "recreational shooting," defined as the discharge of any firearm for any lawful, recreational purpose other than the lawful taking of a game animal. They separated this activity from hunting, which the project was not intended to address. Unlawful shooting activities are not considered to be recreational shooting.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: If you would like more information concerning the meeting, please contact Olivia Montes, Administrative Assistant at the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, 130 South Scott Avenue, Tucson, Arizona 85701, (520) 670-5299, or Cherie Shanteau at the number noted below.

A copy of the situation assessment "Recreational Shooting in the Tucson Basin: The Potential for Collaborative Dialogue and Action" can be obtained at http://www.ecr.gov/s_publications.htm#Tucson_Basin

Tucson Basin Recreational Shooting Workshops

NOTICE OF WORKSHOP

DATE: Saturday, May 22, 2004

TIME: 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

PLACE: Doubletree Hotel at Reid Park, 445 S. Alvernon Way, Tucson

You are invited to attend Workshop #1, the first in a series of workshops focused on getting input from the Tucson Basin's recreational shooting community on four topics: 1) Issues relating to locations for recreational shooting; 2) Safety and enforcement issues; 3) Resource impacts; 4) Education. The workshop will emphasize a problem-solving approach, using a range of practical tools and exercises in order to solicit information and further clarify and address the issues related to recreational shooting in the Tucson Basin and the challenges of unlawful shooting on public lands.

The workshop is being convened and facilitated by the U. S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution. Partners in this effort include the Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Forest Service, Arizona Game & Fish, Pima County, City of Tucson, City of Marana as well as members of a variety of groups, including the National Rifle Association.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, please contact Olivia Montes, Administrative Assistant at the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, 130 South Scott Avenue, Tucson, Arizona 85701, (520) 670-5299, or Cherie Shanteau at the number noted below.

For additional background information on this project, a copy of the situation assessment "Recreational Shooting in the Tucson Basin: The Potential for Collaborative Dialogue and Action" can be obtained at http://www.ecr.gov/s_publications.htm#Tucson_Basin



PRESS RELEASE

CONTACT: Cherie Shanteau or Larry Fisher
Senior Program Managers
PHONE: (520) 670-5299
DATE: May 11, 2004

TUCSON BASIN RECREATIONAL SHOOTING ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC WORKSHOP

(Tucson, AZ) -- The U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (U.S. Institute) will convene a public workshop to solicit information about issues related to recreational shooting on public lands in the Tucson Basin on Saturday, May 22, 2004 from 1:00 to 5:00 p.m. at the Doubletree Hotel at Reid Park, 445 S. Alvernon Way.

The workshop will address four key topics including criteria for establishing recreational shooting locations, issues related to safety and enforcement, resource impacts and education. Seating is limited and available on a first-come, first served basis.

The workshop is the first in a series of collaborative dialogues designed to engage the recreational shooting community, federal, state and local land management agencies, and various other stakeholder groups in developing appropriate management guidelines for resolving resource management and public safety issues related to recreational shooting in the Tucson Basin, and the challenges of irresponsible or unlawful shooting on public lands. "Recreational shooting" is defined as the discharge of any firearm for any lawful, recreational purpose other than the lawful taking of a game animal. It is thus distinct from--and does not include--hunting. Participating agencies include the Bureau of Land Management, USDA Forest Service, Arizona Game and Fish, Pima County, City of Tucson, City of Marana, and representatives from a variety of user groups, including the National Rifle Association.

A general presentation will include an overview of recreational shooting activities on public lands and background about this particular project. Concurrent breakout sessions will emphasize a problem-solving approach, using a range of practical tools and exercises to solicit feedback on each of the four topics, and will enable the public to attend more than one discussion. Opportunities for formal public comments, as well as question and answer sessions will be provided. For more information about the workshop, or to submit oral or written comments, please contact Olivia Montes at the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, 130 South Scott Avenue, Tucson, Arizona 85701 or call (520) 670-5299. Comments can be emailed to montes@ecr.gov.

more/ . . .

For more information about this project, a copy of the situation assessment "Recreational Shooting in the Tucson Basin: The Potential for Collaborative Dialogue and Action" can be obtained at http://www.ecr.gov/s_publications.htm - Tucson Basin

The U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution is a federal program established in 1998 by the U.S. Congress to assist parties in resolving environmental, natural resource and public land conflicts. It is a program of the Morris K. Udall Foundation, an independent agency of the executive branch that is based in Tucson. The U.S. Institute serves as an impartial, non-partisan institution providing professional expertise, services and resources to all parties involved in environmental disputes, regardless of who initiates or pays for assistance. For more information about the U.S. Institute, call (520) 670-5299 or visit www.ecr.gov.

###

APPENDIX 5

Workshop #1 - Participant Input

EDUCATION BREAKOUT SESSION
Saturday, May 22, 2004

SESSION GOALS

Overall Goal: To obtain input about better educating public land agency staff and visitors about shooting opportunities and issues to enhance visitor safety and minimize the impact on natural resources.

Gather information about how to better educate three primary audiences: 1) shooting public, 2) agencies, 3) other public lands visitors,

About:

- Shooting opportunities
- Shooting safety
- Visitor responsibilities (knowing what is going on where on public land - i.e. where to shoot, how to avoid conflicts)
- Existing regulations
- The legitimacy of shooting as a legal activity on public lands

Provide opportunities for public input regarding:

- Desires and expectations for education programs
- Feedback on current agency education efforts
- Strategies for getting educational information to the public
- Consistency of educational information
- Inter-agency cooperation/communication regarding regulations and education
- Improving information access

QUESTIONS

1. What specific audiences do we need to consider?

- Shooters
- Non-shooters
- Anti-shooters
- The minority of shooters that doesn't want to go to formal range
- Youth
- General public including ethnic groups (non-English speakers) and people new to area
- Seniors
- All users of public lands
 - Hikers
 - Mountain bikers
 - ATV
 - Others
- Schools, school officials/boards/districts
- Environmental groups
- Animal rights groups
- Media

- Law Enforcement
- Local politicians
- Federal politicians
- Recreational Shooting Organizational Group

2a. What kind of messages need to go to these audiences?

- What weapons do, what you should not do, damage that can be done.
- Shooters: how to leave minimum impact, not littering; make aware of existing resources and locations
- Media: What shooters are really doing more balanced; break unfair stereotypes (shooters think the media has anti-shooting bias)
- Gun safety, responsible gun safety/usage – 3 simple rules.
- Terminology - “Firearms” vs. “guns” and “weapons” (decriminalized firearms), “recreational use of firearms” vs. “recreational shooting”
- Law Enforcement: educate about firearms laws & fair enforcement
- Non-shooting public lands users and public activists: legitimate firearms usage; take away some fear; shooting can be very safe, and is most of the time.
- General Public (shooting public)
 - Penalties for non-responsible shooting
 - Difference between responsible and non- responsible shooting.
 - Just because illegal dumped doesn’t mean you should shoot at it.
- Seniors: What is responsible/irresponsible shooting
- Schools/Universities: responsible public lands use; gun safety
- Organizational Group: definitions – one person suggests “how and where you shoot is regulated by law and if you break the law you will be prosecuted”

2b. What methods/strategies can be used to reach of these audiences?

- Media: redirect media’s focus
- Redefine terms so less bias/inflammatory
- Law Enforcement: incorporate into their training
- Non-shooting users: outreach to existing clubs, organizations
- Shooters: go to where they buy firearms supplies (gun shops, clubs, ranges, gun shows); use marketing such as brochures, posters, and catchy slogans.
- Youth: gun safety taught through schools
- Schools as way to reach families – actual course or part of health or civics, individual responsibility, communication service have to clean up.
- Irresponsible shooters: If caught illegally shooting, 1st offense need to attend a class (as alternative to fine, but have to pay for it), 2nd offense increase in fine, 3rd offense jail.
- Responsible shooters pick up after litterers to increase reputations (?). Educate irresponsible shooters.
- Seniors: brochures, etc. at recreational centers
- AARP possible resource altering (anti-gun?) message to seniors
- NRA green sheets to stores, etc (gun, outdoor, Walmart, Target though Target has policy of not selling guns, etc....)
- Spanish language programs to reach non-English speakers
- Schools/universities: incorporated responsible shooting into broader course on responsible public lands use.

- ATV users: integrate responsible public lands use into classes
- Booths at concerts & other large public venues.
- Find/conduct study comparing risk/safety across public lands uses
- Minority illegal shooters: law enforcement, TV ads/hotlines (if you see anyone call, open eyes and ears).
- Illegal shooter/dumpers: TV spot with Game & Fish officer/ BLM offer solution to general public, show problem, then people cleaning it up emphasize positive
- Signs at wildcat shooting areas about picking up litter, penalties, basic safety
- Rewards for reporting illegal shooting.
- Add gun safety & land use ethics to archery or PE programs
- Shooting clubs at schools can be safe; change perceptions about this

3. What challenges might be encountered with each of these audiences?

- Media: they don't want to break stereotypes.
- Schools: kids getting bias messages. Schools are demonizing item (e.g. gun, knife) vs. the action (e.g. shooting cactus).
- Facilities for classes closed to hunter/recreational shooting education. (American Legion suggested but youth having a class at Am. Legion that serves alcohol would be a problem).
- Illegal dumping: lack of law enforcement
- Illegal shooters (a minority): "will never reach them"; legal requirement for witnesses and court testimony scares people away, afraid those they testify against will come after them.

4. What agency and organization outreach programs/products already exist?

- No comprehensive list of local trainings and other resources, would be useful
- NRA Eddie Eagle program (video, etc.)
- Hunter safety
- Formal shooting ranges – programs, facilities, courses, one-on-one resource people.
- Hunter education classes taught by volunteers
- Boy Scouts (badge)
- 4-H program
- Existing courses – add responsible public lands use (including about safe shooting, littering, etc.)
- ATV training for purchasers of new ATVs
- INS course for immigrants
- Game & Fish education trailer
- Lawful shooting community (to talk with, educate, and report illegal activity).
- 88Crime/Operation Game Thief (reward)

5. On what other topics do we need more information? Other education related topics/information.

- For August public meeting - prefer earlier in month, please avoid start of hunting season

Recreational Shooting in the Tucson Basin
Workshop #1

RESOURCE IMPACTS BREAKOUT SESSION

BREAKOUT SESSION GOALS:

- Inform workshop participants/public about resource impact issues resulting from irresponsible shooting
- Clarify definitions relating to resource impacts
- Establish the categories of problems that exist
- Determine what the existing resources are for addressing these problems
- Establish what the workshop meeting participants/public are willing to do to help address these problems

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES²:

1) From your experience, what are the important resource impact issues that result from irresponsible shooting?

- Land and environment destruction (3)
- Wildlife harassment and destruction
- Shooting up signs (7)
- Destruction of cactus/saguaro (3)
- Shooting of water tanks (2)
- Litter/trash/garbage strewn about (9)
- Noise
- Destruction of property (5)
- Ranchers' equipment/property
- Historical artifacts/rock art (3)
- Abandoned vehicles
- Old targets, debris, and litter left at shooting sites
- Empty casings
- Very insignificant impact – not measurable – on vegetative cover
- Much of illegal dumping is mistakenly interpreted as associated with illegal shooting
- Poor community relations
- Bad public relations for responsible shooting (damage to image of responsible shooters) (2)
- The closing of shooting areas because of irresponsible shooters
- Conflicts among recreational interests

2) What suggestions do you have to help resolve these problems?

- Study when, who and where the illegal activity is taking place (4)
- Increased enforcement, particularly of trouble spots (10) (similar to DUI task force)
- More high profile, and more severe penalties for illegal shooting/dumping – use funding for cleanup and enforcement (9)

² Numbers in parentheses following the statements indicate multiple similar responses.

- Take away gun rights from offenders
- Move the enforcement group around unannounced to target the activity
- Identify illegal shooters and take action
- Work with the courts to get convictions
- Smaller, but more fines – make it progressive
- Since hunters already pay for most everything, institute permit fees for all others who use the resource
- License people to use public lands (but target money for enforcement) (6)
- Don't charge people with hunting licenses for access
- More supervised, accessible public ranges with adequate facilities (4)
- Provide a place to shoot that won't take driving for half an hour to get there
- Video surveillance
- Shooters talking to shooters
- Encourage people to police their own areas
- Responsible shooters should report the people that are being irresponsible, write down their license plate number and give it to agencies (2)
- Ability to report illegal dumping to one place, not playing phone tag with BLM, USFS, AZGFD to report it. Must have confidence action will be taken (4)
- Need a contact phone number to report law breakers (e.g., 1800-555-1221) (6)
- Need guidelines/instructions for reporting lawbreakers (license number, photo, other information?)
 - Better coordination among land management agencies – make sure they are coordinating and that they respond to calls
- Two witnesses needed to report – always shoot with a buddy
- Post more signs in strategic locations; put contact number on all signs (3)
- When hunting licenses are sold, include information packet and suggestions
 - Designate alternative areas to shoot on State/BLM/Forest land (5)
 - Re-open Tucson Rod and Gun Club for the Northeast (2)
 - Open alternative firearm range on east and north side of Tucson
 - Better education among the general public about responsible shooting (4)
 - Educate the public, by issuing citations and publishing court results
 - Educate the public about land ethics and their own sense of responsibility
 - Training in firearm use, etiquette and responsibility, in the schools (3)
 - University orientation program
 - Volunteer programs (e.g., shooting or sportsmen groups, boy scouts) to help keep the wildcat shooting areas cleaner and safer (5)
 - Use the media to educate the public about these issues (3)
 - Confiscate vehicles and firearms to sell for future enforcement
 - Clean/remove illegal dumping sites
 - Offer additional/accessible dumping sites
 - Make signs out of ½" or 3/8"
 - Less restrictions, more access
 - Operation Trash Busters (like Operation Game Fee) – be proactive, publicize on radio, TV, newspapers
 - Financially target the problem (e.g., Heritage Funds, Pittman-Robertson Funds, other sources of federal funding) (3)
 - All users should contribute to funding, not just shooters

- Set up a website to coordinate reporting and enforcement activities

3) What additional suggestions to you have for resources for clean-up and remediation of damaged areas?

- Provide free, more accessible dumping sites of garbage/appliances (2)
- Promote “adopt-a-hill” or other adoption programs (4)
- Sportsmen groups, hiking clubs, bird watchers and other volunteer groups can help remove garbage and clean up debris (3)
- Involve the public in monitoring, reporting, and enforcement
- Use welfare recipients and jail inmates for clean up
- Force violators to clean up (4)
- Creative sentencing – court ordered community service of perps/illegal shooters (2)
- Make illegal aliens pick up their trash
- Allocate (or reallocate/reprioritize) the funds necessary (3)
- Promote these issues at concerts, ball games, and other highly populated venues
- Change state lands laws to allow for target shooting
- Return all public lands to Arizona – eliminate mixed ownership land problems

4) What have we missed?

- Blaming shooters for illegal dumping (2)
- Blame the USFS for closing Sabino range
- Illegal shooting is not a significant problem – public dumping is – remove the illegal dumping sites (2)
- Activities of illegal border crossers and the damage and trash they cause
- Activities and impacts of OHV users are much worse than shooting damage

5) What would you be willing to do to help?

- Willing to pay land fee for use (if the money is used for increased surveillance) (3)
- Report law breakers to enforcement (2)
- Pack out more than I take in
- Would participate in shooting club sponsored clean-up programs or other periodic (e.g., annual) clean-up events (5)
- I’m a member of a sportsmen group that has a clean up near Sasabe (Buenos Aires WR) that we do each spring from garbage of UDAs
- Clean up established ranges
- Engage in more dialogue and idea sessions
- Have an annual workshop to discuss issues and generate solutions
- Would be happy to volunteer or solicit speakers for schools and other groups
- Support education efforts at key events

Recreational Shooting in the Tucson Basin
Workshop #1
Saturday, May 22, 2004

SAFETY & ENFORCEMENT BREAKOUT SESSIONS

SESSION GOALS:

- Provide information and materials on safe gun handling
- Provide information to participants/public regarding existing rules and regulations for shooting on public lands
- Identify safety and enforcement challenges
- Identify possible solutions for these challenges

QUESTIONS AND COLLATED RESPONSES³:

1. From your personal experience, what are the short and long-term challenges that you believe relate to safety and enforcement?

- Insufficient enforcement manpower is a long-term problem.
- Lack of officers, officers are spread out too thin for their areas.
- Insufficient number of law enforcement because of insufficient budgets.
- Too few law enforcement officers to adequately cover the land mass, and population density
- Concentrating people in shooting areas with too few law enforcement officers.
- Staffing always a problem
- Insufficient formal/safe/designated informal ranges encourages shooting at unsafe informal sites
- Lack of safe, open places to shoot, Sabino closed –distance to other ranges from the Northeast side of Tucson is an added cost
- Lack of gun safety training in schools.
 - Public education – (lack of it)
 - Uneducated youth from out of town.
 - Problem sharing rules and regulations with broader public
- Public officials too heavy on enforcement under “color of law” not the actual law.
- Most of the problems come from inappropriate acts of citizenship – schools, families are responsible.
- How to separate the dumping and littering issues from the shooting issues?
- OHV driving in front of shooters.
 - How do you identify people engaging in unlawful activity? People who shouldn't own firearms (e.g. criminal record).
- Some people arrested have outstanding warrants.

³ Similar responses across the three breakout sessions and the written comments provided are grouped together to facilitate easy review.

- Small number of shooters are “criminals”
- What are the statistics of recreational (non-hunting) shooting related incidents to other types of incidents on public lands? Types of stats wanted:
 - Human death, injury
 - Physical costs as well e.g. bullets in stock tanks
 - What are the costs (opportunity costs) of losing access to public land?
 - Problem of statistics – tell us how many violations, how many service calls so that we can compare the needs with the manpower available.
 - How do you enforce existing rules?
 - Younger people are often seen shooting unlawfully.
 - Don’t want a license to shoot
 - Who do we call if we see unlawful shooting? Agency can’t take all calls.
 - Question from group to agency resource volunteers: Give us examples of the types for problems you face.
 - Forest Service – conflicts between different types of users, for example, bullets through windshields.
 - BLM – Shooting of physical structures resulting in damage to natural resources, vegetation etc.
 - “Irresponsible Shooting” Responsible shooters not the problem. Problem is the irresponsible shooters for example individuals using body-armor piercing ammunition and shooting while on drugs (the example was a person on methamphetamine).
 - Explore target shooting on public lands.
 - Distinguish between safety and enforcement
 - Don’t want more law enforcement
 - Enforcement to observe Article 2 Section 2 of Arizona constitution.
 - Long term challenges: young people don’t care.
 - Attitudes are important – more laws and regulations may discourage lawful shooters from reporting problems.

2. What ideas do you have to deal with these challenges?

- Suggestions are all things we don’t have control over – requires legislation.
- How do you legislate or enforce common sense?
- Increase staffing of agencies
 - Review current capabilities (tools) of enforcement agencies. What tools are needed to resolve problems?
 - Need statistics to quantify to problems related to safety and enforcement.
- Concentrate enforcement staffing – use the wolf pack approach – e.g. TPD motorcycles to enforce the speed limit.
- Whenever you (agencies) see a person you suspect of doing something illegal run their record to check for felonies – in possession of a weapon.
- Run checks on vehicle license plates to determine if a person has a prior record. (Need probable cause). If have a record e.g. prior felony, use of firearm is prohibited.
 - Lawful shooters, hunters, hikers observing illegal activities and reporting the perpetrators to the proper authorities.
 - Enforce strict laws against dumping and littering on public lands.
- High fines for dumping

- Law enforcement should apply equal priority to unlawful shooters and dumpers.
 - Education as part of the penalty: confiscate weapons until violator completes training.
- Add teeth to the penalties, e.g. a person should lose drivers license.
- Get Sheriff's department involved in the OHV problem.
- Heavy fine, confiscation of weapons and jail time for violations per degree.
- If ticketed for illegal shooting not only fine but also make mandatory gun safety course and monitor the individual to ensure they comply (like traffic school for speeding).
 - Who should a lawful shooter report unlawful shooting to? BLM: Get license plate, photo document and give to the agencies.
 - BLM has a central dispatch that takes calls from local law enforcement. The public should report unlawful shooting to local law enforcement
- 1-800 number to report – Call just one place to report unlawful shooting. Then the agencies should determine jurisdictional responsibility
 - Can repeat offenders be tracked?
 - (BLM) – have a database but not accessible in the field.
- (Game & Fish) – do have a database networked into NCIC.
- Lobby Congress to increase enforcement budgets.
- Funds to pay personnel and equipment (signs, brochures, newspaper announcements, TV, radio).
 - Use Pittman-Robertson Act money to support/fun law enforcement on federal Lands.
 - Don't want to divert money from Act to non-shooting issues, use the Act funds that are currently diverted away from shooting issue to underwrite enforcement costs
- Educating young people in schools about firearms safety, shooting, hunting ethics get them while their young.
- Involve public thru education
- Educate – non-shooters
- Directed patrol to educate public
- Identify people who are “reachable” via education.
- Education, education, etc.
 - Make “Eddie Eagle” type programs in elementary and middle schools mandatory.
 - Education programs I & E
 - More public education involvement k – 12 even university level
 - Elementary school education and middle schools
 - Instruct people in responsible use of firearms e.g. rifle clubs in high school.
- Public education – use local TV stations.
- Make gun safety trainers paid positions (paid by fines collected from unlawful shooters).
- Educate rather than prosecute

- Post the location of legal places to shoot where you buy licenses, and post signs on public lands, post information on websites.
- Provide maps and information to all the public through local media newspapers.
- Need synergy between law enforcement and law-abiding public. Increase communication.
- Mark areas as preferred or designated shooting – i.e. with reasonable backstop, barriers etc.
 - Spend more time, money posting “open to shooting” as they do to no shooting.
- Posted 1000 yards buffer zone around formal and informal (known) places.
- Post guidelines where guns/ammo sold
- Easy to see, and follow regulations and rules
- Permit program to shoot on public land.
- Membership in firearms/hunting organization to qualifies for permit.
 - License use of public land (lose license if violate)
 - Use of public lands should be open to all
 - Look at public lands in proximity to high population areas develop safe areas.
 - More safe areas that are signed for shooting
 - Increase safe informal ranges by designating and publicizing their locations.
 - Provide structural range. Stupid people should find it easier.
 - Create designated areas for shooting.
 - Need more areas closer (more convenient) to people
 - Just do it!
 - Volunteer groups to go to ranchers, BLM, FS, and State officials and organizations to restore and clean up damaged property.
 - “Adopt a shooting area” by local groups.

3. What creative ideas do you have for addressing enforcement penalties?

- Community Service.
- Community Service programs for offenders and “mis-users” of rights and properties in any area.
- Require considerable hours of related community service.
- Stiffer fines, community service, loss of use of /on public lands.
- Stricter penalties – higher fines.
- Significant fines and penalties
- Game & Fish fines are reasonable. Penalties should be graduated but not draconian
- Simplify laws – make language clearer. Educate people about law.
- Simplify laws. The way laws are written all of us are in violation at some time
- Enforcement of existing laws.
- Don’t need increased presence of law enforcement.
- Go where the problem is alleged to be.
- High profile enforcement areas.

- Prosecute under existing laws
- Public embarrassment: publicize photos of unlawful shooters in press, TV, website
- Mark open areas with signs for maps.
- Have pamphlets at locations where people buy guns.
- Signs with a phone number to report illegal activity.
- Take a gun owners class.
- Restitution for damages.
 - (BLM) –money from citations goes to National Victim’s assistance fund.
 - (BLM and Game & Fish) – Existing fines can’t be used for restitution.
- Bring U.S. Attorney’s Office into process because involved in sentencing.

- Can illegal dumpers be tracked?
 - (BLM) Exploring contracting for a helicopter to get the big picture of what is happening in Ironwood N.M.
- Make anyone caught littering clean up their litter and the litter of ten others who did not get caught.
 - Need to assign oversight of clean up programs
 - Can people with refrigerators be arrested?
 - BLM will cite.
 - Forest Service would require special closure order for any limitation.
 - Would need to be very thoughtful, identify legitimate common targets e.g. bowling pins, tin cans
 - Concern that puts limitations on people.
- Can federal land be patrolled by local sheriff’s department?
- Multiple law enforcement agencies should coordinate efforts
 - (BLM) dealing with range of crime on public land: e.g., urban/public land interface (high population concentration), border issues such as drugs and people
- Can there be a volunteer program to ride along with law enforcement?
 - (BLM) – enabling law requires person to be a law enforcement officer.
 - Encourage public to report events.
- Have to get public involved: Give them opportunity to be a user and steward for the land
- Ask public to help enforce, they can be the eyes and ears for law enforcement
 - Clarification: BLM needs those who report events to also be witness and testify
- State Land and Game & Fish volunteer programs
- License public land use if no hunting use is permitted – loss of license and denial of use for violation.
- License for public lands – punish those who are wrong.
- Return lands to Arizona.

4. How can we increase law enforcement presence on public lands?

- The question presumes that we need to increase law enforcement. Do we need more law enforcement on public lands?
- Obviously, more officers are needed, but a proper balance needs to be found so that we do not end up as a police state.
- We do not need more law enforcement we need more “peace officers”
- How are jurisdictional issues addressed?
 - (BLM) - Assimilation Agreements with other federal agencies.
- Use teams for concentrated efforts on specific target area at varying times
- Decrease law enforcement within designated user areas
- Give the same priority to dumping as they do to shorting reports.
- Creating more laws to enforce does not alleviate the problem.
- Need enforcement to know about the types of guns being used.
- Off-duty sheriff and police officers (Paid)
 - (Challenge – officers get pulled back because of staff shortages may also have to deal with police/sheriff/fire fighter unions.
- Deputize more of the public.
- Involve public
- The lawful citizens with cell phones, note pads reporting illegal activities.
- “High intensity enforcement” zones in known illegal shooting/dumping areas.
- Use citizen reports of unlawful acts.
- Use of legitimate individual shooter/“recreators” to police any and all program areas – information to public on what is and isn’t proper use.
- Allocate volunteers, students.
- Listen to users who report events and take them seriously.
- Increase of funding by restitution for damages caused.
- Money
- Budget, Budget, Budget, listen to users.
- More people = more money for support
- Legislative – more funds.
- Increase the budget
- Open more public lands to public

5. Other issues raised:

- Don’t close gun ranges
- Reopen Sabino Canyon
- Legal clarification – regarding if a hunting license allows an individual to sight a gun on state lands.
- Shooting areas need convenient
- Enforcement of hunters rights e.g., hunters encounter people intentionally frightening animals.
- Why licensing is objectionable:
 - Being charged fees for public lands that are already public e.g. Mt. Lemmon fees we now have to rent the land to use it.
- Other illegal activity – ATV, tearing down fences
- Public employees are to serve the public.

LOCATION ISSUES BREAKOUT SESSION

Saturday, May 22, 2004

SESSION GOALS:

- Describe where we are and what we know about shooting locations
- Clarify that we want to know more from participants/public
- Educate participants/public about existing locations for formal and informal shooting
- Get help in answering questions posed

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES:

1. **Please provide information regarding other informal shooting areas that are not described on the map provided.**
 - The Maps themselves are not sufficiently clear. Example: which hatch-marked area is Molina Basin and which specific area is marked for the actual shooting spot?
 - Gardner Canyon – shooting group of 4-6 with arsenal .22 to AK 475 right next to designated campground in use. ATV's, horses, hikers in area but away from direction of activity.
 - Amado – West Frontage Rd., Next to I-19 S. There is a gated AZ Game & Fish area open to shooters. Don't go alone - lots of drugs and people smugglers passing through.
 - Need more places to shoot! Will divert many from "problem areas"
 - There need to be more designated informal shooting ranges for casual shooters. If they are designated it would steer shooters to safe places and discourage unsafe problem areas.
 - Ranges need to be available in Northwest Tucson, Reddington, Green Valley, and Houghton Rd/I-10
 - Agree that there are no public sites being provided for the shooting sports, since the Forest Service without cause shut down the Tucson Rod & Gun Club. So there is only Reddington Pass, which is totally inadequate.
 - Better definitions and public knowledge of where possession is permitted and not.
 - East and North
 - Wait! Those that are shown have no street or highway etc. marking so that it is impossible to tell exactly where these are located.
 - Saguaro National Forest
 - The area is not a lot, therefore, the shooter has a good backstop.
 - Take a portion of a National Forest and build a range – we need a backstop like Saguaro East.
 - Milepost 8 Reddington Pass – denial of an legitimate safe area in which to shoot. (Boulders in trail, fencing off legitimate area.)
 - Shooting range such as the old Sabino Canyon Range should be available.

2. What parts of the Tucson Basin need formal ranges?

- All
- Who will enforce a closure to shooting in specific areas? No one enforces dumping, littering, and reckless shooting now due to shortage of manpower. How will you do if a new rule closes shooting?
- Three are necessary – North, East, West
- Northwest Tucson near Reddington Road (Wildcat Shooting is all we have now)
- Southeast near Vail
- East, Northeast, Oro Valley, Catalina, Oracle
- Northwest, Northeast, Southeast
- Northeast – USFS needs to reopen Tucson Rod & Gun Club
- We need safe, supervised places to shoot in the Green Valley, Sahuarita, Amado Area
- Southwest closer to Valencia/Ajo Area
- Problem areas--what violations are not being enforced? What stats do you have to prove unsafe areas? Leave status quo let law enforcement enforce current laws, which include sound pollution etc.
- There is currently only one public archery range by the Desert Museum in the Tucson Basin. It is not maintained in a manner that would attract any shooters. The two courses that use to be there are destroyed. This is sad that we have a beautiful location but no support.
- Northeast Tucson Rod & Gun Club needs to be reopened
- Northeast Sabino Canyon
- Northeast Sabino Canyon Rd. and Sunrise
- Northeast Sabino and Kolb area
- Northeast Tucson Rod and Gun Club reopened. Need public ranges in the Southeast, too. Took county seven years to start.
- Northwest
- There should be a formal shooting range providing a safe place for rifle, pistol and shotgun shooting. No more than a 20 minute drive from any part of Tucson.
- North side Rifle range 200 yards +. East side rifle range 200 yards +.
- How about a commercial shooting range or ranges on the Tohono O'odham reservation? It could be another income source for the tribe.
- The possibility of a large shooting complex on the San Xavier Reservation should be discussed with the Tohono O'odham Nation.
- Build a range in the holes in the ground at the sand and gravel pits on the NW side of Tucson.
- Agencies close ranges and then wonder why there are a lot of places that shooters congregate. Open ranges then consider closures.
- Build range near the City dump. No one wants to live near it. Tractor can build barriers
- Southwest near Valencia and Cardinal
- Tucson still needs a northeast facility to replace the Tucson Rod and Gun Club, preferably on the same site.
- NE side Reddington Pass area – you could set it up as an informal area.
- East, South East Side, Northeast
- Anywhere on east side

- The eastern and northern areas need “Long” range shooting facilities (500 yards minimum, preferred 1000 yards). Locate them far enough out to forestall urban encroachment.
- Pima County Fairgrounds
- East & North
- Desert trails is the only range (other than indoor pistol) that I have been able to find.
- The West side (Tucson Mountains) has no place that I am aware of.
- Far East area
- Northeast, far east
- Ironwood Forest National Monument
- North central, far northeast side, northeast (Sabino)
- Northeast
- Southwest, Tucson Area by Indian Reservation, indoor ranges.
- Southeast Tucson – somewhere reasonably close to Tucson – Somewhere a range can be built and not closed for 25 years.
- Three ranges as described above: one in the north, one on the east and one in the west. South could be substituted for west or east.
- What suggestion will be implemented if there is a complaint about raise as safety problems as in the east of Tucson Rod and Gun Club?
- Showing shot up refrigerators and signs illustrates two violations of law, littering and vandalism. Why use those to illustrate recreational shooters? It’s insulting.
- Regulations for establishing ranges are very cumbersome and unnecessarily complex. Why can’t these be streamlined?

3. What kind of shooting opportunities would you like to see at those ranges (e.g. rifle, pistol, shotgun?)

- Rifle, pistol, shotgun. Cowboy action shooting. Automatic weapons, skeet and traps.
- Rifle 100 & 200 yards. Pistol up to 50 yards, shotgun trap and skeet
- Multi use ranges – just safe ranges for all to use simple at that.
- Why haven’t the agencies organized voluntary clean up to help solve some of the problems?
- Shotgun, rifle, and pistol
- All three and 1000 yard rifle. Add shotgun to TRC
- Sporting clay
- All types of rifle, shotguns and handgun ranges.
- 1 shoot 2700 bulls eye competitive matches. The nearest range is in Phoenix Rod & Gun club (120 miles) need a proper range facility in Tucson.
- All ranges need to have facilities for rifle, pistol and shotgun
- All firearm use!
- All three.
- Range should have 22 rifle for junior shooters, pistol ranges, 100, 200, 500 yard ranges rifle sighting.
- All events also geared only for women. Air rifle facilities should be included in addition to rifle; pistol and shotgun kids need a safe place to be introduced top shooting.

- I have a chronograph which requires a/c to work well. A range needs to incorporate protected slots where individual can safely go down ranges at will as opposed to formal ½ hour intervals.
- Archery
- Rifle in particular, shotgun on north side.
- Northeast side establish Reddington Pass area (a section for shooting – maybe a formal range) someplace where people can go and shoot, especially sporting clays since there are few opportunities on East side to shoot.
- Tucson Needs: 100 yards rifle, 1000-yard rifle, tactical shotgun, Tactical pistol, Trap & skeet. Current ranges are too far out of town.
- All above to appeal to everyone and attract them to the range versus Wildcat Shooting.
- All types including Skeet/Clay
- Rifle and pistol
- All
- Rifle, pistol, shotgun
- Some individual slots were chronographs etc and cans/water containers for fun/useful shoot can be done.
- A/C Electrical outlets would be nice. Some negotiations with the Native Americans to acquire the use of their land for shooting and firearm use.
- Yes, pistol, long rifle, shotgun
- Membership, so care of range is the responsibility of all rifle, pistol ranges and trap & skeet area.
- All, including cowboy action and a place for automatic weapons
- Pistol and rifle (main ones), shotgun on east side.

4. What mapping resources do we see need to address multiple uses?

- Topographical, areas of border patrol, animal pathways, the maps themselves are insufficiently detailed
- Maps that breakdown information. Law Enforcement incidents, multiuse lands, single use lands
- Posted lands
- Maps are inefficient. Sites that are problems are not marked with incident areas. We need to know the number and type of incidents (litter, citations, number of occurrences, fines, issued etc) by each of the interested agencies identifying high occurrence sites will allow volunteers to assist in being present to act as witnesses or to educate those who are irresponsible when they are shooting. We also need to know more detail about private sections vs. ranch vs. public, NPS, USFS, lands, etc. and which areas have the most complaints.
- I would suggest the interested stakeholders engage a geospatial consultant to provide professional input for decision support.
- It looks like you want to close these areas – Hum!
- Probably GIS
- Specific shooting user areas in Reddington and all “problem areas”
- The maps identifying the problem areas seems to broad. There are areas within (east of Green Valley and Sahuarita) that are not littered and unsafe. Who or what agency determined this? These need to be narrowed down.
- None

- You need to have an educational group subcommittee to work with USFS, NPS, State Parks and NRA to establish an educational program.

5. In your experience, is informal shooting occurring on public lands appropriate, and safe in the locations shown on these maps? Please be specific.

- Not when shooting thru road signs, buildings and water tanks.
- In most cases I have found them to be safe. I don't shoot with unsafe shooters as a rule. I pick up my shells and trash, as should all shooters.
- Yes, it's done in a legal manner
- No – too many people with no regards to other people, property or themselves. Leaving trash, wounding cattle/etc especially around Arivaca.
- Reddington Pass area seems to be safe but too much litter is left behind by shooters.
- The maps identifying shooting problem area are too broad. There are areas within these boundaries that are littered and unsafe. Narrow down these areas.
- Yes, to my knowledge check with law enforcement.
- Reopen the Sabino Canyon range.
- I don't go there!
- One of the reasons that there is so much “informal” shooting is due to the illegal closure of the Tucson Rod & Gun Club Range at Sabino Canyon.
- Yes it is, as long as the basic safety rules are observed. We need education about places to shoot, Tucson Rod and Gun Club, school education, etc.
- There have been virtually no accidents in the many public areas, because 99.9% of shooters police themselves. There is no reason to further restrict the few remaining areas open to shooters.
- Yes it is appropriate and safe everywhere that it is not prohibited by law.
- Shooting is safe in all areas indicated if the shooter is responsible! That is the key.
- Shooting is safe with an appropriate backstop.
- Area South of Pima. Pistol—there isn't a shooting area used by public.
- Shooting can safely be done in most of the indicated areas. Shooting is not legal on state trust land in the specific zones and it may make sense to allow it. The area south of I-10 east and west of the fair ground would be ideal.
- No problems in these areas.
- Help save areas by working on the committees
- I think it is ok.
- Yes, it's appropriate and safe
- Yes, proper design makes shooting safe
- Yes, provided safely and legally done.
- In some cases no.
- In Reddington, an area I have used for informal shooting, target and sighting of hunting rifles and pistol deemed ok by Forest Service Rangers as “ok” is now being called unsafe
- It is safe and appropriate – I take control and act as a range officer – calling season fire keeping section open etc and I've never had a problem.
- Until convenient areas in different areas of the Tucson Valley are dedicated to shooting ranges, there will always be shooting on public land.

- The closure of these lands once again would deny use to legal shooters (hunters) who are not the problem.
- Yes, I think that informal shooting is an acceptable use of public lands.
- Sometimes yes; sometimes not depending on attitude/experiences of shooters. The point is without a range there is no control. In general, Wildcat shooting is not desirable and would be reduced with available ranges.
- It is appropriate. It is not always safe--sites should be evaluated and safe sites designated and advertised. Unsafe sites should be restricted and posted as such. The State trust lands are not currently legal for shooting although it may be suitable to have legislation enacted to make it legal.

APPENDIX 6

Workshop #2 - Meeting Schedule Summary

Consolidation and Analysis of Input by Organizational Committee

7/8/04
7/29/04
8/12/04
10/25/04

Development of Action Plans and Project Update for Participants

Several meetings in 11/04
December 6, 2004

Preparation for Workshop #2

1/4/05
1/21/05
2/17/05
3/14/05
4/13/05
5/31/05
6/11/05
5/31/05

Workshop #2 - 6/11/05

APPENDIX 7

Project Update

August 27, 2004

TUCSON BASIN SHOOTING ON PUBLIC LANDS WORKSHOPS

PROJECT UPDATE

This Project Update is being sent to all persons who attended Workshop #1 held on Saturday, May 22. Note: Not everyone who attended Workshop #1 provided us with their contact information; this Project Update is being sent out to all attendees who provided us with their information. We want this information to be available to all those who are interested, so please feel free to pass this on to anyone who shares an interest in these issues.

The Organizational Committee wants to thank you again for attending Workshop #1 and for providing such impressive input on the issues raised during the workshop. We wanted to report back with everyone as soon as possible to: a) update you on the status of the Committee's activities since Workshop #1 and b) share preliminary information on the plans for Workshop #2.

The Givens

We thought it would be helpful to restate the "givens" (or basic understandings) established for this project at Workshop #1:

- There is a constitutional right to bear arms.
- Shooting is a legitimate activity on public lands.
- The U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution is serving as a neutral, impartial convener for this project, and will not be making any substantive recommendations to participants.

Project Objectives/Goals

The overall goal of this project is to enhance opportunities, both formal and informal, for safe and responsible shooting on public lands in the Tucson Basin. The intent is to create a strong solution-based citizen/government partnership to focus on these issues, based on an interagency approach (including state, federal and local government involvement) and active public participation.

The Organizational Committee

The Organizational Committee was created through consultation among participating state and federal land management agencies. The initial group included individuals and representatives from various perspectives who had been involved in the early assessment process. The aim of the Organizational Committee is to include the full range of perspectives relating to shooting on public lands. Since it was first established, individuals and representatives from additional U. S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution August 27, 2004 perspectives have joined the Organizational Committee. The Organizational Committee is still open to accepting additional members. For your information, we have attached a complete list of the committee members. The Organizational Committee's job is to design a process that is consistent with the project's objectives and goals. The Committee met a number of times prior to Workshop #1 to plan and prepare for that meeting. After Workshop #1, members have continued to meet regularly. They have discussed and synthesized the large amount of input you provided in Workshop #1. Four working groups have been meeting to synthesize the many good suggestions that emerged during Workshop #1. These four subcommittees are working on the following issues:

- 1) Locations for shooting
- 2) Safety and enforcement
- 3) Education
- 4) Resource impacts

Several preliminary recommendations – including immediate, short and long-term actions – will be presented at Workshop #2 for public consideration and discussion, and for follow up in subsequent meetings.

Plans for Workshop #2

While the initial plan was to hold Workshop #2 at the end of August, we want to be well prepared and make sure that your time is used effectively. We are now beginning to plan Workshop #2 for sometime in late Fall, although the actual date has yet to be determined. This second workshop will focus on reviewing the many important suggestions that were shared in Workshop #1 and reviewed by the Organizational Committee. The plans for addressing shooting issues on public lands are very much a work in progress. We need your help in assessing these potential activities, and ultimately in working together on the highest priority actions. Workshop #2 will focus primarily on assessing the many proposed solutions, prioritizing the most immediate opportunities, and figuring out how we can work together to implement the plans that have the greatest potential for resolving shooting issues.

We are also considering access to more information on a website, or portions of an existing website, dedicated to issues regarding shooting on public lands in the Tucson Basin. This website would also contain links to various related websites.

Immediate Opportunities

As we prepare for the second Tucson Basin-wide workshop, *we do encourage your active involvement* in two public lands planning efforts that will consider shooting as one element of the planning process:

- 1) The Bureau of Land Management's Resource Management Plan for the Ironwood Forest National Monument, which is ongoing and
- 2) The USDA Forest Service's Forest Plan Revision for the Coronado National Forest, which will begin in 2005.

Your input will be an invaluable resource to these federal land managers as they consider longterm management of these public lands for multiple uses, including shooting activities. They need to have you there and are looking forward to receiving your input!
U. S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution August 27, 2004

Information on these planning processes can be obtained from the following contacts:

- Bureau of Land Management:
 - Larry Shults
Address: Tucson Field Office, 12661 E. Broadway, Tucson, AZ 85748
Phone: 520-258-7242
E-mail: Larry_Shults@blm.gov
Or visit the Ironwood Forest National Monument's website at:
<http://www.az.blm.gov/>
- Coronado National Forest:
 - Jennifer Ruyle or Teresa Ann Ciapusci
Address: 300 W. Congress, Tucson, AZ 85701
Phone: 520-670-4552
E-mail: jruyle@fs.fed.us or tciapusci@fs.fed.us
Or visit the Coronado National Forest website at:
<http://www.fs.fed.us/r3/coronado/>

*The Coronado National Forest Plan Revision web page is under development. It is expected to be available in October 2005.

Additional Information

If you have any questions regarding the information in this update, plans for Workshop #2, would like to join a subcommittee, or would like general information about the Tucson Basin Shooting on Public Lands project, please contact:

Cherie Shanteau, Senior Mediator/Senior Program Manager (shanteau@ecr.gov) or Larry Fisher, Senior Program Manager (fisher@ecr.gov), at the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, (520) 670-5299.

U. S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution August 27, 2004
CURRENT ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
Lee Aitken	BLM Resource Advisory Council	Shela McFarlin	BLM – Tucson Field Office
Gail Aschenbrenner	USDA Forest Service	Kay McLoughlin	Congressman Kolbe’s Office
Annalaura Averill-Murray	Arizona Game and Fish Department	Bob Magon	USDA Forest Service
Debbie Backhaus	The Good Gun Club Foundation	Austin Nuñez	Tohono O’odham Nation
Kerry Baldwin	Pima County Natural Resources Parks and Recreation	Gary Oaks	City of Tucson
Alan Belauskas	USDA Forest Service	Rafael Payan	Pima County Natural Resources Parks and Recreation
James Bertrand	Private Citizen	Bill Perkins	Private Citizen
Vic Brown	BLM – Tucson Field Office	Gerry Perry	Arizona Game and Fish Department
Lorraine Buck	BLM – Tucson Field Office	Andrew Quevedo	USDA Forest Service
Don Burtchin	Private Citizen	Larry Raley	USDA Forest Service
Don Carr	Private Citizen	Todd Rathner	NRA
Jennifer Christelman	Marana Planning Department	John Regan	Pima County Department of Transportation
Bob Currieo	Senator McCain’s Office	John Romero	Arizona Game and Fish Department
Dave Daughtry	Pima County Natural Resources Parks and Recreation	Mindee Roth	USDA Forest Service
Jeanine Derby	USDA Forest Service	Don Saba	NRA and Tucson Rod and Gun Club
Bill Dowdle	Arizona State Land Department	Heidi Schewel	USDA Forest Service
Albert Elias	City of Tucson	Will Schmall	Tucson Rifle Club
Sami Hamed	Congressman Grijalva’s Office	Larry Shults	BLM – Tucson Field Office
Trevor Hare	Sky Island Alliance	Jon Shouse	Sonoran Desert Mountain Bicyclists
John Heiman	Southwest Trekking	Ken Slawinski	Pima County Natural Resources Parks and Recreation
Stan Helin	USDA Forest Service	Bobby Spillman	Private Citizen
Bob Hernbrode	Private Citizen	Brian Tucker	Pima County Sheriff’s Department
Tony Herrell	BLM - Tucson Field Office	Dale Turner	The Nature Conservancy
Chuck Hudson	Arizona State Land Department	May Warren	Arizona State Rifle and Pistol Association
Julie Katsel	Senator Kyl’s Office	Mike Watson	USDA Forest Service
Ken Klukowski	NRA	Frances Werner	BLM Resource Advisory Council
Sue Kozacek	USDA Forest Service	Don Winslow	Arizona Game and Fish Department
Greg Lelo	USDA Forest Service	Sandy Wolf	National Park Service
Bob Love	National Park Service	Soledad Zuzuarregui	Governor Janet Napolitano – Southern AZ Office

APPENDIX 8

Workshop #2 – Notices and Press Releases



PRESS RELEASE

CONTACT: Cherie Shanteau or Larry Fisher
Senior Program Managers
PHONE: (520) 670-5299
DATE: May 11, 2005

SHOOTING IN THE TUCSON BASIN ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC WORKSHOP

(Tucson, AZ) -- The U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (U.S. Institute) will host a second public workshop on issues related to shooting on public lands in the Tucson Basin on Saturday, June 11, 2005, from 1 p.m. to 5 p.m. at the Lew Sorenson Recreation Center, 11100 E. Tanque Verde (corner of Tanque Verde and Tanque Verde Loop).

The workshop will focus on issues and questions discussed at the first May 2004 public meeting including current rules and regulations for shooting on public lands, information about citizen involvement in land use planning, and education about the process for acquiring public lands for formal shooting ranges. Issues related to safety and enforcement, resource impacts, education and volunteer projects will also be discussed. Seating is limited and available on a first-come, first-served basis. The session will begin with short presentations by agency representatives, followed by an open house format, including a brief question and answer period.

This is the second public workshop about Tucson basin shooting. The first workshop, held in May 2004, engaged the shooting community, federal, state and local land management agencies, and various other stakeholders including recreationists, environmental advocates, commercial operators and others, in initial discussions about issues related to shooting on public lands in the Tucson Basin. Participating agencies included the Bureau of Land Management, USDA Forest Service, Arizona Game and Fish, Pima County, City of Tucson, City of Marana, and representatives from a variety of user groups, including the National Rifle Association. Since then, agency representatives and stakeholders have been meeting regularly to respond to public comments received during the first workshop.

For information about the upcoming workshop, please contact Cherie Shanteau, Senior Program Manager at the U.S. Institute at (520) 670-5299. For more information about the project in general, a copy of the situation assessment "Recreational Shooting in the Tucson Basin: The Potential for Collaborative Dialogue and Action" can be obtained at http://www.ecr.gov/pdf/Tucson_Basin.pdf

The U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution is a federal program established in 1998 by the U.S. Congress to assist parties in resolving environmental, natural resource and public land conflicts. It is a program of the Morris K. Udall Foundation, an independent agency of the executive branch that is based in Tucson. The U.S. Institute serves as an impartial, non-partisan institution providing professional expertise, services and resources to all parties involved in environmental disputes, regardless of who initiates or pays for assistance. For more information about the U.S. Institute, call (520) 670-5299 or visit www.ecr.gov.

June 22, 2006

**Notice of Workshop #2
Tucson Basin Shooting on Public Lands Project**

Hello Everyone,

The U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (U.S. Institute) will host a second public workshop on issues related to shooting on public lands in the Tucson Basin on **Saturday, June 11, 2005, from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m.** at the Lew Sorensen Recreation Center, 11100 E. Tanque Verde (corner of Tanque Verde and Tanque Verde Loop).

The workshop will focus on issues and questions discussed at the first May 2004 public meeting including current rules and regulations for shooting on public lands, information about citizen involvement in land use planning, and education about the process for acquiring public lands for formal shooting ranges. Issues related to safety and enforcement, resource impacts, education and volunteer projects will also be discussed. Seating is limited and available on a first-come, first-served basis. The session will begin with short presentations by agency representatives, followed by an open house format, including a brief question and answer period.

This is the second public workshop about Tucson Basin shooting. The first workshop, held in May 2004, engaged the shooting community, federal, state and local land management agencies, and various other stakeholders including recreationists, environmental advocates, commercial operators and others, in initial discussions about issues related to shooting on public lands in the Tucson Basin. Participating agencies included the Bureau of Land Management, USDA Forest Service, Arizona Game and Fish, Pima County, City of Tucson, City of Marana, and representatives from a variety of user groups, including the National Rifle Association. Since then, agency representatives and stakeholders have been meeting regularly to respond to public comments received during the first workshop.

For information about the upcoming workshop, please contact Cherie Shanteau, Senior Program Manager at the U.S. Institute at (520) 670-5299. For more information about the project in general, a copy of the situation assessment "Recreational Shooting in the Tucson Basin: The Potential for Collaborative Dialogue and Action" can be obtained at

http://www.ecr.gov/pdf/Tucson_Basin.pdf

Tucson Basin Shooting Workshop

NOTICE OF PUBLIC WORKSHOP

SUBJECT: Resources and information for shooting on public lands.

DATE: Saturday, June 11, 2005.

TIME: 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

**PLACE: Lew Sorenson Recreation Center
11100 E. Tanque Verde (corner of Tanque Verde and
Tanque Verde Loop).**

PRESENTED BY: U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution

This workshop is the second of two workshops convened and facilitated by the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution. Partners in this effort include the Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Forest Service, Arizona Game & Fish, Pima County, City of Tucson, City of Marana as well as members of a variety of groups, including the National Rifle Association. The first workshop held in May 2004 helped the Institute gather information on questions and concerns from the shooting public.

This second workshop is focused on getting information to the Tucson Basin's shooting community and other interested people. Several topics will be presented: background on the Tucson Basin Shooting Dialogue; rules and regulation for shooting on public lands; formal and informal shooting on public lands; how to acquire land for formal shooting sites; participating in land use planning projects; and volunteer opportunities.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, please contact Cherie Shanteau at the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, 130 South Scott Avenue, Tucson, Arizona 85701, (520) 670-5299.

For additional background information on this project, a copy of the situation assessment "Recreational Shooting in the Tucson Basin: The Potential for Collaborative Dialogue and Action" can be obtained at http://www.ecr.gov/s_publications.htmlTucson_Basin