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:

U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution
Morris K. Udall Foundation

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]

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

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

[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.

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 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.

<u>Safety concerns</u>

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).

---

[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.

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.

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 uses. 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 Burtchin, 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 Lesher, 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