

# FINAL REPORT

## 2001 Project Abstract

For the Period Ending June 30, 2003

**TITLE: Development and Rehabilitation of Recreational Shooting Ranges**

**PROJECT MANAGER: Chuck Niska**

**ORGANIZATION: Minnesota DNR, Division of Enforcement**

**ADDRESS: 500 Lafayette Road, St. Paul, MN 55155-4047**

**WEB SITE ADDRESS: chuck.niska@dnr.state.mn.us**

**FUND: Future Resources Fund**

**LEGAL CITATION: ML 2001, 1<sup>st</sup> Special Session, Ch. 2, Sec. 14, Subd. 05(o)**

**APPROPRIATION AMOUNT: \$ 910,000.00**

### Overall Project Outcome and Results

Key objectives of this project included:

To rehabilitate or start safely run rifle and pistol ranges. Forty total rifle and pistol ranges were worked with, including building 8 new facilities. To work with new trap and skeet facilities; 11 grants were for new trap and skeet facilities. To update and improve existing trap and skeet facilities; 20 facilities received rehabilitation grants. To address environmental concerns; nine grants were awarded to address these concerns. To improve shooting range site access, based on ADA Standards: 21 grants were awarded for this purpose. To provide utility upgrades, so that either lighting improvements, hand washing for lead removal, or ADA standard bathroom upgrades could be provide. Thirteen grants were issued for this purpose.

A total of 63 range operations received 81 grants. Fourteen recipients were original participants during the 1999/2001LCMR grant program, when 30 ranges received grants. So, since 1999, a total of 79 ranges have received \$1,142, 600 in state match funding to make new shooting ranges, or range improvements.

The positive impact of the range development or improvement projects on Minnesota's shooting sports capacity varies locally for each range, based on parameters such as physical location, population (both local & regional), date of project completion, prior history and activities undertaken by the recipient organization. Three range groups receiving grants were approached for specific, detailed information regarding how their obtaining a grant improved their range. Each group was chosen for a specific reason: one group's range existed prior to 1999; another range was begun during the first cycle of the LCMR grant program, and the third during the 2001 grant cycle. These are best chronicled in an accompanying attachment. All other recipients have likewise been asked to return similar information.

A discussion of recommendations to improve the quality of the project will be included in the Final Report's Outline of Project Results. Accomplishments of the first four years are included in the booklet Outdoor Ranges: Best Practices.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	
1	ATTACHMENT A (Include the attachment in all future update reports.)																	
2	Project Title: Continued Development and Rehabilitation																	
3	of Recreational Shooting Ranges																	
4	Project Number: REC 32																	
5	LCMR Recommended Funding: \$ 910,000																	
6	Attachment A Deliverable Products and Related Budget																	
7	2001 LCMR Project Biennial Budget																	
8	Objective/ Result																	
9	PROJECT TOTAL: \$910,000																	
10	Budget Item (Title of Result)	Result 1 & 2 Budget: Rifle & Pistol Construction	Result 1 & 2 Balance:	Result 3 Budget: New Trap & Skeet Construction	Result 3 Balance:	Result 4 Budget: Trap & Skeet Rehab	Result 4 Balance:	Result 5 Budget: Addressing Environmental Concerns	Result 5 Balance:	Result 6 Budget: Improved Site Accessibility	Result 6 Balance:	Result 7 Budget: Utility Upgrades	Result 7 Balance:	Result 8 Budget: Providing Professional Services	Result 8 Balance:	BUDGET TOTAL:	BALANCE TOTAL:	
11	Wages, salaries & benefits - Be specific on who is paid: DNR Bureau of Engineering													48,000	7,457	40,543	869,457	
12	Grants to (please specify, if there are more than one type of club, include a separate row, and split out the budget.) T American Legion Post 435 (Bloomington)	6,000	429,495	3,000	82,463	2,500	113,880		60,000	1,000	91,662		60,000			12,500	856,957	
13	Babbitt Conservation Club					1,900	119,980			2,000	89,662		500	59,500		4,400	852,557	
14	Bemidji Trap & Skeet Club					6,250	105,730			4,300	85,362	10,250	49,250			20,800	831,757	
15	Byron Sportsmens Club	4,000	425,495							1,000	84,362					5,000	826,757	
16	Cedar Valley Conservation Club	5,000	420,495			6,000	99,730									11,000	815,757	
17	Clearwater County 4-H			3,176	79,287											3,176	812,581	
18	Dakota County Gun Club	6,592	413,903							9,767	74,595					16,359	796,222	
19	Delano Sportsmens Club			2,796	76,491			5,000	55,000							7,796	788,426	
20	East Grand Forks Sportsmens Club	2,000	411,903							5,000	69,595					7,000	781,426	
21	Falls Trap Club			6,647	69,844	1,000	98,730									7,647	773,779	
22	Game Haven Boy Scouts of America (Rochester)	1,000	410,903	16,500	53,344					1,000	68,595					18,500	755,279	
23	Gopher Rifle & Revolver	4,050	406,853													4,050	751,229	
24	Grand Rapids Gun Club			10,000	43,344											10,000	741,229	
25	Hardwood Country Sportsmens Club	5,000	401,853			2,500	96,230			2,950	65,645	5,750	43,500			16,200	725,029	
26	LeRoy Rod & Gun Club	1,248	400,605													1,248	723,781	
27	Minnewawa Sportsmens Club (Alitkin County)	37,871	362,734													37,871	685,910	
28	Monticello Sportsmens Club	4,899	357,835							2,045	63,600					6,944	678,966	
29	Moose-Willow Sportsmens Club (Hill City)	5,480	352,355	8,950	34,394			3,870	51,130			1,700	41,800			20,000	658,966	
30	Montevideo Rod & Gun Club			5,370	29,024	2,050	94,180	1,000	50,130			500	41,300			8,920	650,046	
31	Mount Itasca (Grand Rapids)	26,450	325,905							7,750	55,850	3,350	37,950			37,550	612,496	
32	New Richland Area Sportsmens Club	3,750	322,155			2,075	92,105			1,000	54,850	1,200	36,750			8,025	604,471	
33	Northwoods Shooting Center	15,366	306,789							2,500	52,350					17,866	586,605	
34	Owatonna Gun Club			6,643	22,381	11,478	80,627									18,121	568,484	
35	Pine Island White Pines Sportsmens Club							449	49,681							449	568,035	
36	Prairie Woods Environmental Learning Center	5,300	301,489	10,050	12,331					3,650	48,700	1,000	35,750			20,000	548,035	
37	Sandstone Sportsmens Club	15,000	288,489	5,000	7,331											20,000	528,035	
38	South St. Paul Rod & Gun Club									7,927	40,773					7,927	520,108	
39	Suburban Sportsmens Club	6,422	280,067													6,422	513,686	
40	Waite Park Rifle Club	4,985	275,082													4,985	508,701	
41	Waverly Rifle & Pistol Club	12,750	262,332							1,000	39,773					13,750	494,951	
42	Winona Sportsmens Club					7,500	73,127					10,625	25,125			18,125	476,826	
43	Zim Sportsmens Club							10,000	38,681							10,000	466,826	
44	Proctor Jack Meade Gun Club					8,000	65,127									8,000	458,826	
45	Paynesville Sportsmens Club	11,000	251,332					1,000	38,681	5,000	34,773	3,000	22,125			20,000	438,826	
46	Kanabec Conservation Club	2,100	249,232			1,000	64,127			300	34,473	1,554	20,571			4,954	433,872	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
51	Itasca Gun Club	9,757	239,475							3,000	31,473					12,757	421,115
52	20 Rifle & Pistol Club	17,465	222,010					70	38,611	200	31,273	360	20,211			18,095	403,020
53	Worthington Gun Club	5,000	217,010									5,000	15,211			10,000	393,020
54	Forest Lake Sportsmen's Club					18,278	45,849									18,278	374,742
55	Traverse County Sportsmen's Club	4,000	213,010													4,000	370,742
56	MN Shooting Sports Education Center	1,545	211,465													1,545	369,197
57	Tyler Rod & Gun Club	35,635	175,830													35,635	333,562
58	MN Biathlon Association	5,083	170,747													5,083	328,479
59	Oakdale Gun Club	17,500	153,247					2,500	36,111							20,000	308,479
60	Wild Marsh Sporting Clays	20,000	133,247													20,000	288,479
61	Pennington County Sportsmens Club	4,448	128,799													4,448	284,031
62	Minneapolis Gun Club					8,040	37,809									8,040	275,991
63	Redwood Falls Sportsmens Club	10,000	118,799													10,000	265,991
64	Henning Rod & Gun Club					1,300	36,509									1,300	264,691
65	Deer Creek Rod & Gun Club	40,000	78,799													40,000	224,691
66	Watsonwan Game & Fish Club					7,650	28,859									7,650	217,041
67	Remville Rangers Shooting Club	10,402	68,397													10,402	206,639
68	Becker County Sportsmens Club	2,012	66,385													2,012	204,627
69	Parkers Prairie Sportsmens Club	1,272	65,113													1,272	203,355
70	Golden Eagle/Alexandria Trap Club									20,000	11,273					20,000	183,355
71	Grant County Shooters Association	20,000	45,113													20,000	163,355
72	Key Cities Conservation Club									6,467	4,806					6,467	156,888
73	Bigfork Lions Trap Club					1,225	27,634									1,225	155,663
74	Dawson Rod & Gun Club					2,875	24,759									2,875	152,788
75	Glenwood Gun Club					10,257	14,502									10,257	142,531
76	New Ulm Izaak Walton League Range	20,000	25,113													20,000	122,531
77	Hideaway Shooting Range	20,000	5,113													20,000	102,531
78	Minnetonka Game & Fish Club@St. Francis					2,855	11,647									2,855	99,676
79	Communications Charges															124	99,552
80	Flight taken for range picture															104	96,913
81	BMP Document Printing															7,470	89,443
82	Sales Tax Paid for Services															578	91,400
83	COLUMN TOTAL	430,382	5,113	78,132	7,331	104,733	11,647	23,889	36,111	55,194	4,806	44,789	15,211	48,000	16,055	910,000	91,400
84																	
85	f																
86	Note: \$42 Charge is for internal system and report usage.																

Date of Report: January 21, 2004

**LCMR Final Work Program Report 2001**

**I. PROJECT TITLE: Development and Rehabilitation of Recreational Shooting Ranges**

**Project Manager: Chuck Niska**

**Affiliation: Division of Enforcement**

**Mailing Address: Minnesota DNR, Division of Enforcement  
500 Lafayette Road, Box 47  
St. Paul, MN 55155-4047**

**Telephone Number: 651-297-2449**

**651-485-6445**

**E-Mail: chuck.niska@dnr.state.mn.us**

**Fax: 651-297-3727**

JAN 21 2004

JRV   *PN*    
SAT             
SVM             
YF             
SS           

**Total Biennial Project Budget:**

<b>\$ LCMR Appropriation</b>	<b>- \$ Amount Spent:</b>	<b>= \$ Balance:</b>
\$910,000	818,600	\$91,400

**Legal Citation: Laws 2001, First Special Session, Chapter 2, Section 14, Subd. 05(o).**

**Appropriation Language:** \$910,000 is from the future resources fund to the commissioner of natural resources to provide cost-share grants on a one-to-one basis to local shooting clubs for the purpose of developing or rehabilitating shooting sports facilities for public use. Recipient facilities must be open to the public at reasonable times and for a reasonable fee on a walk-in basis.

**Overall Project Outcome and Results**

Key objectives of this project included:

To rehabilitate or start safely run rifle and pistol ranges. Forty total rifle and pistol ranges were worked with, including building 8 new facilities. To work with new trap and skeet facilities; 11 grants were for new trap and skeet facilities. To update and improve existing trap and skeet facilities; 20 facilities received rehabilitation grants. To address environmental concerns; nine grants were awarded to address these concerns. To improve shooting range site access, based on ADA Standards: 21 grants were awarded for this purpose. To provide utility upgrades, so that either lighting improvements, hand washing for lead removal, or ADA standard bathroom upgrades could be provide. Thirteen grants were issued for this purpose.

A total of 63 range operations received 81 grants. Fourteen recipients were original participants during the 1999/2001LCMR grant program, when 30 ranges received grants. So, since 1999, a total of 79 ranges have received \$1,142, 600 in state match funding to make new shooting ranges, or range improvements.

The positive impact of the range development or improvement projects on Minnesota's shooting sports capacity varies locally for each range, based on parameters such as physical location, population (both local & regional), date of project completion, prior history and activities undertaken by the recipient organization. Three range groups receiving grants were approached for specific, detailed information regarding how their obtaining a grant improved their range. Each group was chosen for a specific reason: one group's range existed prior to 1999; another range was begun during the first cycle of the LCMR grant program, and the third during the 2001 grant cycle. These are best chronicled in an accompanying attachment. All other recipients have likewise been asked to return similar information.

A discussion of recommendations to improve the quality of the project will be included in the Final Report's Outline of Project Results. Accomplishments of the first four years are included in the booklet Outdoor Ranges: Best Practices.

**IV. OUTLINE OF PROJECT RESULTS: Final Report: Recommendation by the Shooting Range Grant Program's Advisory Committee were provided for each grant application received. A period of review and comment was provided for each application, with the group either meeting to discuss proposals, or keeping in contact via e-mail after copies were mailed to each advisor.**

#### **Result 1 & 2: Rifle & Pistol Range Construction and Rehabilitation**

**LCMR Budget: \$435,495  
LCMR Balance: \$ 5,113**

**Matching Amount: \$435,495**

**Results 1 and 2 were for the rehabilitation and new construction of rifle and pistol ranges. In the 1999 Shooting Range Grants, this worked proved to be the highest priority, and also in 2001-3.**

**Cumulative results from 7/1/01-6/30/03: We anticipated working with from 20 to 40 groups statewide to accomplish this result, and ended up working with 40 total range operators. The work on the rifle and pistol ranges is by far the most in demand, and seemingly the most productive way to increase the capacity of shooting sports in Minnesota, since ranges supporting high-powered rifle, shotgun and muzzleloader shooting will also support .22 caliber shooting, used in Firearm Safety (FAS) Training certification.**

#### **Result 3: New Trap and Skeet Construction**

**LCMR Budget: \$ 85,463  
LCMR Balance: \$ 7,331**

**Matching Amount: \$ 85,463**



Result 3 was for new construction of trap and skeet facilities, i.e., construction of buildings, platforms, and other fixed structures, without providing for trap throwers, unless a grant applicant has as their intended use to provide instructional training for shooting groups. An example of this would be for an Environmental Learning Center to apply for funding, where the majority of use would be in providing shooting safety training and instruction to youth groups.

Cumulative results from 7/1/01-6/30/03: A total of 11 grants were awarded for new trap and skeet range construction. All of these are complete as of this update.

#### **Result 4: Trap and Skeet Facility Rehabilitation**

LCMR Budget: \$ 116,380  
LCMR Balance: \$ 11,647

Matching Amount: \$116,380

Result 4 was intended to provide for funding to replace dilapidated trap and skeet facilities. This may include partial or total replacement of an existing facility, or re-orienting it so as to provide for improved operation of the structure. An example of this might be in Proctor, MN, where an existing trap house's use is resulting in lead pellet deposition near the banks of Kingsbury Creek, a DNR-designated trout stream. If a grant is awarded, the group operating the trap house would be able to move it, so that lead deposition is no longer an issue. Trap thrower replacement costs were significantly reduced compared to other types of improvement costs (20 percent of thrower cost, versus 50% for other improvements), in order to discourage use of state funds for this purpose.

Cumulative results from 7/1/01-6/30/03: A total of 20 grants were awarded for trap and skeet range rehabilitation. All of these are complete as of this update.

#### **Result 5: Addressing Environmental Concerns**

LCMR Budget: \$60,000  
LCMR Balance: \$36,111

Matching Amount: \$ 60,000

Result 5 was intended to provide sound abatement installations, and possible lead reclamation, or other proven environmental techniques to address these two areas of concern that, along with safety concerns, are most often cited as negative aspects of shooting range operations across Minnesota.

Cumulative results from 7/1/01-6/30/03: A total of 9 grants were awarded for addressing environmental concerns. Eight of these projects were completed as of the end date of the project. This result ended up having the least amount of demand, which is surprising, considering that a variety of ranges need sound abatement installed to keep sound within the confine of their range. The fact that so much of this funding remained unused may also reflect the lack of concern for lead in the environment in Minnesota. Since the pH of most soils where lead is deposited render lead shot from firearms inert and immobile, this is less an issue than in other parts of the United States.

#### **Result 6: Providing Improved Site Access**

**LCMR Budget: \$92,622**  
**LCMR Balance: \$ 4,806**

**Matching Amount: \$92,622**

**Result 6 was intended to provide for improvements that will primarily benefit disabled shooters. We are also concerned with improvements on driveways and other access points, enabling a wider range of participants to gain entrance to ranges.**

**Cumulative results from 7/1/01-6/30/03: A total of 21 grants were awarded and projects completed for improved site access, ranging from road improvements, to firing line and sidewalk improvements to accommodate wheelchair access, to ramp installation and door reinstallation.**

#### **Result 7: Utility Upgrades**

**LCMR Budget: \$60,000**  
**LCMR Balance: \$15,211**

**Matching Amount: \$60,000**

**Result 7 intended to address facility upgrades that might also improve operation for disabled users, (as in providing outdoor bathrooms that are handicapped accessible), but was not limited to that segment of the MN shooting population. Groups with facilities that hold state and regional shooting competitions were also allowed to improve their facilities, obtaining running water for personal clean up. This is an important improvement, in that contact exposure to lead residue can be minimized simply by cleaning one's hands. We also considered and assisted in constructing firearm break down areas, which are used to investigate and correct misfired rounds and jammed firearms in a safe manner.**

**Cumulative results from 7/1/01-6/30/03: A total of 13 projects were completed for utility upgrades. Two of these projects helped to provide lead clean up, and a third was for a bathroom renovation for disabled shooters, done as a small part of a bigger range improvement project where new backstops were built.**

#### **Result 8: Providing Professional Services**

**LCMR Budget: \$48,000**  
**LCMR Balance: \$ 7,457**

**Matching Amount: \$ 0**

**Result 8 is to pay for supplying DNR Bureau of Engineering staff time and assistance to a variety of activities, including pre-construction site review, working with grant recipients on project layout, design and implementation, and conducting post-construction site review to grant recipients. MN-DNR has a Landscape Architect we have trained to assist in each of these areas, versus requiring grant recipients to receive somewhat inconsistent services from the private sector across the state. Because the DNR-BOE charges each discipline it serves on a per hour basis, we have included these charges/services as a part of this grant, since DNR Enforcement has no other operating budget for these services.**

**Cumulative results from 7/1/01-6/30/03: all 63 grant recipient project sites have been visited by the Shooting Range Grant Program Project Manager and Landscape Design Specialist. Recipient groups were invited to join the DNR for the site review, so that**

proposed work could be discussed prior to the commencement of the visit. This site visit also benefited both sides, as discussion was held regarding any needed permits, wetland delineation issues and other concerns as necessary.

**Personnel:** Personnel costs to this project included those for the DNR's Bureau of Engineering charges, to provide plan and design assistance, as well as pre- and post construction site review assistance to the Shooting Range Coordinator position and grant recipients.

A total of \$ 48,000 for the project period was to be used to pay the DNR Bureau of Engineering for the services provided by the Landscape Architect who has been assigned to work with this project's Program Manager, to provide professional service to the grant recipients. Given the prior training and experience of the individual, and his familiarity with range work, projects and standards, his contribution to this project were far more valuable, and less expensive than if we were to have to pay for professional services from an outside vendor. His expenses totaled \$40,543, leaving a balance of \$7,457 not used.

**Equipment:** \$ 0

**Development:** \$ 850,000 for all projects. This is itemized and shown in a breakdown, based on a pro-rated estimate of project costs after analyzing how funds were spent in the first Shooting Range Grant Program funding cycle, and then shifting some funding based on demand during the 2001-3 biennial period.

**Acquisition:** \$ 0

**Other:** Other costs for this grant period are for promotion and correspondence costs required to document the achievements attained through the program, and provide correspondence and follow up mailings to the grant recipients, as well as any other incidental costs. The decision to prepare a Best Practices manual was made due to the fact that the biggest demand for assistance from range operators, shooting range opponents, legislators and the public in general is in regard to the construction of various components of outdoor firearms facilities for rifle and pistol shooting. With the unspent funding for engineering assistance being \$7,457, and an amount set aside (described below) for communications, it seemed reasonable that the best way to convey what a rifle or pistol range should look like is to document some of those places worked with to make improvements since 1999. Another cost somewhat hidden is associated maintaining grant payment records within the state's MAPS/SEMA4 electronic system. A total of \$12,000 in communications funding was set aside for this project, for the Shooting Range Grant Program promotion, etc. These funds used to pay for the printing of 2,000 copies of this publication. It is being distributed to ranges across Minnesota, as well as legislators, and other audiences. It illustrates what some of the more effective and/or innovative range installations prepared with (and without) these funds look like, as well as giving the reader other details about proper range construction, and how to get further technical assistance. A balance of \$3,724.19 remained in this portion of the project budget.

**Completion Date:** All project work was done by the end of this biennium, June 30, 2003.

**Result Status:** The completion date for all types of fieldwork conducted was at the end of the project period, June 30, 2003. As mentioned, currently 63 projects were completed, and a total of \$818,600 of the \$910,000 allocation was used. Some projects initially funded were not



started, due to local problems that arose after the grant award was issued to the recipient. Other projects came in under budget, some to a small extent, others to a significant degree. Part of this was due to contributions made that were not to be counted as part of the local matching amount. Overall cost of some projects far exceeded the matching grant amount provided by DNR. With proven successes, previous grant recipients were not discouraged or excluded from applying for funding. If additional costs were incurred to further the work on an individual project site, amendments were considered, provided that the additional work was not started prior to proper paperwork being signed and in place. As stated previously, all grant applications were judged against how the project application would improve safe shooting sports opportunities in Minnesota. The Advisory Committee was apprised of all amendments, and consensus was gained before the Project Manager took action. If a problem exists within this project, it is that not enough of the range operators are yet willing to participate in the project.

All recipients were notified in writing and in personal communication well in advance of the deadline of June 2003, and site visits were held in June and July 2003, to view completed projects.

#### **V. TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET:**

<b>All Results: Personnel:</b>	<b>\$ 48,000 (\$ 40,543 Used)</b>
<b>All Results: Equipment:</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>
<b>All Results: Development:</b>	<b>\$ 850,000 (\$ 769,781 Used)</b>
<b>All Results: Acquisition:</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>
<b>All Results: Corresp/Promo</b>	<b>\$ 12,000 (\$ 8,276 Used)</b>

<b>TOTAL BUDGET:</b>	<b>\$ 910,000</b>
----------------------	-------------------

<b>TOTAL FUNDING USED:</b>	<b>\$ 818,600</b>
----------------------------	-------------------

<b>TOTAL FUNDS NOT SPENT:</b>	<b>\$ 91,400</b>
-------------------------------	------------------

**ATTACHMENT A- Submit a budget detail with all the specifics as attached as Attachment A. Please note- this has changed from your previous submission with your amended proposal.**

#### **VI. PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE SPENDING:**

- A. Past Spending:** 1998 General Appropriation Funding: \$35,000; \$34,000 was spent on two range project sites, with an additional \$1,000 contract being cancelled. Matching funding was provided by the two grant recipients worked with by the Division of Enforcement. An additional \$115,000 was provided from the General Fund for the Shooting Range Coordinator position, an amount used by the MN-DNR's Division of Enforcement to fund a single position.

1999 LCMR Funding: \$325,000 was allocated to 33 projects throughout Minnesota. About \$25,000 was appropriated to provide engineering assistance to recipients. A total of \$290,000 was used 28 shooting range projects during the initial LCMR project period, from 1999 through 2001.

**B. Current and Future Spending:** All \$850,00 in 2001-2003 project funds were allocated to potential recipients, with \$769,781 actually being reimbursed to the 63 recipients. All participants were periodically reminded to complete their approved projects before the end of the June 30, 2003 grant period. Current spending was again strictly on a cash match basis, with grant recipient identifying the source(s) of their match. The following breakdown shows the actual amount spent for each activity. The DNR Division of Enforcement provided non-LCMR state funding to pay for the Shooting Range Coordinator position. Total annual expenses, including salary and fringe, were approximately \$140,000 over the course of this project period. Actual range grant spending is broken down based on the following itemized budget

Old & New Rifle & Pistol Construction:	\$430,382
New Trap & Skeet Construction:	\$ 78,132
Old Trap & Skeet Structural Rehab:	\$104,733
Environmental Concerns:	\$ 23,889
Access Improvements:	\$ 87,856
Utility Upgrades:	\$ 44,789
Engineering Services:	\$ 40,543
Promotion/Correspondence:	\$ 8,276

Future funding includes provision of \$240,000 from the Environmental Trust Fund to the Shooting Range Grant Program. Half of the funding will be used for firearms range projects, half for archery range projects

### **C. Project Partners:**

#### **Partners internal to the DNR**

Capt. Jeff Thielen, MN-DNR Division of Enforcement

Jason Peterson, Landscape Architect, MN-DNR Bureau of Engineering

#### **Shooting Range Grant Advisory Committee Members/Representative Agencies**

Les Fluegge, Izaak Walton League

Mark Johnson, MN Deer Hunters Association

Joe Lorsung, MN Field Rep for the Friends of the NRA

Greg Larson, MN BWSR; Cost-Share Program Expert

Bill Stevens, Marketing Program Coordinator, Federal Cartridge

**D. Time:** Work was done starting after July 1, 2001, when funding was made available from a legislative appropriation. An initial application sign up period for funding was held in December 2001. The Advisory Committee and MN-DNR staff then worked to meet periodically to discuss project funding, or, were in communication via phone and/or e-mail to make funding decisions throughout the biennium with all members of the advisory committee.

### **PROPOSED TIMELINE FOR SHOOTING RANGE GRANT PROJECT**

<b><u>Time Period</u></b>	<b><u>Activity to Be Accomplished</u></b>
Feb.-May 01	Application period conducted for second grant cycle;

Criteria finalized for selection process;  
Grant form updated for use.

May-June 01	Advisory committee sent applications for review.
June 01	LCMR informed of advisory committee recommendations; Letters of grant status notification sent to applicants; Verification of intent to participate/ match source(s) required; Environmental and cultural/historical reviews are conducted.
July 01	Grant contracts and guidance material is sent to recipients; DNR Enforcement processes grants, informs recipients to proceed; (This will hinge on environmental & cultural/historical site reviews); Site visits carried out by DNR staff.
July-October 01	Initial fieldwork started.
December 01	Progress Report submitted to LCMR.
April 02-October 02	Second field season carried out; Projects completed unless additional time requests are made.
June 02	Progress Report Submitted to LCMR
December 02	Projects end unless additional time for completion is provided and/or requested by later participant groups.
4/03-6/03	Project work completed for those requiring extra time.
June 03	Final Project Progress Report provided to LCMR.

**VII. DISSEMINATION:** All grant recipients were informed of the need to document their work, through taking video and still photo footage. In addition, periodic press releases were sent to local news media throughout the state, informing them of the grant program, and record of local progress is appearing in various newspapers in Minnesota. Various local newspapers also chronicled the progress of projects at gun ranges throughout the state. The Minnesota Conservation Volunteer included a story about the Shooting Range Grant Program in its November-December 2003 edition. In January 2004, the Environmental Journal will be filming a feature story about the shooting range grants, focusing on one or more of the metropolitan ranges that have been improved through participation in this project.

As previously stated, a booklet entitled Outdoor Shooting Ranges: Best Practices was prepared for dissemination of both written and photo information about range construction methods and recommendations.

**VIII. LOCATION:** Over three hundred shooting ranges throughout the state are eligible to apply for funding. The actual number of locations worked with specifically was not known until an application period was considered, then funded, and work was completed.

**IX. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS:** Periodic workprogram progress reports will be submitted not later than December 2001, June 2002, December 2002, and June 2003. The final workprogram report and associated products will be submitted by June 30, 2003, or by the completion date as set in the appropriation.

Changes to the Workprogram: None, save for the restored "available" status of the funding.