

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Of The

McMILLER SPORTS SHOOTING FACILITY

Eagle, Wisconsin

November 2001

Prepared for:

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services

Region 3

Ft. Snelling, Minnesota

Prepared by:

Lynette M. Check

Natural Resources Engineer

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

Southeast Region

Table of Contents

	Page
Chapter I	
A. Background	3
B. Purpose of this Proposal	5
C. Needs for this Proposal	5
D. Scoping/Public Participation	7
Chapter II	
Alternatives, Including the Proposed Action	
A. Alternative Carried Forward for Detailed Analysis	
1. Alternative A Proposed Action	9
2. Alternative B No Action	9
3. Alternative C Safety Issues	9
4. Alternative D ADA Issues	10
5. Alternative E Safety and ADA Issues	10
B. Alternatives not considered for Detailed Analysis	
1. Alternative F New Location	10
2. Alternative G Totally Enclosed	10
C. Summary of the Alternatives	11a
Chapter III	
Affected Environment	
A. Physical Characteristics	12
B. Biological Environmental	12
1. Habitat/vegetation	
2. Threatened, Endangered, and Candidate Species	
3. Other Wildlife Species	
C. Land Use	12
D. Cultural/Paleontological Resources	12
E. Local Socio-economic Conditions	12
F. Noise Issues	12
G. Safety Issues	12
H. Lead Issues	12
I. Air Issues	12
J. Economic Issues	12
Chapter IV	
Environmental Consequences	
A. Alternative A -Proposed Action	14
1. Habitat Impacts	
2. Biological Impacts	
3. Listed Species	
4. Cultural Resources	
5. Noise Issues	
6. Lead Issues	
7. Safety Issues	
8. Air Issues	
9. Economic Issues	

		page
B.	Alternative B through Alternative E	15
	1. Habitat Impacts	
	2. Biological Impacts	
	3. Listed Species	
	4. Cultural Resources	
	5. Noise Issues	
	6. Lead Issues	
	7. Safety Issues	
	8. Air Issues	
	9. Economic Issues	
C.	Summary of Environmental Consequences by Alternative	20
Chapter V	List of Preparers	21
Appendixes		
Appendix	A	Commitment Letter
Appendix	B	CAC and Task Force List
Appendix	C	Meeting Minutes
Appendix	D	Law Enforcement Survey
		Shooters Survey
Appendix	E	NHI, Archaeological Review
		Indian Notifications
Appendix	F	Noise Analysis and Maps
Appendix	G	MSSF Location Maps
Appendix	H	MSSF Photographs
Appendix	I	MSSF Proposed Action Map
Appendix	J	Range Protection Bill

Chapter I

BACKGROUND

The Kettle Moraine State Forest Southern Unit (KMSF) was established in 1939 in an area on the fringe of the most densely populated areas of Southeastern Wisconsin where much private land is either developed or off-limits to firearm use. Since the establishment of the KMSF, people have gravitated to undeveloped public lands and the uncontrolled shooting did not cause many problems.

As picnic areas, trails and campgrounds started to develop in the KMSF, serious conflicts with target shooters developed. Throughout the forest different types and caliber of weapons were being used. The uncontrolled and often dangerous shooting concerned not only the recreational users but the shooters and the local residents too.

The forest managers closed off the vehicular access to the fire lanes and old farm roads within the forest areas and thought this would help encourage the development of a private range. It did not, and the complaints escalated. In 1967 a law was passed that prohibited the possession of any firearm within the forest and other state lands in SE Wisconsin unless engaged in hunting, dog training or at an approved target range. The forest set up a target range at the gravel pit on the south side of County Hwy. ZZ.

The forest staff began the task of locating a site to construct a shooting range. The DNR, the Waukesha County Park System and the Milwaukee County Park System entered into discussions and with each agency contributing funds, a location was found in the Town of Eagle. The State contributed the land and on April 15, 1971 construction began at the McMiller Sports Shooting Facility (MSSF). MSSF opened on October 1, 1974.

The range was operated at a deficit and the hours of operation lessened each year. On March 22, 1994 a contract for leasing the MSSF to Wern Valley, Inc. was signed. Wern Valley Inc. added a sporting clay range and upgraded the trap and archery ranges. The existing ski trail system was re-routed around the sporting clay range to minimize the recreational use conflicts.

In July 1994 the Department applied for a conditional use permit at the request of the Town of Eagle. The permit was issued in August 1994. The Department has also committed to studying the noise issue at the MSSF and in 1995 hired George Kamperman, Kamperman and Associates, Inc. to study the issue and report on what was occurring and what measures the Department could take to mitigate the noise.

The report was completed and submitted to the Town of Eagle in April 1996. The report recommended relocating the sporting clay range to a lower elevation, re-orienting the stations and installing sound baffling on the fixed station range.

At the July 1997 Town Board and Planning Commission meeting, the Town of Eagle expressed their disappointment with the lack of progress in this matter and rescinded the conditional use permit for the sporting clay range. In August 1997 the sporting clay range was closed but the remainder of the facility

continued to operate. In February 1998 the Waukesha Circuit Court ruled in favor of the State of Wisconsin reversing the Town of Eagle's decision. Prior to this court ruling, Wern Valley, Inc. and the Department attempted to negotiate a compromise with the Town Board and the Planning Commission on the operation of the sporting clay range. Wern Valley applied for a conditional use permit with the Town of Eagle but was denied. In May of 1998 the legislature passed the "Range Protection Bill" (See Appendix J) which prohibits local governments from using noise as an issued to regulate existing shooting ranges. The sporting clay range was re-opened in June 1998.

The Department continued with the ongoing planning effort for the MSSF and continued to meet with the advisory committee to focus in on needed maintenance, safety, and future operation and development activities at the facility. The Department established a proposed project list, estimated project costs and identified an implementation schedule. This report also included a list of recommendation to address most of the issues raised throughout this process. This effort resulted in a completed report dated September 1998. This report will be used as a framework to guide future development activities at the MSSF.

PURPOSE OF THIS PROPOSAL

The purpose of the proposed action is to improve the shooting facilities at the McMiller Sports Shooting Facility (MSSF) located in the Kettle Moraine State Forest in Waukesha County, Wisconsin. The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources has recognized this as a need for action for improving firearms and outdoor skills training.

Shooting ranges are required by hunters to practice and improve their shooting abilities and there is a need to develop shooting ranges on State lands. This was a commitment made in the 1994 Outdoor Skills Report and again in the Hunting, Fishing and Trapping 2020 report. See Appendix A of this report for commitment letter.

NEEDS FOR THIS PROPOSAL

The needs for improving the MSSF are:

- ❑ Improved facilities are needed to provide hunter education with “hands-on” experience. All outdoor enthusiasts need continuing education in map and compass orienteering skills. Historic and recent studies of search and rescues and lost hunters reports show a continued need for fine tuning outdoor orienteering skills. Also, training and education in the areas of bowhunter safety, tree stand safety, first aid, bird and water fowl identification, training for wild turkey hunting and trapping are necessary.
- ❑ Improved facilities are needed to provide hunters a practice area to improve their shooting abilities. Target identification training is needed along with the facilities to sight firearms and practice archery.
- ❑ The need to upgrade the existing facility to meet ADA requirements. Outdoor training/public shooting facilities for people with disabilities is a necessity and currently not available at the MSSF. The majority of the facility is not handicap-accessible.
- ❑ The existing facility has many safety issues, which need to be addressed. The need to increase the height of the berms in the 300-yard range, the replacement of the eyebrow baffles in the 25, 50 and 100-yard ranges. The safety overhead baffles need to be installed on the 50-yard range. The berms on the 25, 50 and 100-yard ranges need to be increased 10 feet along with the installation of lighting and a range office in the sport trap shooting range.
- ❑ The population growth in the Southeastern Wisconsin has led to increase demand for more open space in which to hunt. MSSF is located in the most densely populated area of the State of Wisconsin. With more and more land being developed, the need to make MSSF a place where hunters can come and practice their shooting is essential.
- ❑ The need to reduce the noise migrating from the facility. The results of test conducted for the fixed shooting stations showed the average level to be 51dBA. The results for the testing conducted for the total MSSF show the highest gunfire noise level is due west of the sporting clay range. The report made several suggestions as to changes that could be implemented that would reduce the noise from the fixed shooting stations and the sport shooting clays range.
- ❑ General maintenance due to the age of the facility. The facility was completed in 1974 with not many modifications done during the past 17 years. The need for replacing the targets, benches, new roof on the existing building is only a small portion of

the maintenance that will be needed over the new few years. Many parts of the present facility are over 30 years old, and do not meet the present building codes and pose a potential safety issue.

□ Long term development.

Long term development at this facility would include a biathlon course, lighting at the sporting clay range, the construction of a range office and a master building at the 25-yard and the 300-yard ranges.

SCOPING/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

An initial news release was published on June 12, 1997 soliciting public involvement and participation in the Department's effort to obtain a broader perspective of the issues involving the MSSF. Volunteers were asked to attend the first meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) on June 26, 1997. At this meeting volunteers were asked to become a part of the CAC. The WDNR established a CAC to assist and counsel the Department in this matter. The CAC members have spent considerable time and effort in the participating in the development of this plan. Their contribution of information, comments and unique perspectives were invaluable. The membership of the CAC along with the affiliation is identified in Appendix B of this report.

The WDNR also established an internal task force to work with the CAC to identify issues, concerns, solicit input and review in the development of this report. The membership of this task force is found in Appendix B of this report.

The WDNR began this process with the following goals:

- To address the noise concerns expressed by the local neighbors,
- To identify and address the existing short term maintenance needs and
- To identify and address the long-term development needs at the facility.

The CAC was established to provide a broad perspective and varied background to determine the range of issues involved in the operation and development of the MSSF. The committee charge was:

“To provide advice to the WDNR in the development of a comprehensive plan that addresses the noise concerns of the neighbors, the short-term maintenance and safety needs and the long-term operation and development at the MSSF.”

“To operate in a manner that reflects the concerns of the various groups represented.”

“To strive to attain general agreement on a reasonable alternative that addresses the prominent issues identified by the public and the advisory committee member.”

The Department chaired the meetings and arranged the times, dates and locations. The Department also facilitated the discussion at these meeting and provided a brief summary of each meeting. The meeting dates and an overview of each meeting can be found in Appendix C of this report. The CAC met a total of nine (9) times from July 1997 to August 1998. The committee was provided with background information and various presentations to foster a common understanding of the situation. The CAC was also briefed on a number of items that were to be understood in any discussion of the MSSF operation and development. The included:

- Consistency with the existing Master Plan for the KMSF – SU.
- Continued operation of the fixed station range.
- Implementation of sound attenuation measures.
- Continued leasing of the operation at MSSF.
- Necessity of addressing the safety issues and disabled accessibility.

Continuance of all existing recreational and trail uses on or adjacent to the MSSF.

The WDNR and the CAC worked to develop a plan for the continued maintenance and future development of the McMiller Sports Facility. Using safety, ADA requirements, facility maintenance and user trends, the items were prioritized. The WDNR and the CAC developed a broad scope of conceptual alternatives that identified a possible range of actions from implementing only the needed safety and accessibility projects to exploring the potential for constructing an indoor range. The WDNR and CAC also identified five (5) prominent issues that should be addressed in this planning effort. They included noise, range use/operation, trail use, safety and environmental impacts. These issues generated considerable discussion, which resulted in identifying a number of potential solutions. It was determined that the first phase would address the immediate safety needs and maintenance items to keep the facility operating. The second phase would offer some limited development and the third phase will include long-term projects.

A regional survey of a number of enforcement agencies was conducted to identify the existing and potential law enforcement training and educational opportunities at the MSSF. A summary is included in Appendix D of this report. In addition, a shooters survey was conducted to obtain basic user information and identify potential use opportunities at the MSSF. A summary of this information is included in Appendix D of this report. *Please note, at the request of the CAC, the WDNR conducted the shooters survey and the law enforcement survey. The results of these surveys were utilized by the CAC to establish their needs and objectives. The survey results are not used in the justification of any alternative in this EA.*

A McMiller Sports/Shooting Report summarizing the CAC finding and recommendations was written in September 1998. Since that time, the Department has tried to obtain funds to implement recommendations. No funds have been budgeted for this project, therefore, no major changes have occurred at the MSSF. Once the funds have been procured, the required permits will be obtained and the proper notifications will be done.

Chapter II

ALTERNATIVES, INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTION

Alternatives Carried Forward for Detailed Analysis

Alternative A Proposed Action

The Department is recommending a three-phase MSSF project to be completed over eight years spending about \$200,000.00 per biennium.

The first phase of the proposed action involves the correction of safety problems at the 50-yard range. The tires that are used as the back drop for the spent shot will be removed because they have the potential to cause a fire. Once they are removed then new safety baffles will have to be constructed. The novice trap shooting range that is located within the 300-yard range will be removed and relocated east of the 300-yard range. The shooting area in the novice trap shooting range will be paved for handicap-accessibility. This is being done so that the 300-yard range and the novice trap shooting range can be operated simultaneously. Presently they can not. The 300-yard range will then be regraded and the berms raised to make the range safe for operation. The 300-yard range will also be paved for handicap-accessibility in the shooting area and a walkway will be paved to retrieve the targets. The shooting area at the 300-yard range and the novice trap range will be enclosed similar to the 100-yard range. This is being done to reduce the noise. The proposed action once completed will increase the capacity of the shooting ranges by 8-10 shooting stations. The increase will be seen in the 300-yard range.

The second phase will involve maintenance improvements on the 25, 50, and 100-yard ranges. The 100-yard range will be made handicap-accessible at the shooting benches and the walkway to retrieve the targets. New target carriers will be made. Tire removal will take place on the 25 and the 100-yard ranges for safety to reduce the fire potential. Eyebrow baffles will be installed on the 25, 50 and 100-yard ranges as a safety improvement.

The third phase involves the replacement of the 25, 50 and 100-yard shooting structures, chalet additions and modifications to include classrooms, retail and additional restrooms. The maintenance shed will be replaced, new shooting benches for the 25-yard and 100-yard ranges and a construction of a biathlon track. Also vegetative buffer zones and the use of the existing topography will be incorporated into the design.

Alternative B No Action

Alternative B involves no action.

No action at the MSSF would have the facility operating as it is today. There would be no safety improvements, the novice trap shooting range would remain within the 300-yard range restricting the usage of the 300-yard range and the novice trap shooting range at the same time. Therefore, no increase in capacity for the shooting ranges will occur. Noise reduction is a major concern and would not be addressed in this alternative. The MSSF would continue to be not accessible to the handicapped users. The current level of hunter education would continue at the existing facility. Outdoor education skill training would not be expanded to serve the public need and address the growing demand for public shooting facilities.

Alternative C

Alternative C addresses only the safety items.

This would include all needed baffles and increases in berm heights in the needed areas. The facility would not be handicap-accessible. The relocation of the novice trap would not be included in this alternative. Therefore, the simultaneous use of the 300-yard range and the novice trap range can not occur. Also, the capacity of the shooting ranges will not increase. Noise reduction is a major concern and would not be addressed in this alternative. The current level of hunter education would continue at the existing facility. Outdoor education skill training would not be expanded to serve the public need and address the growing demand for public shooting facilities.

Alternative D

Alternative D addresses only the ADA problems.

Accessibility ramps would be installed for the 100 and 300 yard ranges. This would provide accessibility to retrieve the targets. The shooting bench areas would be paved. The relocation of the novice trap would not be included in this alternative. Therefore, the simultaneous use of the 300-yard range and the novice trap range can not occur. Also, the capacity of the shooting ranges will not increase. Noise reduction is a major concern and would not be addressed in this alternative. The current level of hunter education would continue at the existing facility. Outdoor education skill training would not be expanded to serve the public need and address the growing demand for public shooting facilities

Alternative E

Alternative E addresses the safety issues and the ADA problems.

This would include all needed baffles and increases in berm heights in the needed areas. Accessibility ramps would be installed for the 100 and 300 yard ranges. This would provide accessibility to retrieve the targets. The shooting bench areas would be paved. The relocation of the novice trap would not be included in this alternative. Therefore, the simultaneous use of the 300-yard range and the novice trap range can not occur. Also, the capacity of the shooting ranges will not increase. Noise reduction is a major concern and would not be addressed in this alternative. The current level of hunter education would continue at the existing facility. Outdoor education skill training would not be expanded to serve the public need and address the growing demand for public shooting facilities.

Alternatives not Considered for Detailed Analysis

Alternative F

Alternative F is the total enclosure of the facility.

The state of the art design of an above and below ground shooting range. The estimate costs for this alternative ranged from 3.2 million dollars to 5.6 million dollars. This alternative would solve the safety problems, reduce the noise and provide a handicap-accessible facility for its users. It would increase the current level of hunter education and outdoor education skills training and would be expanded to serve the public need and address the growing demand for public shooting facilities. But, the WNDR finds the costs for this project prohibitive, and therefore, this alternative was dismissed from further consideration.

Alternative G

Alternative G is the relocation of the MSSF to a new location.

A shooting facility in the Southeast Region of Wisconsin is a commitment that was made in 1994. With 7 acres of land as a minimum requirement for a new shooting facility, the possibility of finding that quantity of land, in an area suitable for a shooting facility in the Southeastern Wisconsin is highly unlikely. The recommendation by the Department is that no houses should be located within ¼ mile of the range, unless the residents support the range. Ideally, ranges would be at least 1000 yards from a home. Even if this were possible, the cost to purchase, develop this land, make the facility socially acceptable to the public in that area would be time and cost prohibitive to the Department, and is not a considerable option at this time.

SUMMERY OF ALTERNATIVES

Characteristics Alternative Name	Atlernative Number						
	1 Proposed Action	2 No Action	3 Safety Items Only	4 ADA Item Only	5 Safety and ADA Items	6 New Location	7 Totally Enclosed
Address Safety Issues	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Address ADA Issues	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Addresses Hunter Education Needs	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Address Noise Issues	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Address general maintenance needs	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Provides long term development	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Provides adequate facilitices for outdoor skills training	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Environmental Remediation	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Use of the 300 yard range and the novice trap range simultaneously	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes

Chapter III

Affected Environment

Physical Characteristics

MSSF is located in the Southern Unit of the Kettle Moraine State Forest (KMSF-SU) on the fringe of densely populated Southeastern Wisconsin. The MSSF topography is rather level with berms constructed at each range. The outlying areas of the range have large mature oak and pines. The sporting clay and archery ranges are located in generally forested areas consisting of both pine plantation and oak/hickory hardwoods. There are no wet lands, no lakes or large bodies of water in the immediate area of MSSF. MSSF is not located in or near a flood plain. There is a paved entrance road, parking area and several permanent structures on the property.

Biological Environmental

Habitat/Vegetation

Other than gravel pads at the shooting stations the ranges are generally planted in a mixture of turf grasses. As such the developed area of the range does not provide a habitat for any animal species other than small animals that might occupy a turf grass environment.

Threatened, Endangered and Candidate Species-federal analysis

A National Heritage Inventory (NHI) for Federal and State species was conducted for this site. The results are listed below.

T5N, R17E, Section29

Emydoidea blandingii (Blandings Turtle) – Threatened

Carex sychnocephala (Many-headed Sedge) –Special Concern

Thamnophis proximus (western ribbon snake) – Endangered – Collected on McMiller

Erynnis lucilius (columbine dusky wing – butterfly) – Special Concern

Besseyia bulii (kitten tails – plant) – Threatened

Polystichum acrostichoides (Christmas fern) – Special Concern

Southern Sedge Meadow (Southern Sedge Meadow) - Community

In accordance with the June 28, 2000 FY01 Moratorium on projects impacting federal endangered species including the Eastern Massasauga Rattlesnake and Piping Plover, implementation of this project will not impact any of the concerned species or habitat used by these species. An inspection of the area found no evidence of any rare species in the area. There is some remnant of prairie vegetation behind the grove of trees well up off the road, however no rare species were found. See [Appendix E](#) for reports.

Other Wildlife Species

With the MSSF located in the KMSF-SU there is wildlife that is present. There are deer, raccoons and other small animals. On occasions there will be a deer or two that run through the facility when it is closed but for the most part wildlife stays away from the ranges.

Land Use

The site has been highly developed with significant earthwork completed to create the safety berm and level shooting stations that exist today. Roads were constructed in the wooded area for access to the sporting clay shooting range. The closest resident is about 4000 feet (.75 miles) away.

Cultural/Paleontological Resources

An Archaeological review was conducted for MSSF by the State Historical Society of Wisconsin (SHS.) The SHS stated that “there are no archeological or architectural property listed in the National Register of Historic Places located within the area of potential effect of the proposed undertaking. Furthermore, we are not aware of any properties that may be eligible for the National Register in this area.” See Appendix E.

The WDNR sent a letter to the Potawatomi Nation, in conformance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The letter was mailed on May 8, 2000. As of this date no response has been received from the Potawatomi Nation.

Local Socio-economic Conditions

This project is not expected to impact any ethnic or unique cultural ground. Regional economic conditions will not be affected.

Noise Issues

There were noise level testing completed on October 23, 1995 and September 27, 1997. Results of the testing can be found in Appendix F of this report. In May of 1998 the legislature passed the “Range Protection Bill” (See Appendix J) which prohibits local governments from using noise as an issued to regulate existing shooting ranges.

Safety Issues

The safety issues include:

- Safety for the shooters
- Safety for the non-shooters
- The confinement of all fired ammunition to the range where it was fired
- Safety for the range workers
- Safety for the neighbors of the MSSF

Presently the 25,50 and 100-yard ranges have tires that are used as the back stops for the ranges. These tires pose a potential fire hazard and need to be removed. With the removal of the tires, eyebrow baffles will need to be installed. The berms on several of the ranges are too low and need to be raised.

Lead Issues

Presently the lead is collected from the ranges and recycled.

Air Quality Issues

The air quality issues that need to be address at the MSSF is the dust from the parking lot, the lead dust during recovery/recycling and the lead fumes created when shooting.

Economic Issues

The WDNR will be using Federal Pittman-Robertson funds for this proposal. The WDNR will be requesting \$200,000.00 per biennium for the next 4 to 5 bienniums to complete this work. If Federal funds are not available then a request for State funds will be made.

CHAPTER IV

Environmental Consequences

Alternative A -Proposed Action

Habitat Impacts

The earthwork that is proposed at the MSSF includes the relocation of the novice trap shooting range to the east side of the 300-yard range. This will involve the excavation of soil and the removal of several trees to construct the novice trap shooting range. The berms around the 300-yard range will be raised to provide a safe range. The material to raise the berm height will come from the excavation for the novice trap shooting range relocation. There will be also stripping of topsoil and placing of pavement for the accessible walkways, shooting stations and sound enclosure on several of the ranges. All disturbed areas will be reseeded. All work to be completed is within the boundaries of the existing facility. The work that will be done on the archery and sporting clays shooting range will be repairs/replacement of existing structure and will not have any new impact on the habitat.

Biological Impacts

Biological impacts will be minor. With the increase in the berm height the wildlife will find it more difficult to get into the facility. The noise attenuation measures will decrease the noise levels at the facility and make it a quieter environment for the wildlife. No increase in wildlife activity within the facility is expected.

Listed Species

An inspection of the area found no evidence of any rare species in the area therefore, the proposed action will not cause any impacts on listed species.

Cultural Recourses

An archeological review was conducted for the area and no historic places were found within the MSSF. Therefore, the proposed action will not cause any impacts on cultural resources.

Noise Issues

Noise attenuation measures will be incorporated into this alternative where feasible. The 300-yard range shooting areas will be enclosed similar to the 100-yard range. The berms in the 300-yard range will be raised. Repairs will be completed on the enclosed shooting areas for the 25, 50 and 100-yard ranges. Also vegetative buffer zones and the use of the existing topography will be incorporated into the design. With this proposal the capacity of the shooting ranges increases, however with the noise attenuation measures implemented, no noise increase should be seen.

Safety Issues

The proposed action states the removal of the tires from several of the ranges at the MSSF. In doing this, a potential fire hazard is removed. Once the tires are removed eyebrow baffles must be installed. Eyebrow baffles are an important entity for keeping all fired ammunition confined to the range where it

was fired. Increasing the berm heights on the 300-yard range will provide a safety range for the shooters and the neighbors.

Lead Issues

An operational plan would include the following:

- Periodic collection of leadshot from the soil by raking the topsoil and removing the lead.
- Modify the backstop berms to include a fabric other barrier control to minimize soils infiltration and facilitate recovery and disposal or recycling.
- Incorporate a soil cap or barrier at high impact zones to minimize soils infiltration.
- Design a leadshot recovery system in areas of high use incorporating sand, vermiculite, or other large grain medium to facilitate the recovery and recycling of leadshot.

With this alternative the lead can be removed and recycled.

Air Issues

The parking area in the proposed action is paved and will not create any dust. Lead dust during the lead recovery/recycling may occur. Workers complying with the OSHA health and safety standards and utilizing the proper respiratory protection will minimize the potential for lead contamination. At the shooting stations proper ventilation will abate the potential for lead inhalation by the shooters

Economical Issues

The Federal Pittman-Robertson funds will be used for this project. Each biennium the WDNR will request \$200,000.00 for the proposal until the project is completed. The WDNR anticipates it will take about 8-10 years to complete.

Alternative B (no action)

Habitat Impacts

The Alternative B, which is proposed as a “no action” alternative will not cause any habitat impacts.

Biological Impacts.

The Alternative B, which is the proposed as a “no action” alternative will not cause any biological impacts.

Listed Species

An inspection of the area found no evidence of any rare species in the area therefore, the proposed action will not cause any impacts on listed species.

Cultural Recourses

An archeological review was conducted for the area and no historic places were found within the MSSF. Therefore, the proposed action will not cause any impacts on cultural resources.

Noise Issues

Noise attenuation measures will not be addressed in this alternative. Therefore no reduction in the noise levels in or around the perimeter of the facility will be seen. There is no plan to increase the capacity of the shooting ranges with this proposal. Therefore noise levels will only increase if the usage increases.

Safety Issues

In doing nothing at the MSSF, the tires will remain a potential fire hazard. Several of the berms surrounding the ranges will remain low, leaving the possibility for fired ammunition to leave the shooting range from which is fired from.

Lead Issues

An operational plan would include the following:

- Periodic collection of leadshot from the soil by raking the topsoil and removing the lead.

This alternative will provide lead removal and recycle.

Air Issues

The parking area in the proposed action is paved and will not create any dust. Lead dust during the lead recovery/recycling may occur. Workers complying with the OSHA health and safety standards and utilizing the proper respiratory protection will minimize the potential for lead contamination. The shooting areas will not be properly ventilated with this alternative.

Economical Issues

The funds set aside for this project will not be used.

Alternative C (safety issues only)

Habitat Impacts

Only small areas of the facility will be impacted with the construction of the berms. Any disturbed areas will be re seeded. All work to be completed is within the boundaries of the existing facility.

Biological Impacts.

An NHI review was conducted for the area and no evidence of any rare species were found within the MSSF. Therefore, the proposed action will not cause any biological impacts.

Listed Species

An inspection of the area found no evidence of any rare species in the area therefore, the proposed action will not cause any impacts on listed species.

Cultural Recourses

An archeological review was conducted for the area and no historic places were found within the MSSF. Therefore, the proposed action will not cause any impacts on cultural resources.

Noise Issues

Noise attenuation measures will not be addressed in this alternative. Therefore no reduction in the noise levels in or around the perimeter of the facility will be seen. There is no increase in the capacity of the shooting ranges because the novice trap shooting range will not be relocated. Therefore, the only increase in the noise will be seen if usage at the facility increases.

Safety Issues

The proposed action states the removal of the tires from several of the ranges at the MSSF. In doing this, a potential fire hazard is removed. Once the tires are removed eyebrow baffles must be installed. Eyebrow baffles are an important entity for keeping all fired ammunition confined to the range where it

was fired. Increasing the berm heights on the 300-yard range will provide a safety range for the shooters and the neighbors.

Lead Issues

An operational plan would include the following:

- Periodic collection of leadshot from the soil by raking the topsoil and removing the lead. This alternative will provide lead removal and recycle.

Air Issues

The parking area in the proposed action is paved and will not create any dust. Lead dust during the lead recovery/recycling may occur. Workers complying with the OSHA health and safety standards and utilizing the proper respiratory protection will minimize the potential for lead contamination. The shooting areas will not be properly ventilated with this alternative.

Economical Issues

The Federal Pittman-Robertson funds will be used for this project to correct the safety issues. Each biennium the WDNR will request \$200,000.00 to address the safety issues until all the safety issues corrected.

Alternative D (ADA issues only)

Habitat Impacts

Only small areas of the facility will be impacted with the construction of the walkways, and paved areas under the shooting benches. Any disturbed areas will be reseeded. All work to be completed is within the boundaries of the existing facility.

Biological Impacts.

An NHI review was conducted for the area and no evidence of any rare species were found within the MSSF. Therefore, the proposed action will not cause any biological impacts.

Listed Species

An inspection of the area found no evidence of any rare species in the area therefore, the proposed action will not cause any impacts on listed species.

Cultural Recourses

An archeological review was conducted for the area and no historic places were found within the MSSF. Therefore, the proposed action will not cause any impacts on cultural resources.

Noise Issues

Noise attenuation measures will not be addressed in this alternative. Therefore no reduction in the noise levels in or around the perimeter of the facility will be seen. There is no increase in the capacity of the shooting ranges because the novice trap shooting range will not be relocated. Therefore, the only increase in the noise will be seen if usage at the facility increases.

Safety Issues

In doing nothing to correct the safety issues at the MSSF, the tires will remain a potential fire hazard. Several of the berms surrounding the ranges will remain low, leaving the possibility for fired ammunition to leave the shooting range from which is fired from.

Lead Issues

An operational plan would include the following:

- Periodic collection of leadshot from the soil by raking the topsoil and removing the lead.

This alternative will provide lead removal and recycle.

Air Issues

The parking area in the proposed action is paved and will not create any dust. Lead dust during the lead recovery/recycling may occur. Workers complying with the OSHA health and safety standards and utilizing the proper respiratory protection will minimize the potential for lead contamination. The shooting areas will not be properly ventilated with this alternative.

Economical Issues

The Federal Pittman-Robertson funds will be used for this project to make the MSSF ADA accessible. The Department will request \$200,000.00 per biennium until the MSSF is totally ADA compliant.

Alternative E (Safety and ADA issues only)

Habitat Impacts

Only small areas of the facility will be impacted with the construction of the walkways, and paved areas under the shooting benches and the berms. Any disturbed areas will be reseeded. All work to be completed is within the boundaries of the existing facility.

Biological Impacts.

An NHI review was conducted for the area and no evidence of any rare species were found within the MSSF. Therefore, the proposed action will not cause any biological impacts.

Listed Species

An inspection of the area found no evidence of any rare species in the area therefore, the proposed action will not cause any impacts on listed species.

Cultural Recourses

An archeological review was conducted for the area and no historic places were found within the MSSF. Therefore, the proposed action will not cause any impacts on cultural resources.

Noise Issues

Noise attenuation measures will not be addressed in this alternative. Therefore no reduction in the noise levels in or around the perimeter of the facility will be seen. There is no increase in the capacity of the shooting ranges because the novice trap shooting range will not be relocated. Therefore, the only increase in the noise will be seen if usage at the facility increases.

Safety Issues

The proposed action states the removal of the tires from several of the ranges at the MSSF. In doing this, a potential fire hazard is removed. Once the tires are removed eyebrow baffles must be installed. Eyebrow baffles are an important entity for keeping all fired ammunition confined to the range where it

was fired. Increasing the berm heights on the 300-yard range will provide a safety range for the shooters and the neighbors.

Lead Issues

An operational plan would include the following:

- Periodic collection of leadshot from the soil by raking the topsoil and removing the lead.

This alternative will provide lead removal and recycle.

Air Issues

The parking area in the proposed action is paved and will not create any dust. Lead dust during the lead recovery/recycling may occur. Workers complying with the OSHA health and safety standards and utilizing the proper respiratory protection will minimize the potential for lead contamination. The shooting areas will not be properly ventilated with this alternative.

Economical Issues

The Federal Pittmann-Robertson funds will be used for this project to address the safety issues and to make MSSF ADA accessible. The Department will request \$200,000.00 each biennium until all the safety and ADA items are complete.

Summary of Environmental Consequences by Alternative

Alternatives	Habitat Impacts	Biological Impacts	Listed Species	Cultural Resources	Noise Impacts	Lead Issues	Safety Issues	Air Impacts	Economic Issues
Alternative A (Proposed Action)	Some impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	Reduced	No Issues	Corrected	Corrected	Within Budget
Alternative B (No Action)	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Reduction	No Issues	Not Corrected	Not Corrected	None
Alternative C (Safety Only)	Little Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Reduction	No Issues	Corrected	Not Corrected	Within Budget
Alternative D (ADA only)	Little Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Reduction	No Issues	Not Corrected	Not Corrected	Within Budget
Alternative E (Safety & ADA)	Little Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Reduction	No Issues	Corrected	Not Corrected	Within Budget

CHAPTER V

List of Preparers

Lynette Check
Natural Resources Engineer
Southeast Region
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
2300 N. Dr. Martin Luther King Dr.
P.O. Box 12346
Milwaukee, WI 53212
(414) 263-8690

