

**Final**  
**Environmental Assessment**  
**for Cornell Shooting Range, Chippewa County, Wisconsin**

Prepared by:

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, West Central Region

Prepared for:

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 3

Division of Federal Aid

1 Federal Drive

Fort Snelling, Minnesota

Contact:

Tom Lovejoy, Environmental Impact Coordinator

WDNR-WCR

1300 W. Clairemont Avenue

Eau Claire, WI 54702

Telephone: (715) 839-3747

Fax: (715) 839-6076

E-mail: [lovejt@dnr.state.wi.us](mailto:lovejt@dnr.state.wi.us)

November, 2002

Chapter 1	Project Summary, Purpose and Need.....	3
1.1	<b>Project Summary</b> .....	3
1.2	<b>Purpose</b> .....	4
1.3	<b>Need</b> .....	4
1.4	<b>Background</b> .....	5
1.5	<b>Decisions that Need to be Made</b> .....	5
Chapter 2	Alternatives, Including the Proposed Action	
2.1	<b>Alternatives Not Considered for Detailed Analysis</b> .....	5
2.2	<b>Alternatives Carried Forward for Detailed Analysis</b> .....	5
2.2.1	<b>Alternative A (Proposed Action)</b> .....	5
2.2.2	<b>Alternative B (No Action)</b> .....	7
2.2.3	<b>Alternative C (Improve Existing (Unimproved) Range</b> .....	7
2.2.4	<b>Alternative D (Enlarge Proposed Range Design</b> .....	7
Chapter 3	Affected Environment .....	7
3.1	<b>Physical Characteristics</b> .....	7
3.2	<b>Biological Environment (Habitat/Vegetation)</b> .....	8
3.3	<b>Threatened/Endangered and Candidate Species, Other Wildlife Species)...</b>	8
3.4	<b>Land Use</b> .....	8
3.5	<b>Cultural/Paleontological Resources</b> .....	8
3.6	<b>Local Socio-economic Conditions</b> .....	8
3.7	<b>Economic Issues</b> .....	9
Chapter 4	Environmental Consequences.....	9
4.1	<b>Impacts Common to all Action Alternatives</b> .....	9
4.2	<b>Impact Specific to Alternatives Considered</b> .....	9
4.2.1	Alternative A (Proposed Action).....	9
4.2.2	Alternative B (No Action) .....	11
4.2.3	Alternative C (Improve Existing Unimproved Range).....	12
4.2.4	Alternative D (Enlarge Proposed Range Design).....	12
4.3	<b>Summary Comparison of Environmental Consequences by Alternative</b> .....	13
Chapter 5	List of Preparer(s).....	13
Chapter 6	Consultation and Coordination With the Public and Others.....	14
Chapter 7	Public Comment on Draft EA and Responses .....	14
Chapter 8	References Cited.....	14
<b>Attachments</b>	.....	15

# Environmental Assessment

## Cornell Shooting Range, Chippewa Co., Wisconsin

Note to reviewers: This environmental assessment (EA) has been prepared by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources to be consistent with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements for environmental review. NEPA requirements are relevant since DNR is seeking federal Pittman-Robertson (P-R) funds for the project. The US Fish and Wildlife Service administers P-R funds and will ultimately decide if NEPA and other applicable federal regulations have been met before a funding decision is made. This EA evaluates probable environmental effects and decides on the need for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The EA includes a description of alternatives and the affected environment.

Contact: Tom Lovejoy, Environmental Impact Coordinator  
WDNR-WCR  
1300 W. Clairemont Avenue  
Eau Claire, WI 54702  
Telephone: (715) 839-3747  
Fax: (715) 839-6076  
E-mail: [lovejt@dnr.state.wi.us](mailto:lovejt@dnr.state.wi.us)

---

---

## Chapter 1 Project Summary, Purpose and Need

### 1.1 Project Summary

Location: County: Chippewa City/Town/Village: Town of Cleveland  
Township Range Section(s): NE 1/4 of SE1/4 of Section 24, T31N R7W

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) is seeking federal Pittman/Robertson funding administered by US Fish and Wildlife Service to develop a new shooting range near Cornell, Wisconsin in Chippewa County (west central Wisconsin, approximately 40 miles northeast of Eau Claire). The City of Cornell owns a 47-acre site south of STH 64 in Town of Cleveland (attachment 1). City of Cornell supports development of a shooting range at the site and is willing to make the property available for such use free of charge for at least 20 years (attachment 2). Roughly half the 47-acre parcel is wooded and the remainder is heavily disturbed (attachment 3). The City used ~1/5 of the site as a household and paper sludge landfill from 1969 to the late 1980's. The landfill was capped in 1991. Remaining disturbed portions of the site are still used by the City for clean fill disposal and as a source of sand and gravel.

Hunting is a strong part of Wisconsin's cultural heritage and a vital part of the state's economy. Demographic trends indicate the number of hunters in Wisconsin will likely hold steady through the next two decades but may be proportionately declining compared to population levels. This project reflects a concerted statewide DNR effort to promote hunter safety and skills training. These goals have been identified in a DNR report "Hunting, Fishing and Trapping 2000 - A Report Addressing Long Term Planning for the Secretary's Issue of Hunting, Fishing and Trapping in Wisconsin". One identified strategy is to promote development of hunter skills

training. Statewide efforts include development of new or upgraded shooting ranges to meet shooter demand and to expand hunter skills, safety and education opportunities. Another is to promote outdoor skills partnerships with user groups, local governments and others. A third is to seek non-DNR funding opportunities to develop outdoor skills training and use facilities. The Cornell shooting range project is consistent with these goals.

Such facilities would improve hunter skills and safety by:

- expanding the number of practice facilities available
- providing improved opportunity for "field" shooting practice along with traditional hunter education classroom instruction
- assuring that such facilities are designed to meet state-of-the-art range safety standards
- assuring free public access to users, including those with disabilities.

The adage that "practice makes perfect" is particularly important considering the safety risk associated with firearm use.

## 1.2 Purpose

The purpose of this EA is to look at the feasibility and potential for environmental consequences associated with improved public shooting facilities near Cornell, Wisconsin.

## 1.3 Need

- At the far-west end of the City's 47-acre property (~0.2 miles west of the proposed range) is an active gravel pit where local shooting groups have set up an unimproved shooting range (attachment 3). The site has a simple shooting bench set up to fire east toward a high-bank sand/gravel excavation area. Shooting direction is toward Cornell (located 2 miles east) and parallel to STH 64. Public access to the gravel pit is closed off except during a few months during the fall hunting season. The site has no side berms and does not meet shooting range safety design standards. In addition, the adjacent landowner to the west, Mr. Don White, has voiced concerns to the City regarding vandalism and noise issues. As a result local officials and sportsmen are seeking an alternative shooting range site. Discussions between local conservation wardens, governmental property managers, and interested parties have deemed this site to be the only site available in this area of the county for construction of a shooting range.

Aside from the above described unimproved range, the nearest other shooting range is located about 30 miles south at Tilden, Chippewa County.

Given the above information, the following needs should be met, to the extent possible, by any selected Alternative:

- There is a statewide need for additional ranges (Hunting, Fishing and Trapping 2000).
- There is a need for improved safety over the current site conditions.
- There is a need for improved hours and days of access by the public.
- There is a need to reduce noise and chances for vandalism to surrounding neighbors.
- There is a need for the site to be accessible for users with disabilities.
- There is a need for improved hunter education opportunities/facilities.
- There is a need to develop a local partnership for maintaining the facility.

## **1.4 Background**

As stated earlier, DNR is interested in increasing the number of properly designed shooting ranges in Wisconsin to enhance hunter skills and safety. A side benefit is meeting an increasing demand for shooting practice at ranges as a public outdoor recreation pursuit.

Firearm use, while hunting or practicing, carries a high safety risk. Since 1967 DNR has had an established hunter education program that attempts to prevent firearms incidents in order to maintain a safe and successful recreational experience. Over the last 45 years the number of hunting accidents have progressively decreased while the number of hunters has increased. New hunters are now required to complete a Basic Hunter Education course before they can purchase a hunting license. Over the last 10 years an average of ~ 30,000 students have been Hunter Education course certified by ~ 4,300 volunteer instructors. Shooting practice is encouraged for graduates to continue to gain experience with safe firearm handling and shooting accuracy. Ranges are an ideal practice training ground. (Statistics taken from Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Hunting Accident Report 2000).

In addition to a need for statewide shooting ranges, DNR needs a partner to develop and manage these (new or improved) ranges. The opportunity to partner with the City of Cornell, local hunter safety instructor(s), local FFA chapter and Cornell Lions Club provides for such cooperative efforts. The prospect of federal funding support for range development is an added incentive.

The Cornell Shooting Range project and this EA have been developed to serve as a template for future range development projects across the state.

### **1.4 Decisions that Need to be Made**

US FWS Regional Director will select one of the alternatives analyzed in detail and will determine, based on the facts and recommendations contained herein, whether this EA is adequate to support a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) decision, or whether an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will need to be prepared.

## **Chapter 2 Alternatives, Including the Proposed Action**

### **2.1 Alternatives Not Considered for Detailed Analysis**

None.

### **2.2 Alternatives Carried Forward for Detailed Analysis**

The location of all alternatives is shown on Attachment 3.

#### **2.2.1. Alternative A - Proposed Action.**

See Chapter 1, Project Summary. DNR, City of Cornell and others have cooperated for several years in effort to identify a suitable shooting range alternative in the area that avoids recognized safety problems and neighboring landowner complaints associated with the existing unimproved range (see Alternative B). The proposed site is an active sand and gravel pit that was also partially used as a city landfill from 1969 until the late

1980's. The landfill was properly capped according to DNR regulations in 1991 and is still regularly monitored to detect any problems with cap integrity and possible groundwater contamination (no such evidence of contamination to date). The proposed ~3 acre shooting range would be constructed immediately west of the landfill cap. Years of sand and gravel excavation have created a depression compared to surrounding wooded terrain. The lower topography would provide increased protection from shooting range stray fire. The range site footprint is currently being used for clean waste (gravel and sand) disposal. The disposed material will be used for construction of shooting range side and back berms.

Engineering plans have been developed based on National Rifle Association design standards. A DNR engineer trained in range design would monitor construction. Design plans call for two shooting lanes (50 and 100 yards), earth work to construct shooting lane side and back berms, erosion control measures, relocation of 0.1 miles of interior portions of the landfill access road off STH 64, a new 60'x80' gravel-base parking lot, and various minor gravel walkways, shooting benches and target supports (attachments 4-6). The range would be signed and handicapped accessible.

Construction would mainly involve bulldozing clean fill deposits (primarily clean soil and gravel generated from ongoing City sewer and water line improvements) to engineering plan specifications. A small portion of the outer west edge of the landfill cap will be covered but not penetrated. Several thousand cubic yards of clean fill is available off the western side of the landfill cap for range construction purposes.

Estimated project development costs are \$25,000-\$30,000.

The range would be open year-round, sunrise to sunset and accessible for free public use. Only stationary targets for rifle and pistol or bow shooting practice would be allowed. Shotguns could be used for firing slugs. No trap and skeet use is planned. Operation and maintenance (O&M) of the shooting range will be handled by volunteer Hunter Education Instructor(s) and a local chapter of Future Farmers of America (FFA) (attachments 7 and 8). The Cornell Lions Club has agreed to provide financial support to O&M volunteers (attachment 9). O&M responsibilities will mainly consist of litter control, berm and shooting lane mowing, periodic spent (lead) bullets recovery and recycling, shooting bench and target support replacement and other activities needed to keep the range in good condition. If problems develop DNR will arrange for O&M by others.

The range will not be manned on a routine basis, although there may be supervised sessions for hunter safety classes, club shooting events, etc. Damage by irresponsible shooters or vandalism will be repaired by O&M volunteers. If repeated vandalism becomes an issue local police and sheriff's departments will be contacted to increase surveillance in attempt to ward off such activity.

The proposed site is considered an ideal location for several reasons including: City of Cornell land ownership and support, highly disturbed setting, beneficial (re)use of a disturbed area, clean fill available on site for berm construction, local volunteers available for range operation and maintenance, and should reduce complaints from the west bordering landowner (the existing, unimproved range is 0.2 miles closer to the complainant than the proposed range-see Alternative B, section 2.2.2 below). Measures to maximize hunter safety and skills training and mitigate potential noise conflicts are:

- Site design (berms) and surrounding natural topography should attenuate noise

and help prevent stray rounds release in the surrounding area  
-Volunteer O&M organizations will be encouraged but not required to recycle spent lead (see more detailed discussion on Lead Recovery for each alternative contained in Chapter IV, Environmental Consequences)

DNR will be requesting \$25,00-30,000 federal Pittman-Robertson funds to complete this work.

#### 2.2.2. Alternative B - No Action.

This alternative would not develop a new range. The existing unimproved range, located ~ 0.2 miles west of the proposed range, would continue to be used. Safety, shooter skills and education and range accessibility needs would not be met. Complaints related to use of the unimproved existing range would continue.

#### 2.2.3. Alternative C – Improve existing (unimproved) range.

This site would be suitable for range improvements. Sand and gravel deposits at the site could be used for berm construction and new lanes could be built directing shooting more safely to the south. Plans and cost estimates have not been developed for this alternative but would be comparable to those for Alternative A. DNR will be using federal Pittman-Robertson funds if this alternative is pursued.

#### 2.2.4. Alternative D – Enlarge proposed range design.

Increasing the size is a future possibility. There is some local interest in having a longer shooting lane (proposed plans call for two shooting lanes, 50 and 100 yards long). Any such size increase may be feasible given the size and current use of the City's property. Expansion would require approval of the landowner and additional cost and maintenance. Range construction activities and O7M, etc. would be similar to Alternative A. As with other "build" alternatives (A and C), Pittman-Robertson funds would be used if this Alternative was pursued.

## **Chapter 3      Affected Environment**

### **3.1 Physical Characteristics**

All construction activities for the proposed alternative (A) would be confined within the disturbed area of the landfill. The landfill cap has a seeded grass cover. Cleared areas around the cap are mostly barren sand with a few scattered pockets of native grasses, weeds, shrubs and small trees. Less than ten trees (red pine) at the woodland edge west of the open landfill area may need to be removed for access road relocation (see attachments 3 and 4). Construction for alternatives C or D would be similarly confined to previously disturbed landfill or active sand and gravel mine areas.

No wetlands or waterways exist at the proposed range site or will be impacted. The nearest stream, Chippewa River, is located about 1/4 mile south of the site. Surface water drainage runs from the top of the mounded landfill cap to a wooded area to the west. Two 16" diameter culverts will be placed in shooting lane berms to maintain existing drainage patterns (attachment 4). Erosion control measures will be used to stabilize all disturbed areas (berms, shooting lanes, parking lot, etc.). No substantial increase in stormwater runoff is expected.

The existing landfill access road from STH 64 will also be used for range access. Approximately 0.1 miles of the existing gravel access road will be relocated just off the western edge of the 50 - yard shooting lane side berm (see attachment 4). This will allow continued dump truck access

past the range to current and future clean fill disposal areas. An existing entrance gate will be relocated (past the range parking area) to allow controlled access for city disposal needs.

### **3.2 Biological Environment (Habitat/vegetation)**

The proposed range site and alternatives C and D are exposed sand and gravel deposits or grassed edge of the landfill cap. A few scattered areas of common invading grasses, weeds and shrubs are present. Surrounding the disturbed landfill and mining areas are woodlands, mostly consisting of mixed oak, pine, birch and other common species. The disturbed nature of the landfill and mining areas limit their potential as useable wildlife habitat.

### **3.3. Threatened/Endangered and Candidate Species, Other Wildlife Species)**

The author of this EA, who is an approved caretaker of DNR's Natural Heritage Inventory, has reviewed available records and concluded no state or federal listed endangered or threatened species or other special resources are known to reside at or utilize any of alternative A-D sites. Occasional travel route or stopover use by deer and common small mammals and birds is likely.

### **3.4 Land Use**

Neither the landfill or gravel mining area on City of Cornell property is zoned. Both are highly disturbed industrial sites. The capped landfill is a permanent feature. Open areas surrounding the landfill cap are still in use for clean fill disposal. Additional fill disposal would still occur south of the proposed range in existing open areas. The range footprint will not take up so much open area that would create a demand to clear surrounding woodlands to meet future City clean fill disposal needs.

Surrounding land uses are mainly scattered rural residential lots and farmsteads and a cemetery located on neighboring land to the east (see attachment 3).

### **3.5 Cultural/Paleontological Resources**

To reduce project review workloads at State Historical Society (SHS) and promote faster review times for DNR actions, DNR and SHS have a cooperative agreement whereby SHS provides general (screening level) historical/archeological records to DNR. DNR does initial screening. The EA author is a DNR regional caretaker for SHS records. Review of screening records provided to DNR by the SHS indicate no archeological or historic features present at the proposed range site or alternatives C and D. In addition, any unknown resources that may have been present have likely already been disturbed or destroyed by past landfill and mining operations.

### **3.6 Local Socio-economic Conditions**

The project area is rural and sparsely populated. Cornell, population ~1500, is the only city within ten miles. Most residents work in Cornell (small business or service) or are farmers or loggers in outlying rural areas.

The landfill and sand/gravel mining activity provide for related municipal services for City of Cornell. The solid waste landfill has been closed but surrounding cleared areas are still used for clean fill disposal.

The nearest public recreation areas are Brunet Island State Park (1 mile north) and Old Abe

State Recreation Trail (~3/4 mile east and across Chippewa River) (see attachment 1).

### **3.7 Economic Issues**

DNR will be using federal Pittman-Robertson funds for this proposal. DNR will be requesting \$25,000-30,000 to complete this work.

## **Chapter 4 Environmental Consequences**

### **4.1 Impacts Common to All Action Alternatives**

Endangered/Threatened Species - Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) screening records for endangered/threaten species, natural areas or other rare biological communities have indicated no such sensitive resources present for any of the alternatives considered.

Cultural Resources - SHS screening records for sensitive Historical or Archeological features have been reviewed and indicate no resources present for any of the alternatives considered.

Environmental Justice - Any of the build alternatives for this project would have the potential to have a minor positive impact on Environmental Justice by providing a quality, free public shooting facility.

Economics - DNR will be using federal Pittman-Robertson funds for any of the listed "build" alternatives. DNR will be requesting \$25,000-30,000 to complete this work. Regardless of which alternative (A-D) was implemented, no major economic impacts are expected. Range users may increase sales at nearby small businesses (gas stations, restaurants, shooter supply stores, etc.).

Controversy - No controversy is anticipated with Alternatives A or D.

### **4.2 Impact Specific to Alternatives Considered**

#### **4.2.1 Alternative A - Proposed Action**

Habitat Impacts - Minor negative impacts would be expected. The proposed site is highly disturbed barren ground and provides little habitat value. Reseeding of shooting range side and back berms may increase habitat value but year-round range use would limit habitat suitability.

Minor and temporary fugitive dust and equipment exhaust emissions would be generated during range construction. Heavy construction equipment may compact clean fill deposits used to construct berm and other range features.

Biological Impacts - Minor negative biological impacts would be expected. The City property is already used as an unimproved shooting range and constructing and using an improved range would not greatly increase animal startle effect or other impacts.

There is little current wildlife use of the disturbed site except as a migration corridor or stopover. Shooting range side and back berms will be seeded for erosion control and grass cover establishment. This may increase habitat value and potential for use by deer, mice, moles, voles and other wildlife species, but year-round disturbance from range activity would probably limit suitability for wildlife.

Social Conditions - A new range at the proposed site would meet shooting range user needs/demand, provide improved public access year-round, be handicapped accessible and improve hunter education opportunities. The local partnership that is available to operate and maintain the facility would help make this project economically viable for the Wisconsin DNR.

Safety - There is a safety risk associated with shooter error, firearm malfunction and intentional shooter vandalism. The proposed range would improve safety over the existing condition in several ways. Former sand and gravel mining at the site has created a bowl-shaped depression compared to surrounding wooded terrain. These features, combined with construction of side and back berms, would help prevent stray fire from escaping the City property. The direction of fire south from STH 64 (compared to east, parallel with the highway, at the existing range) would also help prevent stray fire in public use areas (highway and Cornell Cemetery to the east). Firearm handling and shooting practice at the site would help promote / retain routine firearm safety practices for hunters. Intentional vandalism is always a possibility, especially like here where the site will not be continuously manned and supervised. If vandalism becomes a problem increased surveillance from local police officials will be requested to halt such activities.

Noise - Increased in range use (compared to limited seasonal use at the existing unimproved range) would result in increased noise generation. The existing range is gated and has historically been open for public use only during a few months in the fall. The new facility would be open year-round from sunrise to sunset (winter use will probably be little if any). Neighbors have been made aware of this and have expressed no concerns. The existing site topography (lower compared to surrounding terrain due to former sand and gravel operations), change in shooting direction (south as opposed to east) and presence of side and back berms will help attenuate noise impacts to neighbors and visitors at the Cornell cemetery (located ~1/4 mile to the east - see attachment 2). Noise complaints from use at the existing site should be reduced due to increased separation distance to proposed new site location and its surrounding bowl-shaped topography and the presence of new shooting lane side berms which should attenuate noise at ground level.

Land Use - No substantial change in land use is expected. The site is already disturbed and will continue to receive clean fill deposits. Intensity of human use at the site will increase if the range is built and in use. New range construction at the proposed site is a reversible action. Shooting benches and target supports could be removed, berms leveled and spent lead recovered so as to restore existing (already disturbed) site conditions. Creating the proposed range is a compatible and beneficial (re)use of the landfill site. The proposed Cornell facility would replace the use (and problems) associated with the existing gravel pit site

Lead Recovery - Accumulation of spent lead in berms could create a risk of lead contamination to groundwater. This is not known to cause a problem at other Wisconsin land-based shooting ranges. Shooting ranges over water, particularly shotgun ranges, are typically discouraged due to concerns regarding breakdown of lead in water and an associated risk of 1) ingestion by wildlife feeding in such areas and 2) surface or groundwater contamination and associated negative human/biological health effects. Periodic recovery and recycling of lead by operators would be encouraged but not required.

- Recreation - The new range will improve opportunity for recreational practice shooting. It will assure free and year-round public access compared to seasonally-limited access at the existing site. It will provide range accessibility for all interested users, including minorities

and those with disabilities. Impacts to Brunet Island State Park users are not expected, especially considering the proposed southerly shooting direction. DNR's trail coordinator was contacted and expected some noise impacts to Old Abe State Recreation Trail users. The range berms and firing direction should help render any such noise impacts as minor.

Cumulative Impacts - Cumulative impact has been defined in the National Environmental Policy Act as "the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action (in this case new shooting range development) when added to other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency or person undertakes such other action". Chapter 1, Project Summary, describes DNR interest in developing new shooting ranges across Wisconsin to promote hunting safety. The development of the Cornell range would be one step in achieving that goal. No criteria have been set as to the demand for new ranges, how many should be built, location of such facilities, etc. Similarly DNR has no regulations regarding safe setback distances from other types of land uses. It is not expected that so many new ranges would be proposed in near proximity to each other that there would be an additive cumulative effect such as for safety or noise. City of Cornell plans continued use of open areas at the site for clean fill disposal. A (replacement) range, whether alternative A, C or D, would not set a precedent resulting in substantial increased demand for such facilities elsewhere. But it would create a safer and more accessible facility to meet local shooting range demand. No conflicts with local, state or federal plans or policies are expected. Lead deposition and cumulative spent lead build-up in earthen berms is not known in Wisconsin to present a serious risk of groundwater contamination or other environmental risk (see above Lead recovery discussion). DNR would not support or seek federal funding for any new shooting ranges over water. Spent lead recovery at the proposed range would be encouraged.

Controversy - None. The landowner, City of Cornell, is making Alternative A land available without cost. Town and county authorities have no land use jurisdiction but have voiced their support for the project. Neighbors have been contacted and have not raised concerns or objections.

#### 4.2.2 Alternative B - No Action

Habitat Impacts - None. The existing unimproved range would not be altered. The unimproved range would continue to be used during the fall (if allowed by City of Cornell), and there would be no change in habitat value.

Biological Impacts - None. No new disturbance would take place beyond current City use of the site for sand/gravel mining. Public use in the fall as an unimproved shooting range would continue.

Social Conditions - None.

Safety - No change, enhanced shooting practice opportunities would not be realized.

Noise - No change. Noise (and vandalism) complaints from west neighboring landowner would continue.

Economics - No major economic impacts would be expected.

Land Use - None.

Lead Recovery - None.

Recreation - None. The existing range would continue to be open for public use for limited time periods at City discretion.

Environmental Justice - None. The existing range is not handicapped accessible and would not be made so.

Cumulative Impacts - No change. Continued risk for cumulative impacts from lead build-up (as compared to Alternatives A, C and D) since no O&M is planned at the existing range.

Controversy - No change. Some continued controversy is expected as described in Noise discussion above.

#### 4.2.3 Alternative C - Improve existing unimproved range

This site is closer to neighboring property to the west. That landowner's residence is 0.2 miles closer to the existing range than would be the proposed range. The landowner also has a stockpile of old machinery and vehicles scattered along his east property line, and there have been complaints that some of his property has been used as shooting targets. Neighbor complaints would likely increase if the existing range were to be improved and as year-round use increases. Range development cost, design, construction activities, O&M, etc. would be similar to those for Alternative A.

Habitat Impacts - Same as for Alternative A.

Biological Impacts - Same as for Alternative A.

Social Conditions - Same as for Alternative A except that noise and vandalism complaints from west neighboring landowner would likely increase due to year-round use at the unimproved range site.

Safety - Same as for Alternative A, depending on exact site layout/design.

Noise - Alternative C is ~ 0.2 miles closer to the adjacent western property line than Alternative A. Impacts would be the same as or slightly greater than for Alternative A, except continued and possible increased complaints from the adjacent western landowner may occur. This could prompt City to consider discontinued use of the site as a public shooting range.

Land Use - Same as for Alternative A.

Lead Recovery - Same as for Alternative A.

Recreation - Same as for Alternative A.

Cumulative Impacts - Same as for Alternative A.

Controversy - Same as Noise discussion above.

#### 4.2.4 Alternative D - Enlarge proposed range design

Habitat Impacts - Same as for Alternative A.

Biological Impacts - Same as for Alternative A.

Social Conditions - Same as for Alternative A.

Safety - Generally same as for Alternative A depending on exact layout/design of a longer shooting lane. Expansion at some future time may increase safe shooter appreciation of the safe distance (range) and accuracy of their weapons.

Noise - Generally same as for Alternative A.

Land Use - Same as for Alternative A.

Lead Recovery - Same as for Alternative A.

Recreation - Generally same as for Alternative A, possible minor increase in recreation opportunity if a longer shooting lane is added (or one of the proposed lanes is extended).

Cumulative Impacts - Same as for Alternative A.

Controversy - Same as for Alternative A.

### 4.3 Summary Comparison of Environmental Consequences by Alternative

Key:

Unless indicated, 0 = no impact, L(ow) = minor, H(igh) = major, + = positive , - = negative

Issue	Alt. A (proposed)	Alt. B (no action)	Alt. C (improve existing range)	Alt. D (enlarge)
End./Thr. Species	0	0	0	0
Cultural Resources	0	0	0	0
Envir. Justice	L+	0	L+	L+
Economics	\$25-30K	0	\$25-30K	>\$25-30K
Habitat	L-	0	L-	L-
Biological	L-	0	L-	L-
Social	H+	0	L-	H+
Safety	H+	0	H+	H+
Noise	L+/L-	0	L-	L+/L-
Land Use	0	0	0	0
Lead Recovery	L+	0	L+	L+
Recreation	H+	0	H+	H+
Cumulative	0	0	0	0
Controversy	0	0	L-	0

## Chapter 5 List of Preparer(s)

Tom Lovejoy  
Environmental Impact Coordinator  
DNR-WCR  
1300 W. Clairemont Ave.  
Eau Claire, WI 54702

## **Chapter 6 Consultation and Coordination With the Public and Others**

The range site is owned by City of Cornell but is located in the town of Cleveland, Chippewa County. The township is not zoned and, therefore, no local land use permits are required for range development. Mr. Charles Carrell, Town Chairman, was contacted on 3/6/02 and stated that shooting range development at the former landfill is not a problem and requires no town approvals.

Mr. Doug Clary, Chippewa County Zoning Administrator, was contacted on 3/6/02. No county permits or approvals are required. Mr. Clary felt the range would be a good (re)use of the disturbed landfill site.

DNR Conservation Warden Tom Harris (now retired), stationed at Cornell, contacted all adjacent neighbors and no opposition to the project was received.

DNR Conservation Warden Scott Bowe, (stationed at Cornell) and Warden Harris arranged for local volunteers for shooting range O&M (attachments 7-9).

Jack Tritt, DNR solid waste specialist, oversees the Cornell landfill closure and required groundwater monitoring for the site. The east berm of the 100 yard shooting lane will be constructed on top of ~ 20 feet of the western outer edge of the landfill cap. Mr. Tritt indicated the cap edge extended beyond the actual landfill disposal cells and that shooting range berm construction on the edge of the cap would not affect cap integrity. Spent lead (bullets) that are deposited in the back berms behind targets is not a regulated solid or hazardous waste unless there is a permanent change of land use (and ground disturbance) at the site. A land use change is not allowed under conditions of the landfill closure approval.

Jean Rygiel, DNR West Central Region Trails Coordinator, was consulted about potential shooting range impacts to Old Abe State Recreation Trail users. The nearest section of the trail is ~ 0.75 miles east from the proposed shooting range. Some adverse noise impacts to trail users is expected, but range berms and southerly shooting direction (compared to existing range easterly shooting direction) should help attenuate noise impacts.

Gerald Dorscheid, DNR Range Design Engineer, prepared engineering plans and a cost estimate. Mr. Dorscheid would supervise project construction if and when the project is approved and funded.

This environmental assessment will be made available as a draft document for public review and comments, further allowing identification of any controversy associated with the project. A news release will be sent by DNR to Chippewa County TV and radio stations and newspapers describing the project and requesting comments. Comments would be considered before the EA is forwarded as a final document to US FWS for a determination of NEPA compliance. Any public comments received would be attached as a part of the final EA.

## **Chapter 7 Public Comment on Draft EA and Responses**

The draft environmental assessment was distributed for a 30-day review period ending November 4, 2002. No comments were received.

## Chapter 8      References Cited

Copies of references cited can be obtained from WDNR contact person listed on page 1.

-National Rifle Association Range Manual, 1989.

-Hunting, Fishing and Trapping 2000 - A Report Addressing Long Term Planning for the Secretary's Issue of Hunting, Fishing and Trapping in Wisconsin, WDNR, 2000.

-Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Hunting Accident Report 2000, Pub-LE-006-01

## Attachments

Attachment 1    Location map (1999 Chippewa County plat book)

Attachment 2    Land Use Agreement by City of Cornell and DNR allowing range development on city land

Attachment 3    1998 aerial photo showing main features of site layout

Attachments 4-6 Range engineering plans

Attachment 7    O&M agreement with local hunting education instructor

Attachment 8    O&M agreement with local chapter Future Farmers of America (FFA)

Attachment 9    O&M agreement with Cornell Lions Club